

SCHUMANN



舒曼 钢琴作品全集

第一卷

Complete Piano Works

Volume I

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

4J0516

Robert Schumann

罗伯特·舒曼

钢琴作品全集第一卷

Complete Piano Works Volume I

URTEXT

(原始版)

编辑：恩斯特·赫特里希

Ernst Herttrich

指法编注：汉斯-马丁·特奥波德

Hans-Martin Theopold

瓦尔瑟·兰珀

Walther Lampe (Op.1)

罗伯特·舒曼

Robert Schumann (Op.3)

克劳斯·席尔德

Klaus Schilde (Op.5)

上海市第四期教育高地建设项目 (编号: 21023D1)

翻译：秦展闻

杨韵琳

周挺

(按姓氏拼音排序)



G. HENLE VERLAG

德国G. 亨乐出版社提供版权

 **SMPH**
上海音乐出版社
WWW.SMPH.CN

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

舒曼钢琴作品全集 第一卷 / 恩斯特·赫特里希编; 汉斯-马丁·特奥波德等指法编注; 秦展闻等翻译 - 上海: 上海音乐出版社, 2014.9

ISBN 978-7-5523-0581-4

I. 舒… II. ①恩… ②汉… ③秦… 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 123060 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 第一卷

编 者: 恩斯特·赫特里希

指法编注: 汉斯-马丁·特奥波德 等

翻 译: 秦展闻 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: 34 插页: 4 谱、文: 272 面

2014 年 9 月第 1 版 2014 年 9 月第 1 次印刷

印数: 1-3,000 册

ISBN 978-7-5523-0581-4/J · 0516

定价: 94.00 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

舒曼钢琴作品全集

(共六卷)

第一卷

- Op. 1 阿贝格主题变奏曲
Op. 2 蝴蝶
Op. 3 帕格尼尼练习曲
Op. 4 间奏曲
Op. 5 即兴曲 (1833年版)
即兴曲 (1850年版)
Op. 6 大卫同盟舞曲
Op. 7 练习曲 (1830年版)
托卡塔 (1834年版)

第二卷

- Op. 8 快板
Op. 9 狂欢节
Op. 10 帕格尼尼练习曲
Op. 11 升F小调钢琴奏鸣曲
Op. 12 幻想曲集

第三卷

- Op. 13 交响练习曲 (1837年版)
交响练习曲 (1852年版)
Op. 14 无乐队协奏曲 (1836年版)
大奏鸣曲 (1853年版)
Op. 15 童年情景
Op. 16 克莱斯勒偶记

第四卷

- Op. 17 幻想曲
Op. 18 阿拉伯风格曲
Op. 19 花之歌
Op. 20 幽默曲
Op. 21 新事曲
Op. 22 G小调钢琴奏鸣曲
Op. 23 夜曲

第五卷

- Op. 26 维也纳狂欢节
Op. 28 浪漫曲三首
Op. 32 谐谑曲、吉格舞曲、浪漫曲
与小赋格曲
Op. 68 少年曲集
Op. 72 赋格四首
Op. 76 进行曲四首
Op. 82 林地之景

第六卷

- Op. 99 彩色的叶子
Op. 111 三首幻想曲
Op. 118 三首少年钢琴奏鸣曲
Op. 124 纪念册页
Op. 126 七首小赋格形式的钢琴小品
Op. 133 早晨的歌
Anh. F25 练习曲集 (贝多芬主题练习曲集)
Anh. F39 主题与变奏曲 (幽灵变奏曲)

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部作品,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。

第一卷收录了Op. 1~7。这些作品创作于1829至1833年末,并于1831至1834年出版。只有《大卫同盟舞曲》(Davidsbündlertänze)是例外:舒曼直到1837年夏末才创作这一作品,并于1838年1月首次出版。该作品为何编号为“6”仍是个谜,关于这一点,下文中提供了详细信息。

阿贝格主题变奏曲 Op. 1

《阿贝格主题变奏曲》(Abegg-Variationen)是舒曼公开发表的首部作品。他那时正21岁,已经创作了大量乐曲,它们并非全是钢琴曲。(他之后出版的22部作品都是为钢琴而作的事实可能会让人得出错误结论。)除了钢琴曲和歌曲之外,他书桌的抽屉里还有为高音部、中音部和乐队而作的“诗篇”(Psalm),钢琴四重奏曲,钢琴协奏曲以及交响曲,其中部分作品未完成。舒曼最终认为《阿贝格主题变奏曲》值得作为自己的首次出版的作品。根据他在个人抄本的扉页上留下的文字,该作品是于1829~1830年交接的那个冬天在海德堡(Heidelberg)创作而

成的。《阿贝格主题变奏曲》起初并非钢琴独奏作品。它原本是为钢琴和乐队而作的炫技作品,其引子与主题没有关联。这一版本可能是受到了伊格纳兹·莫谢莱斯(Ignaz Moscheles)对《亚历山大进行曲》(La Marche d'Alexandre)进行改编而创作的变奏曲(Op. 32)的启发,舒曼本人也于1830年1月24日在海德堡演奏过它。钢琴独奏版本大约在1830年的7、8月最终成型。一年后的1831年9月12日,舒曼将该作品提交给了莱比锡出版商基斯特纳(Kistner)。这位年轻作曲家在书信中提到了当时的情形:“我只希望乐谱的版式、纸张、刻版以及标题页能与卡尔·迈耶尔(Carl Mayer)由普罗布斯特(Probst)发行的《渴望的华尔兹》(Sehnsuchtswalzer)变奏曲相媲美。如果您能保证实现我的这一请求,我非常愿意以半价购买50至60册(例如提前自费购买),以免您受到经济损失。最后,我能否谦卑地请求您在11月18日之前出版这首变奏曲?那天是阿贝格伯爵夫人的生日,我在很多方面都对她的不胜感激。”

出版商接受了舒曼的“首部”作品,并将其在他所期望的出版期限内发行。首次出版乐谱对舒曼而言有着巨大的意义,这充分体现在他《莱比锡生活经历》(Leipziger Lebensbuch, 1831年10月13日至1838年11月28日的日记)的两段文字中。其中一段写在作品正式出版之前,另一段写在出版后不久:

“人生的第一份校样打断了我的思路。太幸福了!我的第一份校样!”(1831年11月7日)

“变奏曲的谱子来了。里面所有的细节在印刷时似乎都顾及到了。”(1831年11月12日)

初版标题页上提到的波林·阿

贝格伯爵夫人(Pauline Comtesse d'Abegg),据舒曼本人向朋友安东·特奥多·拓普肯(Anton Theodor Töpken)透露,是他“故弄玄虚”。学者普遍认为这一名字指的是梅塔·阿贝格(Meta Abegg, 1810~1835)。这位年轻女士来自曼海姆(Mannheim),因丈夫姓冯·海根多夫(von Heygendorff)而被人熟知。拓普肯推测,这一名字很可能是因朗朗上口而获得了舒曼的喜爱。诚然,其中还有不应忽略的重要私人因素,即便在给基斯特纳的信中提到的11月18日并不是这位年轻女士的生日(她出生在4月16日)。这可能是舒曼为了进一步隐藏他们的实际关系而故布疑阵,也可能是他希望自己第一部发表的作品能在10天后母亲生日的那天(11月28日)拿到。这一谜题的答案仍在推敲之中。当约翰内斯·勃拉姆斯(Johannes Brahms)1855年2月去安德尼希(Endenich)拜访生病的作曲家时,阿贝格伯爵夫人再次成为了谈论的话题,由此可见这位女士对舒曼整个艺术生涯的影响。勃拉姆斯在给克拉拉的信中写道:“他和我说起了你们的旅行,到过七山(Seven Hills)、瑞士和海德堡,也提到了阿贝格伯爵夫人。”

舒曼的首部作品得到了评论界的好评:《维也纳日报》(Wiener Zeitung, 载于《大众音乐周报》,Allgemeiner Musikalischer Anzeiger第26期,第101页)1832年6月28日刊登了以下正面评论:“这位年纪可能尚小的作曲家我们之前从未遇到过,他是我们这个年代非常罕见的。他不拘泥于条条框框,从自己的脑海中汲取灵感,并拒绝借用他人的成就来抬高自己。他创造了欢快嬉戏、勇往直前的理想世界,偶尔甚至有点古怪……这首作品演奏的

难度极高,需要非常鲜明地刻画性格特点。整首乐曲必须经过仔细研究和练习才能获得符合作曲家意图的整体效果。”舒曼在《莱比锡生活经历》中记录了这一评论,并写道:“我自己是不可能《在维也纳日报》上发表这样的评论的。母亲和朱利叶斯(Julius,舒曼的兄弟)一定会很高兴!愿无形中为我大力宣传的第26期《维也纳日报》这位‘赞助商’收获勤奋、谦逊及安宁作为回报!”

蝴蝶 Op. 2

舒曼的《蝴蝶》(Papillons)写于1829至1831年间,与《阿贝格主题变奏曲》几乎同时创作。在一定程度上,这几年是舒曼音乐艺术发展的关键时期。尽管他仍是在莱比锡和海德堡求学的法律系学生,但全身心投入音乐艺术的冲动已愈发强烈,因此他计划成为职业钢琴家。在下定决心无论如何都要放弃学习法律后,他又在音乐与诗歌创作之间犹豫不决。

在音乐和文学两方面的才华使舒曼的众多文学形象与他的音乐创作紧密结合。在1832年4月15日将一份初版副本寄献给母亲以便向三位嫂子展示时,他自己解释了《蝴蝶》中涉及的文学典故。他在附信中这样写道:“恳请各位嫂子尽快阅读让·保尔(Jean Paul)《年少岁月》(Flegeljahre)的最后一幕,因为《蝴蝶》其实是将那场景假面舞会转化成了音符。”

让·保尔是舒曼极为推崇的文学偶像。1828年3月17日他曾向友人卡尔·弗莱奇(Carl Flechsig)感叹道:“这位作家在我心中地位独尊,高于其他所有作家,包括席勒在内(我至今依然读不懂歌德的作品)。”《年少岁月——传记》(Flegeljahre. Eine Biographie)一直都是舒曼喜欢的小说之一。多年以后,在1838年给克

拉拉的一封信中,他甚至认为这是一部“与《圣经》类似的作品”。这部小说于1804~1805年出版,为四卷本。主人公是一对双胞胎兄弟瓦尔特(Walt)和弗尔特(Quod Deus Vult,意为“上帝将会”),还有少女威娜(Wina),兄弟俩都爱上了她。小说的最后一幕(舒曼专门提及)是一场盛大的假面舞会。舞会上,弗尔特戴上了瓦尔特的假面,威娜因而答应了他的求婚。在知晓威娜实际上是同意嫁给瓦尔特后,弗尔特离开了小镇。而瓦尔特则在熟睡,沉浸在由他兄弟吹奏的长笛声以及他自己的幸福回忆交织而成的梦境中。小说最后的结尾是:“瓦尔特愉悦地听着飘荡在小巷里的曲调,却没注意到自己的兄弟正随之离开。”

在舒曼的书信中还有许多段落能表明《年少岁月》与《蝴蝶》之间的紧密关联。在评论家路德维希·雷尔斯塔(Ludwig Rellstab)发来评论文章后,他在回信中特地指出:“我想就《蝴蝶》的由来补充几句,因为两者之间的关联并不明显。阁下一定可以回想起《年少岁月》的最后一幕:假面舞会、瓦尔特、弗尔特、面具、威娜、弗尔特的舞蹈、交换面具、忏悔、怒气、揭发、匆忙的离开以及最后远走高飞的兄弟等等。我经常回顾这一幕,因为我觉得结局似乎预示着新的开始。”(的确,让·保尔直到生命的最后时刻都在考虑续写这部小说。)“不知不觉中,我发现自己来到了钢琴旁,《蝴蝶》中的小曲由此接连诞生。”然而到了1834年的夏天,他在给女性朋友亨丽埃特·福格特(Henriette Voigt)的信中改变了原来的说法:“我重申我是根据音乐改编小说文本而非根据小说文本改编音乐,后者完全是徒劳的。只有与第一首前后呼应、反映命运反复无常的最

后一首小曲是受到了让·保尔的启发。”在之后的几年中,舒曼常常否认音乐以外的因素对他作品的影响,可能是为了避免这些作品被误解为标题音乐。不过就《蝴蝶》而言,这部作品与让·保尔《年少岁月》之间的紧密关联至关重要。在作曲家私人收藏的那本小说中,有许多与《蝴蝶》中的编号相对应的注解,这是两者紧密关联的有力证据。本卷在相关曲目的评注部分中引用了这些注解。

舒曼后来对《蝴蝶》持批评态度,并在1832年6月9日的日记中写道:在《蝴蝶》中,“转调太过频繁,色彩太过鲜明……听众仍在回味前一幅画面时,演奏者已经迅速弹完了下一段。这种“自我毁灭”的特质确实有值得批判之处,不过这并不影响作品本身的艺术性。在乐曲的间隔期内,可以痛饮一杯香槟。”

舒曼非常关注他人对《蝴蝶》的看法,因为这是继《阿贝格主题变奏曲》之后又一部他认为适合出版的作品。他的日记记录了出版商普罗布斯特和霍夫迈斯特(Hofmeister)以及他的老师弗里德里希·维克(Friedrich Wieck)的评价;然而,弗里德里希·维克选择的“刺激、新颖、有原创精神、美国式(!)、少见”等词语,表明这位老师在理解这部新奇作品时有些困难。

舒曼非常重视《蝴蝶》的准确演绎。克拉拉·维克(Clara Wieck)当时刚满13岁,在该作品出版后立即投入练习。舒曼的日记中有大量关于她演奏的记录,例如1832年5月23日:“克拉拉没有完全掌握《蝴蝶》,不过总的来说弹得不错,我挺满意。唯一的缺陷在于她的演奏无论多么富有感情且令人陶醉,仍然不够精致。”三日后,另一篇日记显示她有明显的进步:“克拉拉的处理非常

完美,且充满了感情。”奇怪的是,克拉拉·舒曼直到1866年才公开演奏了《蝴蝶》。此后,这部作品经常出现在她的音乐会曲目表中。

《蝴蝶》的初版于1832年2月或3月由弗里德里希·基斯特纳(Friedrich Kistner)发行。作曲家的私人副本现收藏于茨维考(Zwickau)的罗伯特·舒曼故居(Robert Schumann House),其中包含若干对亲笔手稿的订正,这在评注部分中有详细说明。该版本是我们这一净版的主要参考底本。另一重要参考底本是作曲家的亲笔手稿。

有众多日记信息表明,舒曼曾计划谱写《蝴蝶》的第二部。相关文字出现在第一部初版的标题页上,仿佛暗示着他已承诺出版商一定会完成第二部。同年8月9日,“《蝴蝶》第二部”(Papillons, Livr.2)出现在标题为“作品集”(Works)的列表中,证明舒曼已开始将这一计划付诸实践。然而,该计划并未实现。1833年6月6日,他把《即兴曲》(Op.5)作为《蝴蝶》的第二部交给了基斯特纳,这里的“《蝴蝶》”显然是暗指基斯特纳刚出版发行的那部作品。

奇怪的是,舒曼应该在生命快到尽头时重新回顾了这一早期作品。华盛顿的美国国会图书馆(The Library of Congress)保存了一份第十首的清样,该作品由C大调移至 b B大调。据玛丽·舒曼和克拉拉·舒曼称,这是舒曼在安德尼希隔离疗养时所作。

帕格尼尼练习曲 Op. 3

同许多其他19世纪作曲家一样,包括弗朗茨·李斯特(Franz Liszt)和约翰内斯·勃拉姆斯在内,罗伯特·舒曼深为小提琴魔术师尼科洛·帕格尼尼(Nicolò Paganini)本

人及其“魔鬼气质”所吸引。在创作了改编版本的“随想曲”(Caprices Op. 3)和“练习曲”(Études Op. 10)之后很久,舒曼回顾1829年的音乐历程时透露“是帕格尼尼激发了我创作的灵感和力量”。舒曼第一次听到这位意大利小提琴家的演奏是1830年4月11日在美茵河畔法兰克福举行的一场音乐会上。他在日记中写道:“‘帕格尼尼之夜’让人怀疑他在艺术上是否追求完美,因为他缺少庄严高贵的艺术宁静感……不过我非常高兴。我在包厢里(不清楚舒曼是否被介绍给了帕格尼尼——原文作者注)……愉快地进入梦乡。”从中可以看出,舒曼对帕格尼尼的评价并非一味的褒扬。不过总的来说,他一生都对这位意大利音乐家抱有极高的敬意。帕格尼尼的《随想曲》(Op. 1)对舒曼也许有着特殊的吸引力,因为他俩都擅长“将刻板的作品用皮西厄斯式(Pythias)的动人语言表达出来”。而对于帕格尼尼的精湛技巧,舒曼认为是“完美技艺与超强表现力”的结合(参见1831年6月15日的日记)。

舒曼在当时的日记中多次提及了帕格尼尼,一般都是关于Op. 3和Op. 10的由来。他在1832年6月4日写道:“帕格尼尼的这首《G小调随想曲》旋律优美。(帕格尼尼版的编号是Op. 3 No. 16,舒曼版的编号是Op. 3 No. 6。——原文作者注)前天我看到一幅给我留下恶劣印象的画:在魔力圈内的帕格尼尼,被谋杀的女子,舞动的骷髅以及一队纠缠不休的幽灵[约翰·彼得·里泽尔(Johann Peter Lyser)创作的题为‘1828年维也纳音乐会上’的漫画。——原文作者注]。不过这幅画的创作不乏想象力和生命力。谱写‘g小调’的急板时,这幅画经常浮现在我脑海中,不过我

相信曲子的结尾部分还不至于让人马上联想到它。”

舒曼自己的作品集的目录中显示该作品的诞生时间为“1832年复活节”。尽管如此,舒曼自那天以后必定又为这部作品花了大量时间,因为他在6月6日的日记中写道:“随想曲昨天终于全部完成了。”最后,他于6月8日生日那天将完成的作品寄给了老师弗里德里希·维克,并写道:“请友善地对待这些随想曲,因为创作过程非常艰辛。请您拿支铅笔,坐在克拉拉身旁,把怪异之处标记出来。”

第二天,他又在日记中写道:“约中午时去了老师家。他称赞了‘我的勤奋’,并表示这部作品非常有趣。”舒曼在6月3日就已经请维克将他的新作品推荐给莱比锡出版商霍夫迈斯特。维克似乎满足了他的愿望。6月9日,舒曼在日记中写道:“去镇上拜访了年轻的霍夫迈斯特,事情解决了。克拉拉忙着寻找帕格尼尼主题变奏曲,在我生日时拿来两首(作为庆祝)。”6月22日他写道:“这是对随想曲的最后一次精心润色。”篇幅冗长的“序”可能也是在这段时间内完成的。然而,舒曼日记中6月22日之前八天的空白透露了一个不幸的消息。6月14日的日记这样写道:“中指完全麻痹。”舒曼成为职业钢琴家的希望最终被埋葬。

Op. 3的亲笔手稿遗失。该版本可能作为初版刻版者的副本,初版于1832年8月由霍夫迈斯特在莱比锡发行,有以下字样:“Op.III. Lief. [installment] I”(Op. 3,分册出版,第一分册)。Op. 10正式出版后,这一编号变更为“Op.X.N° 1”,以反映这两部作品之间的紧密联系。在私人副本的作品编号下方,舒曼标记了“Equals Opus III”(即Op. 3)并

沿用至今。现在这一版本按照原有的格式复制了德文版前言,重新校译了法文版前言,并添加了新的英文翻译。由于亲笔手稿已不存于世,初版是本版本参考的唯一底本。

Op. 3 在评论界获得的评价褒贬不一。路德维希·雷尔斯塔在杂志《音乐艺术领域中的伊里斯》(*Iris im Gebiete der Tonkunst*, 1833年1月4日)发表评论时批评了这一作品,认为它“缺乏创新性”且“指法令人费解”。另一方面,不止弗朗茨·李斯特一人支持 Op. 3 这首练习曲,他在多场独奏会中都演奏过。克拉拉·维克自1834年起就将该作品列入了曲目表中。帕格尼尼本人肯定也听过这一改编版的随想曲,而且似乎对它非常感兴趣。要知道舒曼在1838年2月13日给出版商霍夫迈斯特的信中透露,帕格尼尼“向他在法国的笔友索要由这家公司出版的所有随想曲,以便全面了解这些作品”。

间奏曲 Op. 4

舒曼这首《间奏曲》(*Intermezzi* Op. 4)的创作动机未知。最初的草稿出现在可能作于1828年至1831或1832年之间的《习作簿3》(*Studienbuch III*)中。除了大量零碎的片段之外,该簿主要记录了《阿贝格主题变奏曲》(Op. 1)、《蝴蝶》(Op. 2)、《帕格尼尼练习曲》(Op. 3 和 Op. 10)、《钢琴奏鸣曲》(Op. 11)以及之后作为《纪念册夜》(*Albumblätter*, Op. 124)出版的曲子。其中 Op. 4 的草稿涉及第一、第四及第五首乐曲的片段。第四首乐曲仍被称作“蝴蝶”,这一称谓之后又意外地与《间奏曲》联系在了一起。此外,《习作簿3》中还包含了标题为“幻想曲——罗伯特·舒曼为钢琴而作”的作品草稿,其中第一首为A大调和D大调(no. 1),第二首

为d小调和B大调(no. 5),第三首为C大调和e小调(编号未知)。

上文提到的《莱比锡生活经历》中有多处涉及《间奏曲》(Op. 4)的内容。最早便是1832年4月29日的日记:“我脑海中已有对每首间奏曲的清晰描绘,只是还有些小细节需斟酌处理。真是令人愉快的一周——虔诚的,远离俗世,让人宁静、清醒且精神饱满。”然而,这些“小细节”占用了他在7月之前的所有时间。他在5月14日的日记中写道:“天气阴晴不定。出去散步至3点,心情不好,就连手指都如雷云般沉重。对第四个转调乐段(此处显然是指第六首间奏曲的中间段落)做了不错的修改。”他在5月19日又写道:“脑海中有许多想法,但无法在钢琴上表达出来。《间奏曲》应有所完善,每个音符都应位置精确。”6月10日的日记中再次提到的“对转调乐段的巧妙修改”与第一首间奏曲有关。6月22日的日记则首次提到了日夜萦绕在舒曼心头的“古怪间奏曲”。显然,在前往德累斯顿(Dresden)的旅行途中,舒曼继续在这首乐曲(可能就是第三首间奏曲)上花费了大量的时间,因为他回来后在7月4日的日记中透露:“我比较愿意在旅途中与他人交谈。这首‘古怪’的间奏曲主要源自内心深处的呐喊。我对乐曲的顺序不太满意。另外还有好多想法。”舒曼在这段时间内似乎也在第五首间奏曲上花费了大量心血,从7月13日的日记中可以看出他当时创作热情格外高涨:“我意识到了生活的幸福,感悟到了自信。我感觉自己得到了升华。不过我的全身心都在你——我亲爱的第五首间奏曲上,你诞生在难以言表的深爱之中。昨天所有细节都搞定了!”这一作品最终在7月22日完成,那天舒曼又在日记中写道:“《间

奏曲》全部完成了,润润色,交给了赫克(Hecker)。”赫克是舒曼在莱比锡的抄谱员。

在日记中涉及《间奏曲》的部分也提到了另外两件事,即舒曼对巴赫作品的专门性研究以及对复调作品的整体研究:“《间奏曲》一完结,”他在1832年5月15日写道,“我就继续研读马尔普格(Marpurg)的书[可能是《赋格论》(*Abhandlung von der Fuge*)——原文作者注],并和多恩(Dorn)一起完成对复对位的研究。”6月22日的日记显示,Op. 4 原本是以双重赋格结尾。从作品风格上来看,舒曼对对位法的研究深刻影响了他对第一首和第五首间奏曲的创作。

同样令人震惊的还有 Op. 4 中对舒曼本人及其他作曲家作品的大量引用。例如,第六首间奏曲让人回忆起“ABEGG”主题以及帕格尼尼的《钟》(*La Campanella*)。《间奏曲》(Op. 4)中还引用了部分舒曼少年时期的作品。这些他生前未曾出版的作品如歌曲《牧童》[*Der Hirtenknabe*, 1828年,《舒曼作品年表》(*Schumann Werkverzeichnis*), Anh.M2 No. 9],《C小调钢琴四重奏》(1829年,《舒曼作品年表》, Anh.E1)。

在舒曼完成《间奏曲》之前,他已致力于寻找出版商,并最终与莱比锡的霍夫迈斯特达成了协议。他于12月17日将刻版者的副本寄给了出版商,并附言:“请愉悦地接受这部《间奏曲》……我对它做了精心雕琢,希望能在获得大众认可的同时,更多地得到大师们的赞赏。”又过了9个月,这一新作品才正式出版。直到1833年7月舒曼才收到第一份校样,完成印制可能是在当年的9月。尽管篇幅中等且第四首紧接着第三首,但这一新作仍被分为第一部分(第一至三首)和第二部分(第四至六首)两卷出

版。这部作品题献给作曲家兼小提琴大师约翰内斯·温泽斯劳斯·卡利沃达(Johannes Wenzeslaus Kalliwoda, 1801~1866), 不过亲笔手稿的标题页显示题献的是克拉拉·维克, 且作品号是“3”。题献及作品号的变化是之后出版商应舒曼的要求而更改的。

评论界对《间奏曲》的看法存在很大分歧。《大众音乐周报》的评论员倾向于支持这一作品, 而为杂志《音乐艺术领域中的伊利斯》撰写文章的雷尔斯塔则认为舒曼“完全是在歧路上徘徊”且只是企图“通过古怪来创新”。

即兴曲 Op. 5

舒曼对钢琴作品的古典曲式有着深入的研究, 特别是在早年。这在他的奏鸣曲及变奏曲的体裁作品中尤为明显。在他的前二十三部钢琴作品中, 有五部是奏鸣曲或包含奏鸣曲式的乐章(Op. 8、11、14、17和22), 有三部变奏曲式作品, 分别为Op. 1和Op. 13, 外加这首《即兴曲》(Impromptus Op. 5)。麦克科尔(McCorkle)从舒曼的大量作品中还整理出了另外六部变奏曲式作品, 这些作品或已遗失, 或仅有片段留存(《舒曼作品年表》, F7~9, F24~26)。由此可见, 舒曼极为关注变奏曲这一体裁。他常常抨击当时的音乐市场, 认为由巡回钢琴演奏艺人根据流行歌剧曲调而谱写的粗浅作品已使市场接近了饱和。因此, 舒曼早年以作曲家的身份出现在公众面前, 为何出版《阿贝格主题变奏曲》(Op. 1, 1831)以及《即兴曲》(Op. 5, 1833)这两部变奏曲作品就不足为奇了, 它们充分显示了他要改变这一现状的坚定决心。将《莱比锡生活经历》翻到1833年的部分, 舒曼这样写道: “我大多数时间都忙于研究巴赫的作品, 这是《即兴曲》(Op. 5)的灵感来

源。可将Op. 5视为采用了一种新曲式的变奏曲。”

认定采用了“新曲式”的原因——部分在于《即兴曲》中的两个主题有着非常巧妙的变化和连接。为了凸显这一特点, 舒曼在初版中分别介绍了两个主题: 首先是低声部主题, 接着是在此基础上构成的旋律。根据初版中的标题信息, 主题来自克拉拉·维克。的确, 她题献给罗伯特·舒曼且于1833年出版的《浪漫变奏曲》(Romance variée, Op. 3)是以同样的主题起始。然而, 开头四小节更早地出现在罗伯特的日记中: 1830年9月28日或29日, 舒曼在从海德堡途径杜塞尔多夫(Düsseldorf)前往帕德伯恩(Paderborn)的路上, 写下了四个主题的开头。其中第二个与《浪漫变奏曲》主题的开头几乎完全相同:



因此, 这一主题的开头并非来自克拉拉, 而是来自罗伯特·舒曼。可能是两人从很早便开始的亲密音乐交流使这一乐思的源头发生了转移。以C-F-G-C开头的低声部主题在舒曼作品中经常出现, 如在他的对位法习作中(《舒曼作品年表》, F19 nos. 3&7)。这些习作是1832年或1833年舒曼与海因里希·多恩(Heinrich Dorn)一起对对位法进行研究后自己创作的。它同时也在那段时间开始创作的“青年交响曲”(Youth Symphony)末乐章中扮演了关键角色。《莱比锡生活经历》于1832年5月29日的部分有以下记载: “晚上, 我和克拉拉四手联弹, 很快就轻松完成了巴赫的六个主题……九点回到家后, 我坐在钢琴前, 我的指尖仿佛出现了鲜花和神灵, 乐

思CF·GC就在这时流淌而出。”在为C.F. Peters版《即兴曲》所写的前言中, 汉斯·约阿希姆·科勒(Hans Joachim Köhler)提出了这样的假设: 这几个音符序列组成了与终止式类似的简单音乐进行, 这是舒曼发明的用字母代表克拉拉和他本人的方法。此处的三个字母分别表示: C—克拉拉, F—弗洛斯坦, G—古斯塔夫(后两个是舒曼的两个笔名)。日记中用于将四个字母分开的间隔号是对这一假说的有力支持。在一本从1834年开始使用的记事本中, 同样也记载了以这一主题起始的赋格习作。

舒曼原本于1833年6月6日将Op. 5作为《蝴蝶》的第二部交给了莱比锡的弗里德里希·基斯特纳。由于无法与这位出版商达成协议, 舒曼自费为《即兴曲》进行了刻版, 并由在萨克森邦(Saxony)施内贝格镇(Schneeberg)从事图书出版行业的兄弟卡尔发行。为了扩大这一作品的发行量, 舒曼努力以委托印刷的形式为它冠上了一家音乐出版社的名字。因此, 他在1833年7月31日给弗里德里希·霍夫迈斯特的信中写道: “我想给一直关照我的维克一份惊喜——用由克拉拉‘浪漫曲’主题改编而来的《即兴曲》为他8月中旬(18日)的生日庆生。由于现在时间已经非常紧迫, 所以我不敢让您出版, 而是把作品给了我的兄弟印刷和发行。现在能否请您允许我们在标题页上添加贵公司的名字以示授权?” 该作品最后的确在维克的生日来临前适时出版。

莱比锡的《大众音乐报》(Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung)早在1833年9月11日便刊载了关于这部作品(以及《阿贝格主题变奏曲》Op. 1和《帕格尼尼练习曲》Op. 3)的评论。文章指出: “这十二首即兴曲的每页

乐谱在装饰性及和声性方面都相当复杂……创意讨人喜欢且独特,赋予了整部作品娱乐性和挑战性。没有哪位公正的评论员会否定作曲家的勤奋、技巧、才能,生动的想象力以及远大的抱负。这些品质值得我们加倍关注。”由此可见这些即兴曲非常新颖独特。在1837年11月12日巴黎《音乐公报》(*Revue et Gazette Musicale*)上刊载的短篇评论中,弗朗兹·李斯特也重点指出《即兴曲》中出现了大量的“新型和声及节奏组合”。然而多年来,舒曼的作品没有为出版商带来商业上的成功,因为他的声誉主要是源于《新音乐杂志》(*Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*)的创刊编辑这一身份,而不是作曲家。尽管如此,代理商霍夫迈斯特于1842年率先表示有兴趣全权接管《即兴曲》(Op. 5),并在1850年最后一次要求舒曼给出合理报价。霍夫迈斯特在1850年4月5日的信中写道:“尊敬的先生!关于您的招标……请允许组织发行新版作品5号,并支付给您20金路易(确实不多)。我调查了您作品4号及7号的销售情况,将此作为这一报价的依据……在过去的三年中,它们每年只销售了十本,自1847年以来总共才销售了三十本。我的报价正是以这一调查结果为基础的。若您觉得数额过低,请见谅。”这一次,事情推进得很快。1850年4月19日舒曼就在他的《书信集》(*Briefbuch*)中写道:“莱比锡,霍夫迈斯特。对《即兴曲》的手稿进行了修订。要求查看校样。”

Op. 5的这份“校样”非常重要,比舒曼其他早期钢琴作品(Op. 6、13、14和16)的新版本都重要。新修订版于1850年7月问世。在这一版本中:标题页上添加了“新版本”(Neue Ausgabe)字样。尽管舒曼与弗里德

里希·维克在1843年成功和解,但原本给维克的题献被省略了。1833年版中的第四首即兴曲被一首全新的乐曲替代,而第十一首则直接被删除。由于新老两个版本之间存在巨大差异,本版本将两者都完整再现。

大卫同盟舞曲 Op. 6

在为出版作品选集而写的简介中,舒曼描述了由他自己创建的同盟。“‘大卫同盟’仅存在于其创办人的脑海中。为了能够借助对艺术本质的各种看法来表达自身观点,舒曼恰当地虚构出了几个截然不同的艺术人物,其中最重要的莫过于弗洛雷斯坦(Florestan)和优西比乌斯(Eusebius)……该同盟就像红线般贯穿了整个杂志(即舒曼创办的《新音乐杂志》),将真实与虚幻有趣地结合在了一起。”当然,舒曼创办“大卫同盟”有着相当特殊的目的:反对艺术中一切陈旧、落后且平庸的事物(他用“腓力斯人的”来指代)。舒曼借用圣经中大卫之名为这一同盟命名绝非巧合,因为这位少年英雄在与腓力斯人领袖歌利亚(Goliath)的战斗中凯旋而归后,以国王的身份在约柜前起舞和演奏竖琴。

舒曼《狂欢节》(Carnival)中最后一首的标题“大卫同盟向腓力斯人进军”便是他引用自“大卫同盟”的题词。《狂欢节》和《大卫同盟舞曲》也从此联系在了一起。克拉拉·维克在1838年2月3日的信中对这部新作品持保留意见。(她认为该作品与她最喜欢的《狂欢节》中的小曲子过于相似。)舒曼对此则极力反驳,并提出这样一种比喻:“我认为《大卫同盟舞曲》中的小曲子与《狂欢节》中的大不相同,两者的关系就好比是面孔与面具。”

事实上,弗洛雷斯坦和优西比乌

斯这两位神秘“大卫同盟”中最重要成员也意外地出现在了《狂欢节》中。他们分别体现了舒曼本人的双重性格:弗洛雷斯坦代表了他冲动易怒且偶尔阴郁的一面,而优西比乌斯则代表了他温和谦逊的本性。

最终,弗洛雷斯坦和优西比乌斯在“大卫同盟”中扮演了主要人物,因为舒曼有选择地将作品分别归入他们名下,从而赋予了他们独特的个性。

《大卫同盟舞曲》诞生于1837年的夏末。舒曼在9月21日给作曲家阿道夫·亨泽尔特(Adolph Henselt)的信中写道:“我刚完成了十八首大卫同盟舞曲,正当我颠簸在人生路上的时候。”这里暗指舒曼与克拉拉在分别数月后于8月15日秘密订婚。两人的关系适时地鲜明体现在这一新作品中,尤其是开头部分借用了克拉拉《音乐晚会》(*Soirées musicales*, Op. 6)中的一首玛祖卡片段。在1839年9月5日给老师海因里希·多恩的信中,舒曼谈及了往事:“协奏曲、奏鸣曲、大卫同盟舞曲、克莱斯勒偶记(*Kreisleriana*)以及新事曲(*Novelletten*),都是为克拉拉一人而写。”

8月15日,克拉拉接受了舒曼的求婚,舒曼欣喜若狂。他在1838年1月5日透露:舞曲包含了“许多对婚礼的遐想,这些想法都是在我有记忆以来最激动的时刻诞生的”。2月7日,在将一份精美的乐谱副本寄给克拉拉后,舒曼恳切地说道:“无论这些舞曲包含什么内容,我的克拉拉都会了解,因为我笔下的作品更像是她写的。整部作品就像是一场‘闹婚之夜’,你可以清晰地想象出它的开始和结局。我无比欢快地坐在钢琴前,那正是我灵感泉涌的时刻。”

尽管如此,正如上文所提到的那样,克拉拉显然无法很好地理解这一

新作品。直到舒曼去世后,她才将这些小曲纳入保留曲目列表中。1860年3月27日,她首次公开演奏了其中十首小曲。约翰内斯·勃拉姆斯同样将《大卫同盟舞曲》作为演奏曲目。勃拉姆斯可能是第一位演奏整部作品的音乐家,他于1869年3月15日在布达佩斯与歌唱家朱利叶斯·斯托克豪森(Julius Stockhausen)合作的音乐会上演奏了这一作品。勃拉姆斯还有该作品的作曲家亲笔手稿,如今与他的遗作一起在维也纳音乐之友协会(Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde)的档案馆中保存。除了十八首小曲之外,这份手稿还包含一首被删除的g小调舞曲,其编号在第二册中为“六”。第一册第七首以及第二册第一首小曲在亲笔手稿中分别标有日期“9月11日”和“9月7日”。这表明十八首小曲并非按出版时的顺序创作,舒曼是在经过数次调整后最终确定排序。

为了确保《大卫同盟舞曲》能尽快出版(该作品显然是为克拉拉准备的订婚礼物),舒曼甚至没有试着将作品出售给权威音乐出版商,而是直接将它交给弗里斯(Friese)出版发行(弗里斯是莱比锡的一家图书经销商,也出版过舒曼的《新音乐杂志》)。他自费进行了刻版,并拥有作品的版权。根据日记中的多处记载,舒曼于1837年10月审读了初版的校样,并于11月底进行了复核。这一作品于1838年1月底问世,舒曼在1月27日的日记中简略地记录:“《大卫同盟舞曲》完成了。”

将作品交给弗里斯出版的想法很快被证明是不明智的,舒曼因而试图将刻版出售给公众所认可的音乐出版社。1842年11月5日,他将《大卫同盟舞曲》推荐给弗里德里希·霍夫迈斯特,并解释说该作品“曾由弗

里斯发行,但由于弗里斯并非专门的音乐图书经销商,所以这一作品实际上依然不为人知。然而一旦有合适的出版商对它感兴趣,那么这种情况会立刻转变,因为其中的小曲对业余演奏者而言也特别容易驾驭”。

舒曼的请求遭到了霍夫迈斯特的婉拒,他将《大卫同盟舞曲》推荐给其他出版社的尝试同样以失败告终。直到1850年3月19日,汉堡的出版商舒伯茨(Schuberth)由于对《少年钢琴曲集》(Album for the Young, Op.68)的热销印象深刻,同意将《大卫同盟舞曲》纳入他的出版目录中。不过舒伯茨是以“刻版上不必做任何改动”为前提着手出版的(参见1850年7月1日的信)。舒曼尽管做了些改动,但都未造成影响。“第二版”于1850年秋问世,刻版与初版所使用的相同,印版是经舒曼本人修订过的初版副本。

本卷的编辑决定只采用1850年版的文本,不赞成将两个版本合并呈现。对相关缘由的详细阐述以及底本的更多信息参见本卷最后的评注部分,其中包括1838年版和1850年版的差异列表。最显著的差异会在乐谱下方的脚注中提及。

托卡塔 Op. 7

罗伯特·舒曼的《托卡塔》(Toccata Op. 7)历经数年才成型。根据《计划书》(Projectenbuch)中的记载以及作者在初版私人副本上的批注,该作品最初以“练习曲”(Exercice)为标题,是作曲家1830年仍在海德堡学习法律时谱写的。之后,它便同舒曼在海德堡期间所写的诸多作品一样被搁置在一旁。当时舒曼正致力于研究乐器演奏技巧与高品质音乐素材的结合。这就解释了他的《帕格尼尼练习曲》的由来,以及多次尝

试谱写练习曲(要么只是片段,要么直接被丢弃)的原因。

《托卡塔》也属于这一类。1832年8月13日,舒曼向维也纳出版商托比亚斯·哈斯林格(Tobias Haslinger)推荐这一作品,将其描述为“克拉默(Cramer)和凯斯勒(Keßler)练习曲的延续”“幻想练习曲”以及“与第一部音调相同但难度却降低的第二部双音练习曲”。参考“四声部”和“双音”等因素,可以确定舒曼在这里指的是创作时间较晚的《托卡塔》。在一份于1832年年初至1833年7月间亲笔书写的作品列表中,舒曼将其记录为:“双音幻想练习曲, Op. 6, 海德堡。”并注明将该作品题赠给1812至1840年间在茨维考任邮政局长并不定期为《新音乐杂志》供稿的乔治·弗里德里希·威廉·施莱格尔(Georg Friedrich Wilhelm Schlegel)。列表中补充标注的“海德堡”一词可能表明当时该作品仍是舒曼在海德堡期间所谱写的最初版本,未经深加工。

舒曼一定在1833年整理作品时重新抄写了一份《托卡塔》,不过该手稿已遗失。这一作品现存的唯一底本是由弗里德里希·霍夫迈斯特于1834年春在莱比锡出版的版本。在该版本首页底部有以下批注:“赋予演奏者最大的自由,仅对可能遭到误解的乐段做了清晰的标记。”因此,这一版本几乎不含任何指法和演奏提示,与1830年的亲笔手稿版本形成了强烈的对比。由于两个版本大不相同,所以正式出版时实际上是呈现了一部新作品。本卷的出版商和编辑因而商定在此出示两个版本。其中1830年版是首次面世。该版本只有184个小节,并且从第二页起奇怪地都以八分音符记谱,而非前25小节所采用的十六分音符。总体而言,

1830年版的技巧要求略低,音乐结构与1834年版相比也更为简单(有许多八度音乐片段以及重复的和弦)。1834年版在曲式上有重大创新:在第48小节引入第二主题,转而构成奏鸣曲式。

舒曼在晚些时,对自己的大部分早期钢琴作品持批判态度,然而对《托卡塔》的评价却一直是正面的。1840年,舒曼将该作品与《帕格尼尼练习曲》(Op. 3和Op. 10)一起交予李察尔特(Richault)在巴黎出版,并在当年的自传性随笔中写道:“我最初的作品过于平庸,小题大做。可能只有《托卡塔》《间奏曲》(Op. 4)才能向音乐爱好者传达哪怕一点点我的创作意图。”克拉拉·维克虽然在职业生涯后期才开始公开演奏舒曼的早期作品,但在《托卡塔》正式出版之后便将它纳入了音乐会曲目表,并于1834年9月9日在莱比锡的独奏会上正式演奏。9月26日,《彗星日报》(*Der Komet*)文化娱乐版的“文学、艺术、时尚、生活及新闻单元副刊”刊载了以下评论:“舒曼的新作《托卡塔》给人留下了美好的印象……该作品洋溢着原创革新的精神,而且尽管风格保守,但依然牢牢吸引着听众。我们在舒曼身上看到了塞巴斯蒂安·巴赫、贝多芬或帕格尼尼的特质,他甚至比肖邦更值得关注,因为他能通过原创作品将现代音乐流派发扬光大……舒曼的《托卡塔》难度极高,可能除了舒恩克(Schunke)和克拉拉·维克以外,(在莱比锡)没有人能完美演绎。舒恩克和克拉拉的演绎截然不同:前者将它作为练习曲,展现出惊人的技巧,而后者对作品的把握则更富诗意,倾注了大量情感。此次演奏中,克拉拉同样以深刻精妙的细节处理赋予了作品生命力,使这一独奏会完

美的收官之作光芒四射。”

根据拓普肯(作曲家在海德堡的同学)写给舒曼传记作者瓦西列夫斯基(Wasielewski)的信(1856年)以及古斯塔夫·詹森(Gustav Jansen)的信(1879年)中所述,舒曼本人演奏这部《托卡塔》时“常常带有鲜明的个人特点”。准确地说,即“沉着地用中等速度演奏,而不是像陶西格(Tausig)那样用急板速度演奏”。

*

关于底本及其解读的信息,请参见评注部分。

编辑和出版社对评注中所有提及的图书馆慷慨地提供相关版本资料,表示感谢。

恩斯特·赫特里希
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.

This first volume contains opus nos. 1–7. These were composed between 1829 and the end of 1833, and published between 1831 and 1834, with the exception of the *Dauidsbündlertänze*, which Schumann did not compose until late summer 1837, and which were first published in January 1838. How they nevertheless came to be given the opus number 6 remains a mystery, about which more information is provided below.

Abegg-Variationen op. 1

The *Abegg-Variationen* were the first work that Schumann brought before the public. When he resolved to take this step he was twenty-one years old and had already produced a large number of compositions. Not all of them were piano pieces, even though one might conclude so from the fact that his next 22 published works are all for piano; as well as piano music and several songs, his desk drawer also contained a Psalm for soprano, alto and orchestra, a piano quartet, a piano concerto and a symphony, some of which were still unfinished. The work he finally considered worthy of serving for his publishing début was the *Abegg-Variationen*, composed, as we learn from his own words written on the flyleaf of his personal copy, in Heidelberg during the winter of 1829–30. They were not intended from the outset to be for solo piano. Originally they were conceived as a virtuoso piece for piano and orchestra with a thematically unrelated introduction. This version may possibly have been inspired by Ignaz Moscheles's *Variations on La Marche d'Alexandre*, op. 32, which Schumann himself performed in Heidelberg on 24 January 1830. The solo piano version probably acquired its final form in July and August 1830. A year later, on 12 September 1831, Schumann offered

the work to Leipzig publisher Kistner. His letter is revealing of the situation in which the young composer then saw himself: "I would only ask that the format, paper, engraving and title page be comparable to those of, let us say, Carl Mayer's variations (on the *Sehnsuchts-walzer*) as issued by Probst. If you [...] could find it in yourself to grant this request of mine, I would gladly agree to guard you against any loss by taking some fifty to sixty copies at 50 percent [i. e. by purchasing them in advance at his own expense]. Lastly, may I ask most humbly whether the variations can appear in print by the 18th of November, the birthday of Countess Abegg, to whom I am indebted in several ways?"

The publisher accepted Schumann's "first born" work, and apparently met the desired publication deadline. The great significance this initial publication had for Schumann is amply attested by two entries in his *Leipziger Lebensbuch* (a diary covering the period from 13 October 1831 to 28 November 1838), one written just before the work's publication and the other shortly thereafter:

"I was then interrupted [...] by my first set of proofs; what bliss, my first proofs!" (7 November 1831).

"The variations have now arrived; it is as if everything in them gains in significance when printed." (12 November 1831).

The *Pauline Comtesse d'Abegg* mentioned on the title page of the first edition is, as Schumann himself confided to his friend Anton Theodor Töpken, a "mystification" which he had his own reasons to circulate. Scholars generally agree that the name refers to Meta Abegg (1810–35), a young lady from Mannheim also known by her married name of von Heygendorff. As Töpken himself surmised, it was, in the main, probably the "musical tractability of the name that caught [Schumann's] fancy." Admittedly a closer personal attachment cannot be dismissed, even though the date of 18 November mentioned in the letter to Kistner, happens not to have been the young lady's birthday (she was born on 16 April). Perhaps this was de-

liberately meant to cast further obscurity on their actual relations; perhaps Schumann wanted to have his opus 1 appear in print by his mother's birthday ten days later, on 28 November. The solution to this riddle remains a matter for speculation. When Johannes Brahms visited the ailing composer in Endenich in February 1855, Countess Abegg again became an object of discussion, thereby, one might say, framing Schumann's artistic career. Writing to Clara, Brahms reported that "he told me of your travels, of the Seven Hills, of Switzerland and Heidelberg, and spoke also of Countess Abegg."

The critics gave Schumann's first work a very warm reception: the *WIENER ZEITUNG* (ALLGEMEINER MUSIKALISCHER ANZEIGER no. 26, pp. 101 f.) published the following very positive review on 28 June 1832: "The probably still youthful composer, whom we have never encountered before, is a rare phenomenon of our age: he follows no school, draws his ideas from his own mind, and declines to preen himself with [...] borrowed plumes. He has created an ideal world in which he gambols with almost reckless abandon, at times even with original *bizarrierie* [...] Nothing about it is easy to play; its performance cries out for sharp delineation of character. The entire piece must be carefully studied and practiced to attain the overall impression intended." Schumann wrote out this review in his *Leipziger Lebensbuch*, adding: "I myself would not have been able to write the review in the *Wiener Zeitung*. How delighted mother and Julius [Schumann's brother] will be! May No. 26, this great and invisible patron, be repaid with industry, modesty and tranquillity."

Papillons op. 2

Schumann's *Papillons* were composed between 1829 and 1831, more or less contemporaneously with the *Abegg-Variationen*. To a certain extent, these were the decisive years in his artistic development. Officially he was still a law student in Leipzig and Heidelberg, but the urge to devote himself entirely to the

arts was growing ever stronger, and he planned to take up a career as a pianist. Having resolved to abandon his law studies come what may, he then had difficulty in deciding between music and poetry.

These twin musico-literary talents led time and again to an intimate cross-fertilization between Schumann's many literary impressions and his musical creativity. Schumann himself pointed out the literary references in *Papillons* on 15 April 1832 when he sent his mother a dedicatory copy of the first edition for presentation to his three sisters-in-law. His cover letter reads as follows: "Please ask all of them to be so kind as to read the final scene of Jean Paul's *Flegeljahre* as soon as possible, for the *Papillons* are actually meant to transform this masked ball into notes."

Jean Paul was Schumann's great literary idol. This writer, Schumann exclaimed to his friend Carl Flechsig on 17 March 1828, "still takes pride of place in my mind; I put him above all the others, not excluding Schiller (I don't yet understand Goethe)." *Flegeljahre. Eine Biographie* had long been one of his favourite novels; even years later, in a letter of 1838 to Clara, he referred to it as "a book like the Bible in its way." The protagonists of the novel, which had appeared in four volumes in 1804–05, are the twin brothers Walt and Quod Deus Vult (= what God will) and the maiden Wina, with whom both men are in love. Its final scene, expressly mentioned by Schumann, is a grand masked ball in which Vult takes on his brother's disguise and thus obtains Wina's consent to his proposal of marriage. Knowing that her consent was actually intended for Walt, he leaves the town. Walt himself has fallen asleep, lulled into a world of dreams by his brother's flute playing and by his own blissful memories. The novel ends with the words: "Even from the alleyway below Walt listened in delight to the language of the fugitive notes, for he did not notice that with them his brother too was running away."

Many other passages in Schumann's letters refer to the close links between

the *Flegeljahre* and his *Papillons*. He even drew attention to them in a letter to the critic Ludwig Rellstab when he forwarded a reviewer's copy: "I feel at liberty to add a few words to the *Papillons* regarding their origins, as the thread that is intended to tie them together is barely visible. Surely your worship will recall the final scene of *Flegeljahre* – masked ball – Walt – Vult – masks – Wina – Vult's dancing – the exchange of masks – confessions – anger – disclosures – hasty departure – final scene and then the departing brother. – I often turned over this final page, for to me the denouement seems to augur a new beginning." (Indeed, until the end of his days Jean Paul considered writing a continuation of the novel.) "Almost unawares I found myself at the piano, and thus there arose one papillon after another." By the summer of 1834, however, in a letter to his lady friend Henriette Voigt, he slightly distanced himself from this stance: "I further mention that I have adapted the text to the music and not vice versa – to do otherwise is a vain undertaking. Only the final piece, fashioned by a capricious fortune in response to the first, was inspired by Jean Paul." In later years, Schumann frequently denied the extra-musical influences on his compositions, probably to prevent their being misconstrued as program music. In the case of *Papillons*, however, the close ties to Jean Paul's *Flegeljahre* are of central importance. The composer's personal copy of the novel contains a number of annotations keyed to the corresponding numbers of *Papillons*, thereby providing firm evidence of their correlations. These annotations are quoted at the end of our volume in the *Comments* for each piece concerned.

Schumann later was somewhat critical of the *Papillons*, and wrote in his diary on 9 June 1832 that, in the *Papillons*, "the transitions are too rapid, the colours too vivid," and that "the listener still has one page in his mind [...] while the pianist is quickly finishing up the next. There is, perhaps, something critical about this self-destructiveness of papillons, but surely nothing artistic.

Between some of them one might quaff a glass of champagne."

Schumann was keenly interested in other people's opinions of the *Papillons* – only the second work after the *Abegg-Variationen* that he saw fit to publish. His diary records the comments of the publishers Probst and Hofmeister as well as those of his teacher Friedrich Wieck, whose choice of epithets – "piquant, new, original spirit, American [...], rare" – suggests, however, that he had trouble relating to the work's novelty.

Schumann placed great store in the proper performance of *Papillons*. Clara Wieck, at that time just turned thirteen, started work on them as soon as they appeared in print. Schumann's diary contains many entries concerning her playing. On 23 May 1832, for example, we can read: "Clara and the *Papillons*, which she hasn't quite mastered; altogether they are well turned-out and to my liking; the only thing I miss is delicacy, no matter how soulful and wholesomely rapturous her playing may otherwise be." Three days later, another diary entry informs us of her clear progress: "Clara attacked them properly and passionately." Oddly, Clara Schumann did not perform *Papillons* in public until 1866. Thereafter the work was frequently found on her programs.

The first edition of *Papillons* was issued in February or March 1832 by Friedrich Kistner. The composer's personal copy, preserved at the Robert Schumann House in Zwickau, contains a number of autograph corrections which are itemised in the *Comments*. This volume served as the primary source for our urtext edition. Another important source that we consulted is the autograph manuscript.

Several diary entries inform us that Schumann planned to write a second volume of *Papillons*. In any event, the first edition bears the words on the title page, perhaps implying that he had promised a second volume to his publisher. On 9 August of that same year we find "Papillons, Livr. 2" listed under the heading "Works," evidently proving that he had in fact set this plan in mo-

tion. But it was never carried out, and when he offered the *Impromptus* op. 5 to Kistner on 6 June 1833 as "a second volume of *Papillons*," he was surely only alluding to the opus that Kistner had most recently published.

It is strange that Schumann should have returned to this early work again at the end of his life. The Library of Congress in Washington preserves a fair copy of no. 10, transposed a whole step down to Bb major. According to information supplied by Marie and Clara Schumann, it was prepared during the composer's internment in Endenich.

Paganini Studies op. 3

Like many other 19th-century composers, among them Franz Liszt and Johannes Brahms, Robert Schumann was fascinated by the figure of Nicolò Paganini – the "magician of the violin" – and by what he felt to be his "demonic spirit." Reviewing the year 1829 in his "Musikalischer Lebensgang" long after his *Caprices* op. 3 and his *Études* op. 10 had been written, he confided that "Paganini roused [the spirit] and stimulated effort." Schumann had first heard the Italian violinist in concert on 11 April 1830 in Frankfurt on the Main. In his diary he wrote: "Paganini in the evening – doubts about the ideal in art and his lack of grand, noble, priestly artistic repose [...] tremendous delight – me in the loge [was Schumann introduced to Paganini?] [...] Happily to bed and gently to sleep." As one sees, his stance was not at all uncritical. But, on the whole, he retained a great admiration for the Italian throughout his life. Paganini's *Capricci* op. 1 possibly exerted a particular attraction on Schumann since they "kindle the driest formulaic exercises into the language of Pythias." As to Paganini's virtuosity, Schumann held it to be a combination of "the ideal of technical accomplishment and expressiveness" (diary entry of 15 June 1831).

Schumann's diaries of that time are full of references to Paganini, both general in nature and specifically referring to the genesis of op. 3 and 10. An entry

of 4 June 1832 reads: "The beautiful g-minor Caprice by Paganini [i. e. Paganini's op. 1, no. 16, and Schumann's op. 3, no. 6]. The day before yesterday I saw a picture that left a hideous impression – Paganini in an enchanted circle – a murdered woman – dancing skeletons and a procession of magnetic, nebulous specters [a caricature by Johann Peter Lyser "on the Viennese concerts of 1828"]; yet, in its composition, the picture was not without imagination and vitality. It often appeared to my mind's eye as I arranged the g-minor Presto, and I believe that the conclusion goes so far as to recall it."

The catalogue of compositions in Schumann's own hand gives "Easter 1832" as the date of origin for op. 3. Nonetheless, Schumann must have worked hard on the pieces after that date, for a diary entry of 6 June reads: "Finished the caprices yesterday down to the last detail." Finally, on 8 June (his birthday), he sent the finished opus to his teacher Friedrich Wieck and wrote: "Accept the Caprices with kindness; it was a heavenly task, yet somewhat Herculean. Please – take a pencil, sit down next to Clara, and mark whatever strikes you."

The day after he wrote in his diary: "Went to his house around noon; he praised 'my industry' and called the work extremely interesting." On 3 June Schumann had already asked Wieck to advocate for his new work with Leipzig publisher Hofmeister. Wieck seems to have complied with Schumann's wish. On 9 June Schumann noted in his diary: "Went to visit young Hofmeister in town; the matter is settled. Clara worked on the Paganinians and came with two of them to my birthday [celebration]." On 22 June we read: "the most careful final polish [...] to the caprices." The extensive preface was probably also finished during these weeks. But a tragedy is revealed by the eight-day gap in Schumann's diary before this entry on 22 June. The previous entry, dated 14 June, read: "Third finger completely rigid." Schumann's hopes for a career as a concert pianist were finally laid to rest.

The autograph of op. 3 has disappeared. It probably served as an engraver's copy for the first edition, which was issued in Leipzig in August 1832 by Hofmeister and bore the inscription *Op. III. Lief. [installment] I*. After the appearance of op. 10 this opus number was changed to "Op. X. N° 1" to reflect the close affinity between the two works. Beneath the opus number in his personal copy, Schumann noted *Equals Opus III*, the opus number by which the work has been known to the present day. The present edition reproduces the German foreword to the first edition in its original form; the original French translation has been redone, and a new English translation is supplied. Since the autograph no longer exists, the first print is the sole source relevant to our edition.

Opus 3 received a mixed reception from the critics. Ludwig Rellstab, writing in the journal *IRIS IM GEBIETE DER TONKUNST* (4 January 1833), found fault with the work, calling it "weak in invention" and "incomprehensible in its fingering." On the other hand, no less a figure than Franz Liszt championed the *Études* op. 3, and played them at many of his recitals. Clara Wieck, too, included them in her repertoire from 1834. Paganini himself must have heard about the arrangements of his *Capricci*, and they seem to have piqued his interest. At all events, Schumann informed his publisher Hofmeister in a letter of 13 February 1838 that Paganini had "requested from my Paris correspondent all of my Caprices published by your firm, as he would like to become more thoroughly acquainted with them."

Intermezzi op. 4

Nothing is known about the circumstances that gave rise to Schumann's *Intermezzi* op. 4. Early sketches for the work are found in the "Studienbuch III" that probably dates from the years 1828 to 1831–32. Besides a large number of isolated fragments, the book mainly contains studies for the *Abegg-Variationen* (op. 1), *Papillons* (op. 2), the *Paganini Studies* (opp. 3 and 10), the Pi-

ano Sonata (op. 11), and the pieces later published as *Albumblätter* (op. 124). The sketches for op. 4 relate to pieces 1, 4, and 5. Piece no. 4 is still referred to as a *Papillon*, a term that will crop up again later in connection with the *Intermezzi*. In contrast, the same "Studienbuch III" contains the following working title elsewhere in its pages: *Pieces fantastiques pour le Pianoforte par Rob. Schumann. 1. A maj. D maj.* [i. e. no. 1] / 2. *D moll B maj* [no. 5] / 3. *C maj. Emin.* [?].

The above-mentioned *Leipziger Lebensbuch* contains many allusions to the op. 4 *Intermezzi*, beginning with an entry on 29 April 1832: "The picture of each intermezzo is firmly fixed in my mind; only minor touches are missing. That was a lovely week – pure, pious, sober, and brisk." However, the "minor touches" occupied him until July. The entry for 14 May reads: "April weather the whole day – went out for a walk until 3 o'clock, but without pleasure – even my fingers are heavy with thunderclouds. Made lovely changes to fourth *alternative*" (evidently a reference to the middle section of *Intermezzo* no. 6). Again on 19 May: "Many ideas at the piano, but no ability to work them out. – The *Intermezzi* should amount to something – every note should be placed on the balance." Another "felicitous change to the *alternativo*" was noted on 10 June, this time in connection with *Intermezzo* no. 1; and on 22 June we encounter the first mention of a "droll *Intermezzo*" that haunted Schumann day and night. Evidently the same piece (probably *Intermezzo* no. 3) continued to occupy him during a short trip to Dresden, for after his return on 4 July he confided to his diary that he was "little disposed for conversation during the entire trip. The 'droll' *Intermezzo* is basically a cry from the depths of the heart. Not quite satisfied with the order of the pieces. I've had quite a few ideas." He also seems to have worked hard once again on *Intermezzo* no. 5 during this period, evidently in especially high spirits, as we learn from the entry of 13 July: "My happy awareness of life and self-esteem has few words – I sense a

feeling in me that may perhaps be virtue. But my entire heart is in thee, my dear Fifth *Intermezzo*, who was born with such inexpressible love. How everything fell into place yesterday!" The work was finally completed on 22 July, as Schumann again noted in his diary: "*Intermezzi* [...] completely finished, touched up, and handed to Hecker" – the latter being his Leipzig copyist.

In close proximity to the *Intermezzi*, the diary contains references to two topics that record Schumann's increasingly intensive engagement with Bach in particular and with contrapuntal studies in general: "Once the *Intermezzi* are finished," he wrote on 15 May 1832, "I will again take up Marpurg [probably the treatise on fugue, *Abhandlung von der Fuge*] and complete my [studies of] invertible counterpoint with Dorn." An entry for 22 June informs us that originally op. 4 was even meant to end with a double fugue. Stylistically, Schumann's counterpoint studies left an especially deep mark on the first and fifth of the *Intermezzi*.

Equally striking are the many quotations of his own or other authors' works that found their way into the various pieces of op. 4. The sixth *Intermezzo*, for instance, recalls the ABEGG theme and Paganini's *La Campanella*; and there are borrowings from juvenilia that remained unpublished during his lifetime, such as the song *Der Hirtenknabe* (1828, *Schumann Werkverzeichnis*, Anh. M2 no. 9) and the c-minor Piano Quartet (1829, *Schumann Werkverzeichnis*, Anh. E1) quoted in *Intermezzo* no. 4.

Before he had finished work on the new opus Schumann was already making efforts to find a publisher, and he was eventually able to conclude an agreement with Leipzig publisher Hofmeister. He sent the engraver's copy to the publishers on 17 December and added: "So accept the *Intermezzi* with favour [...] I have carefully polished and pruned them, and hope thereby to obtain greater thanks from artists than from the public." Yet another three quarters of a year were to pass before the new work was published. Schumann

did not receive a first set of proofs until July 1833, and it was probably in September of that year that the work appeared in print. Despite the work's moderate length – and despite the *attacca* transition between nos. 3 and 4 – the new opus was divided into two volumes: *Part I* (nos. 1–3), and *Part II* (nos. 4–6). It is dedicated to the composer and virtuoso violinist Johannes Wenzeslaus Kalliwoda (1801–66), even though the title page of the autograph bears a dedication to Clara Wieck along with the opus number *III*. The dedication and the opus number were later altered by the publisher at Schumann's request.

The critics varied quite widely in their opinion of the *Intermezzi*. If the reviewer for the ALLGEMEINER MUSIKALISCHER ANZEIGER was inclined to be benevolent, Rellstab, writing in the periodical IRIS IM GEBIETE DER TONKUNST, felt that Schumann was wandering "on completely errant paths" and merely attempting to be "original through oddity."

Impromptus op. 5

Schumann engaged very intensively with the classical forms of piano music, especially in his early years. This is particularly true for the sonata and variation genres. Five of his first 23 works for piano are sonatas or sonata movements (op. 8, 11, 14, 17 and 22), and three of them are works in the form of variations – op. 1 and 13, plus the op. 5 Impromptus. Six further works in variation form are listed by McCorkle among the numerous works that are either lost or exist only as fragments (*Schumann Werkverzeichnis*, F7–9 and F24–26). Schumann thus gave special attention to the variation genre. Time and again he criticised the musical market of his day, with its near-saturation by – in his opinion – shallow pieces written by itinerant piano virtuosi and based on popular (opera) themes. So it is not surprising that in the earliest years of his public career as a composer he published, in his *Abegg-Variationen* op. 1 (1831) and the Impromptus op. 5 (1833), two variation

works that firmly demonstrated how things could be done quite differently. Looking back in his "Musikalischer Lebenslauf" to 1833, he wrote in this regard: "Most of the time I busied myself with Bach; such was the inspiration for the Impromptus op. 5, which may rather be regarded as a new form of variations."

Part of this "new form" resulted from the fact that, in these Impromptus, two themes are varied and joined together in an especially skilful way. To give visibility to this particular feature, Schumann presented the two themes separately in the first printing: the bass theme first of all, and then the melody that is built upon it. According to title information in the first edition, the theme came from Clara Wieck; indeed, her *Romance variée* op. 3, dedicated to Robert Schumann and also published in 1833, does begin with this same theme. However, the first four measures appear much earlier in one of Robert's diaries, in which he noted down four thematic incipits while on a journey from Heidelberg to Paderborn via Düsseldorf on 28 or 29 September 1830. The second of these is practically identical to the beginning of the theme of the *Romance variée*:



Thus the nucleus of the theme comes not from Clara, but from Robert Schumann. It seems to have travelled from one to the other during the close musical exchanges that the two practised from very early on. The striking C–F–G–C opening of the bass theme is frequently found in Schumann: it appears in the counterpoint exercises (*Schumann Werkverzeichnis*, F19 nos. 3 and 7) that he continued on his own after completing his studies with Heinrich Dorn in 1832/33; and it plays a central role in the finale of his "Youth Symphony" from that time. The following entry appears in the *Leipziger Lebensbuch* for 29 May 1832: "In the evening I romped through six things of Bach with Clara, at

sight, four hands [...]; and when I came home towards nine o'clock I sat down at the piano, and it seemed to me as if nothing but flowers and gods flowed from my fingers, including the idea C F · C C, which likewise streamed forth." In the preface to his edition of the Impromptus for C. F. Peters, Hans Joachim Köhler presents the hypothesis that, in the sequence of notes making up this simple musical cadential progression, Schumann has discovered letters for Clara and himself: respectively, C for Clara, F for Florestan and G for Gustav (two of Schumann's pseudonyms). The dot in the diary entry that divides the letters might very well support such a hypothesis. Notes for fugal exercises also using this thematic incipit are still to be found in a notebook from 1834.

Schumann initially offered op. 5 to Friedrich Kistner of Leipzig on 6 June 1833, as a "second volume of *Papillons*." After being unable to reach an agreement with this publisher, he had the Impromptus engraved at his own expense and issued by his brother Karl, who operated a book publishing business in Schneeberg (Saxony). To secure wider distribution for the work, Schumann also made efforts to offer it on a commission basis to a music publishing house. Thus on 31 July 1833 he wrote to Friedrich Hofmeister: "I would like to surprise Wieck – to whom I am so indebted – with Impromptus on Clara's Romanze for his birthday, which falls in mid-August [the 18th]. Because the time until then is so short, I have not dared to ask you to publish the work, but have given it to my brothers for printing and distribution. Would you now perhaps allow me, and them, to add the name of your firm to the title page, to give it a layer of authority?" The print did, in fact, appear in time for Wieck's birthday.

The Leipzig ALLGEMEINE MUSIKALISCHE ZEITUNG published a review of the work (and of the *Abegg-Variationen* op. 1 and *Paganini-Etüden* op. 3) as early as 11 September 1833. The twelve Impromptus, wrote the reviewer, offered on every page "A multiplicity of melismatic and harmonic aspects. [...]" There

is originality of both a pleasant and unusual kind, which provides entertainment or challenge throughout. No impartial observer will deny that the writer has diligence, skill, talent, a lively imagination and bold ambition; qualities that rightly demand our redoubled attention." The novelty of these variations was therefore clearly perceived. In his short review of the Impromptus in the Parisian REVUE ET GAZETTE MUSICALE of 12 November 1837, Franz Liszt likewise emphasised the "new harmonic and rhythmic combinations" that were present in abundance. However, for many years Schumann's works brought his publishers no commercial success, as his fame was based more on his employment as founding editor of the NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK than on his compositions. Nevertheless, at the end of 1842 the commission agent Hofmeister first expressed an interest in taking the Impromptus op. 5 over completely, and in 1850 Schumann was eventually forced to give him another ultimatum within which to make a reasonable offer for them. Hofmeister answered by a letter of 5 April 1850: "Most esteemed sir! In regard to your express invitation to bid [...] allow me, for permission to organise a new issue of your opus 5, to offer you the – admittedly not large – sum of 20 Louis d'or. As material support for this offer, I have re-examined sales of your two works op. 4 and op. 7 [...]. During each of the past three years, 10 copies, or a total of 30 copies since 1847, have been sold. It is on this that I base my offer. Forgive me if it seems too trivial." This time all proceeded quickly, and already on 19 April 1850 Schumann was noting in his "Briefbuch" (correspondence book): "Hofmeister | Leipzig | With revision of the manuscript of the Impromptus. Requested a proof copy."

This "proof" turned out, in the case of op. 5, to be particularly substantial, at all events more substantial than was the case for the new editions of some other piano works from his early period (op. 6, 13, 14, and 16). The revised edition appeared in July 1850 with *Neue Ausgabe* (new edition) added to its title

page. In spite of their successful reconciliation in 1843, Schumann's dedication of the work to Friedrich Wieck was omitted. Impromptu no. 4 in the 1833 version has been replaced by a completely new one, and no. 11 was removed and not replaced. Owing to the many, and, in places, significant differences between the two versions, both are reproduced in their entirety in our edition.

Davidsbündlertänze op. 6

In the introduction to the edition of his collected writings, Schumann described a league, founded by himself, that "existed only in the mind of its creator: the *Davidsbündler*. In order to lend expression to various views on the nature of art, it seemed not entirely inappropriate to invent several contrasting artistic personalities, the most important being *Florestan* and *Eusebius*. [...] This 'League of David' pervaded the entire journal (the NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK, which Schumann had founded) like a red thread, amusingly uniting 'truth and fiction'." One should also add that this League of David had, of course, a quite specific purpose: to wage war against everything obsolete, backward-looking, and unpoetical – or what was then known as "philistine" – in the arts. It is no coincidence that the figure who lent his name to the league was the biblical David, the boy-hero who emerged victorious from his battle with Goliath, the leader of the Philistines, and who would later, as king, dance and play the harp before the Arc of the Covenant.

The title of the final piece in Schumann's *Carnaval* – *Marche des Davidsbündler contre les Philistins* – might well serve as a motto for the entire import of Schumann's *Davidsbund*. Indeed, both *Carnaval* and the *Davidsbündlertänze* are thus closely interrelated. When Clara Wieck, in a letter of 3 February 1838, was somewhat reticent about the new pieces (she confessed that "they often bear too close a resemblance to *Carnaval*, my favourite among the smaller pieces you've written"),