

SCHUMANN



舒曼 钢琴作品全集

第三卷

Complete Piano Works

Volume III

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

4J0542

Robert Schumann

罗伯特·舒曼

钢琴作品全集第三卷

Complete Piano Works Volume III

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. 15)

上海市第四期教育高地建设项目 (编号: 21023D1)

翻译: 陆平

俞琳霁

(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 第三卷 / 恩斯特·赫特里希编; 汉斯-马丁·特奥波德等指法编注; 陆平等翻译 - 上海: 上海音乐出版社, 2014.9

ISBN 978-7-5523-0607-1

I. 舒… II. ①恩… ②汉… ③陆… 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 168387 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 第三卷

编 者: 恩斯特·赫特里希

指法编注: 汉斯-马丁·特奥波德 等

翻 译: 陆 平 等

出 品 人: 费维耀

项目负责: 秦展闻

责任编辑: 段劲楠

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: 38 插页: 4 谱、文: 304 面

2014 年 9 月第 1 版 2014 年 9 月第 1 次印刷

印数: 1-3,000 册

ISBN 978-7-5523-0607-1/J · 0542

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首作品,按作品编号顺序排列(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。

第三卷收录了Op. 13~16号。这些作品创作于1834年秋至1838年春,并于1836至1839年出版。后来,这四部作品中的三部(Op. 13, Op. 14和Op. 16)由舒曼重新修订后再版。鉴于作品Op. 13和Op. 14修订前后的两个版本差别较大,当前版本因而将这两版乐谱均完整印出。

交响练习曲 Op.13

《交响练习曲》的成型情况高度复杂,经历了数个不同的创作阶段。1834年4月,舒曼结识了艾妮斯汀·冯·弗里肯(Ernestine von Fricken),到了11月他们已然私订终身。同月,艾妮斯汀的父亲伊格纳茨·费迪南德·冯·弗里肯男爵(Baron Ignaz Ferdinand von Fricken),送给舒曼一组由他自创的主题变奏曲,也许是为长笛与钢琴而作的。从9月19日的一封信中可以看出,舒曼对这部作品进行了措辞严厉的批评,尤其挑了主题本身的毛病。然而,或许是为了向未婚妻和她父亲示好,他开始用这一主题写作一套自己的变奏曲,在同一封信中他告诉男爵,

他想将其称作“悲怆变奏曲”,“如果其中蕴含着一些悲怆情绪的话”,他希望“通过各种色调的变幻将这些情愫描绘出来。”诚然,据Op. 13现存最早的作曲家手稿显示,个别乐曲并非称作“练习曲”,而是被称作“变奏曲”,而第十二练习曲则叫作“终曲”。这首终曲显然给舒曼造成了一些困难,这样说是因为他在11月28日写给男爵的信中说道:“我为变奏曲的终曲犯难了。我想把这首葬礼进行曲(该主题在最初的手稿中称作“葬礼进行曲”)逐步升华至一首凯旋进行曲,此外,再融入戏剧化的特质,但是我无法摆脱小调的约束。在创作中,某种‘意图’总会成为一块绊脚石,让人变得过分现实。”日后,当舒曼回首过往时,在日记中写道:“《交响练习曲》在(1834~1835年)冬天制成誊清稿。”

这份誊清稿末尾标注的日期是1835年1月18日,写有“献给策特维茨伯爵夫人(Comtesse Zedtwitz)和弗里肯男爵夫人(Baron Fricken)”。如此一来,这套变奏曲就是由他未婚妻的父亲创作主题、题献给她母亲,并由他们的女儿来演奏的,一首音乐作品便串起了这一家人。这份手稿中仅有第一、二、四、五、十和第十二首练习曲,外加此次版本附录中重印的五首变奏曲,以及附录末尾印出的一首未完成的小曲。不过,舒曼显然认为这部作品该暂且搁笔了,因为他把该手稿用作了抄谱员抄本的底本,而该手抄本自然无法进一步传递出作品在修改中所包含的原始信息,因而这些内容便也不为人知了。1835年12月22日,他将《辉煌的奏鸣曲》《交响变奏曲》和《狂欢节》[即《狂欢节》Op. 9]等一批作品交付给Breitkopf & Härtel出版社出版。这是“交响”一词首次被用于这部作品,该词日后

将成为这些作品的标志。渐渐地,舒曼开始偏向使用“练习曲”这一说法,后来仅在1852年出版时才改用回“变奏曲”的称呼。

1836年2月,就在Breitkopf & Härtel出版社对是否出版其新作犹豫不决时,舒曼将作品转投维也纳的Haslinger出版社,该社最终采用了这部作品,并将其出版。起先,舒曼可能是把上文提及的抄谱员抄本寄到了维也纳,将其作为刻版者的样本,因为当时他不太可能已备妥了带有另外六首练习曲(第三、六至九和第十一首)的最终成形版本。诚然,舒曼在写给哈斯林格(Haslinger)的信中提到了“《大卫同盟练习曲》”,而非在写给布赖特科普夫(Breitkopf)信中说到的变奏曲,但是显然,各首乐曲的最终顺序还未排定,因为哈斯林格在6月13日的信中还询问起这些练习曲的最终次序。只有现存的刻版用样本(即另一份包含所有十二首乐曲的抄谱员抄本)是按最终顺序排列的。这意味着,它一定是在1836年6月13日之后才被寄往出版社的。至此,分散的各首乐曲就可以被称为第一至十二首练习曲了。有人猜测,这一新的名称(甚至或许还有几首遗失的练习曲的创作)与舒曼在1835年9月和1836年9月同肖邦的会面有关,但这一点是否属实仍然需要研究。无论如何,就在同肖邦第二次会面四天后,即在1836年9月18日,舒曼在日记中吐露:“我以高昂的兴致和充沛的激情创作了几首练习曲。我在钢琴旁待了一整天。”我们不能排除这样的可能性——就是在添加了几首练习曲之后,才使整套作品完整成形的。

由于各种原因导致《交响练习曲》的出版拖延了许久,直到1837年5月17日,哈斯林格才把一批校

样送到作曲家那里,而到了6月6日舒曼才将校样送回。此后,一切进展迅速,首批乐谱在同月就出版了。此时,作品的题献变成了“献给伦敦好友威廉·斯腾代尔·贝内特(William Sterndale Bennett)”。贝内特是一位英国钢琴家、指挥家和作曲家,1836至1837年间他曾在莱比锡音乐学院师从过门德尔松,就在那段时间里,他加入到舒曼的私人朋友圈子里。手稿中的“献给弗里肯男爵夫人”的题献之所以未出现在正式出版的作品中,是因为在1835年季夏时,舒曼就已和艾妮斯汀分手了,将近年底时二人永久性地解除了婚约。从这个角度而言,《交响练习曲》的酝酿形成过程也折射了一段凋谢的爱情。初版甚至都不曾提及艾妮斯汀的父亲是主题的创作者一事,仅仅注有“该旋律是由一位音乐爱好者所写”。

起先,几乎鲜有听众知晓《交响练习曲》这部作品。克拉拉·舒曼在1837年8月13日的莱比锡独奏会上演奏了其中的三首乐曲。1838年2月11日,舒曼事后评论道:“我在两年里只听你弹过两次(……)但这是我所想象中最理想的演奏了。我仍然记得你演奏我创作的《练习曲》的方式,你将它表现得无异于一部杰作——一部听众还不太懂得如何欣赏的杰作。”

舒曼对他的钢琴曲 Op. 5、Op. 6、Op. 14 和 Op. 16 以及《声乐套曲》(Op. 39)进行了不同程度的修订,并于1849至1853年间再版,《交响练习曲》也位列其中。从一开始,研究舒曼的学者们就对这些新版本作了大量的解释分析,他们中的绝大多数人都把修改作品的原因归结于舒曼

美学观的改变,却无法说明他为何偏偏专门修订了这六部作品。各种因素表明,可能是这六部作品各自的出版状况促使了它们的重版:Op. 5 和 Op. 6 由罗伯特·弗里泽(Robert Friese)在莱比锡出版,他是一名书商,而不是音乐出版商。在一封1842年11月5日写给音乐出版商霍夫迈斯特(Hofmeister)的信中,舒曼吐露了自己的心声,他认为这就是导致这两部作品“几乎完全不为人知”的原因,而且“只要一名真正意义上的出版商能对它们展现出兴趣,这种局面无疑会立刻改变”。其他四首作品由维也纳的出版商哈斯林格于1836至1842年间出版。在托比亚斯·哈斯林格去世(1842年)后,他的儿子卡尔(Carl)逐步开始专营维也纳舞曲乐谱。1845年3月30日,舒曼将四手演奏版的《序曲、谐谑曲与终曲》(Op. 52)连同一本歌曲集一起交付给他,却遭到了回绝。德国的出版商同样察觉到了哈斯林格在出版方略重心上的转移。汉堡的尤利乌斯·舒伯特(Julius Schuberth)试图从哈斯林格处购买 Op. 13、Op. 16 和 Op. 39,却只购得了《交响练习曲》(Op. 13)。

舒曼打算为新版本进行一系列的改动。到了1849年11月3日,他已在了一本1837年版乐谱上显著地标出了有待修改之处,并将修改稿发给了出版商。但是不知为何,新版本直到1852年2月才出版。在一些外部细节上,该版本回归到了手稿资料所要传达的样子上来——各个段落再次被称作“变奏曲”,而最后一首又一次被叫作“终曲”。在标题页上写道:由作曲家本人修订的新版本。在保留了添加上去的“练习曲”

名称的同时,补充的“交响”一词却不见了,取而代之的是添加的“以变奏曲式写成的”。尽管如此,标题时至今日仍为 *Études Symphoniques* 或 *Symphonische Etüden*^①。舒曼又一次删掉了1837年版中的第三和第九首练习曲,这两首至少是在后期才创作的。他还删去了第九变奏(第十一首练习曲)的引子,在曲式上对终曲(第十二首练习曲)作了些改动。除了一些微小的细节外,其余的几段未作变动。

起初,当时的音乐刊物并未关注到这一“新版”中的变化。威廉·约瑟夫·冯·瓦西耶列夫斯基(Wilhelm Joseph von Wasielewski)1858年的传记和阿道夫·舒布林(Adolf Schubring)1861年发表在《新音乐杂志》(*NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK*)上的文章《舒曼作品集之三:新版舒曼早期钢琴作品》(*Schumanniana.Nr.3:Neue Ausgaben von Schumann'schen Clavierwerken der ersten Periode*)最早对此给予了深入关注。舒布林声称终曲在曲式上的改动或许“仅仅是一时疏忽”。这一点很难令人信服,因为在舒曼和舒伯特^②之间的通信中并未提到此事,而作曲家是不会容忍这样的“疏忽”的。另一方面,舒布林显然是可以去查阅上文提及的那份1837年版乐谱的,在这份乐谱上写有舒曼为第二版所做的修改。据他所说,这份乐谱上还写有第三和第九首练习曲的修改部分,这些修改是作曲家亲笔写下的,舒曼显然是到后来才决定将它们从新版中删去的。舒布林在1861年出版了第三版,结合了前两个版本。结果,今天的钢琴家通常按照1852年版来演奏,但常常加上1837

① 两者均意为“交响练习曲”,前者为法语,后者为德语。——译者注

② 即上文提及的出版商尤利乌斯·舒伯特。——译者注

年版中的第三和第九练习曲,而几乎毫无例外地恢复演奏第九变奏中删去的起始小节。这种将两个版本混合在一起的做法是站不住脚的,因此我们没有将第三和第九练习曲以及上述的起始小节编入1852年版的新版中。它们具有不同的历史背景。

F小调钢琴奏鸣曲 Op. 14

正如前文所述的《交响练习曲》一样,舒曼的许多作品都写有两个版本,作品Op.14也是其中之一:本曲的一个版本是《无乐队协奏曲》,出版于1836年;另一版本为《大奏鸣曲》,于1853年出版。从现存的亲笔手稿中可见,作曲家原本将其构思成一部含有五个乐章的奏鸣曲。这份手稿末尾所注的日期为1836年6月5日。这就表示,《F小调奏鸣曲》的创作时间要晚于《G小调奏鸣曲》,而《G小调奏鸣曲》的作品编号数字22却更大。这是因为作品Op.22虽然在1835年10月就已基本创作完成,但它一直到1839年才印刷出版。后来新创作的作品Op.14的终曲仍未找到。

全曲是由“克拉拉·维克小行板”这一动机扩展开来的。该动机先是在首乐章的开头引出,接着被用作变奏曲乐章的主题,并于“第二谐谑曲”中再现。此外,在早期版本的末乐章中,它也多次出现。舒曼将克拉拉·维克的动机写入这部奏鸣曲的做法有着充分的理由:在结束了同艾妮斯汀·冯·弗里肯之间的一段短暂婚约后(参见Op.13的前言),1835年夏日,他与当时还未满16岁的克拉拉·维克之间的关系变得愈发亲密。在《莱比锡日记本之二》(Leipziger Lebensbuch II)中,舒曼写道:“成天与克拉拉在一起。”这本日记记述了1831年10至1833年3月

间的事,还追述了从这段时间直至1838年11月28日间的要事。(1835年)日记中的大量记录显示,二人的关系正稳步发展。但日记中也提到,1836年2月,克拉拉的父亲将其二人强行拆散,时间长达一年有半:“维克写信来了/与克拉拉天各一方/凄凉的1836年/克拉拉6月份写信来了,我也写了回信/夏天创作了《无乐队协奏曲》/按我自己的决定,彻底同克拉拉分开。”舒曼1838年2月12日写给克拉拉的一封信再次证实,作品Op.14和这些要事(尤其是分处异地)之间有着很重要的关联。听听舒曼在这段时间里写了些什么:“4.我为你写了一部协奏曲,如果你还没读懂我对你的爱,那么你可真要好好补偿我了。我的心在为你滴泪,比以往更爱我吧!顺便提一句,你甚至都未必看得出我从你的主题中派生出了多少种形态(请原谅我说这话,毕竟我才是曲作者)。”

1836年3月8日,舒曼写信给这部作品后来的题献者伊格纳茨·莫舍勒斯(Ignaz Moscheles)时说:“我新写了一首奏鸣曲,想把您的名字放在题首。”此时此刻,这首奏鸣曲是否已经创作完成?如果是的话,为何慢乐章和第一首谐谑曲在草稿中标注的时间是1836年4月?在舒曼的《莱比锡日记本之二》里,他又为何说他“在1836年夏天”写完了这部作品?这些问题都没有确切的答案。可以断定的是,出版社在3月30日的信中告知舒曼他们已收到了这首新奏鸣曲,而且舒曼还向出版社要回了作品手稿,并在初夏时修订了该作品,他特地把末乐章彻底重写了一遍(亲笔手稿中仅有终曲最初版本的一段开头,新版本是另外写在一张纸上的)。据亲笔手稿所示,修订版的完稿日期是1836年6月5日。

新作原本有五个乐章,而舒曼当时显然只想出版其中的三个,并冠以“协奏曲”的标题。我们并不了解究竟是何种缘由促使他这么做,虽然这主意可能出自作曲家本人。哈斯林格在6月13日的回信中写道:“我觉得您把这曲子叫协奏曲的想法真是太时髦了(做人总得跟上潮流),对此我完全赞同(……)作为一个出版商,我的意见虽然并不权威,但我想还是应该加上一小段前言较为合适,这样就能说清楚这部协奏曲是供钢琴独奏用的,而这些话是无法在扉页上用三言两语说清的。真是部独树一帜的新作,它必将独领风骚。”或许是受哈斯林格的启发,舒曼想到为新写的三乐章作品取名“无乐队协奏曲”。7月2日,舒曼要求出版社在7月20日前把毛校校样寄给他看一下。看来,他应该是按时收到了校样,并在7月30日将其寄回。作品于9月份正式出版——从雕版、校对,到印刷、面市共花了不到三个月的时间。除两首谐谑曲外,两首以“克拉拉·维克小行板”为主题的变奏曲也并未出版。和谐谑曲一样,变奏曲也在亲笔手稿中被删掉了。

评论家们对这首奏鸣曲反应不一。要知道,舒曼在1836年时还未得到广泛认可。作为受献者,该作品一经面市,伊格纳茨·莫舍勒斯便收到了乐谱,他在致谢信中开诚布公地表示,对于这部作品不应只是随意弹奏,只有“真正懂得艺术的真谛、了解崇高的音乐语汇之人”方能欣赏理解。谈到标题时,他却指出“它虽然具备了大奏鸣曲的特征,但并不符合一部协奏曲的条件。”至于许多不协和和弦,他写道:“那些要等到两三个小节后才解决的延留音,虽符合乐理,但却刺耳。要想不被这些和弦干扰而产生不悦,演奏者必须是经验丰

富的音乐家,弹奏之前要进行预判,且看这些矛盾是如何一一化解的。”舒曼在他的《新音乐杂志》上公开刊登了这封信(1837年2月24日),在结尾处,他撰写了如下短评:“如是便罢。弗洛雷斯坦(Florestan)和优西比乌斯(Euseb)[舒曼虚构出的两个代表其本人双重性格的化身],你俩今后可得继续严格要求自己,要配得上这样宽仁的评价,正如你们平时在其他方面所做的那样。”

1853年,汉堡的尤利乌斯·舒伯特出版了作品Op. 14的修订版,此版中该作品的标题印作《大奏鸣曲》,这一版本仅把第二首谐谑曲编了进来。[新版本的出版缘由可见于《交响练习曲》(Op. 13)前言中的相关评述。]舒伯特试图从哈斯林格那里购买Op. 13、Op. 16和Op. 39,但他仅购得了《交响练习曲》(Op. 13)。看来他一开始并不知道有Op. 14,似乎是舒曼自己让舒伯特关注到了它。不管怎样,舒伯特在1850年5月19日写信给舒曼时说:“这首《无乐队协奏曲》现在归我了,现将其附上,请作修改。您想为它加一段谐谑曲进去吗?我得知您已确定使用《第三奏鸣曲》的名称了。”

这段话中有两点值得关注:其一,舒曼无疑是从一开始就想重新发行这部作品的,这一次是以《奏鸣曲》作为标题。或许他真的认真考虑了上文提及的受献者伊格纳茨·莫舍勒的不同意见。其二,将初版中的《谐谑曲之二》重新插入该作品新版的做法并不是舒曼自己的主意,而是来自他人的建议。

舒曼《书简》(Briefbuch,书信集)中有以下写于1850年10月25日的内容:“舒伯特/汉堡/他要为大提琴小品(Op. 102)付我十八个路易金币,为协奏曲中的谐谑曲付我三个路

易金币。”能否据此得出舒曼此时已将该曲寄给出版社这一结论?我们尚不全知。无论如何,他一直到1852年6月13日才将全曲寄往汉堡。延迟的原因十有八九是由于出版社在经营上遇到了麻烦,导致支付给舒曼的酬金耽搁了好一阵子。

舒伯特想必是把一本修改过的哈斯林格1836年版用作他这一版的底本了,其中还另外夹插了几页纸。之所以这样说,是因为在两个版本中有着大量相同的错误。至于新添加的谐谑曲,舒曼一定是新写了一份手稿。1853年6月5日(距舒曼寄刻版用稿给出版社几乎一年之后)他写了一封信“连同Op. 14的修改版一起”寄去汉堡。这部奏鸣曲终于在七月份出版了。就跟之前的那部修订本一样,新版《奏鸣曲》(Op. 14)也未能引起当时乐评家们的关注。舒曼似乎极其看重这部作品,约翰内斯·勃拉姆斯9月至10月间前往杜塞尔多夫看望他时,舒曼请克拉拉为勃拉姆斯弹奏了他的《F小调奏鸣曲》[据《家庭记事本》(Haushaltbuch)中1853年10月8日记录所载]。

与1836年版相比,修订版最显而易见的特征当然就是加入了谐谑曲。舒曼不是随意地选择《第二首谐谑曲》的,从手稿中对其名称的反复修改[《第三谐谑曲》、《漫步》(……)《间奏曲》]可知,他最开始是想把它写成一种间奏类的乐曲。结果,这段乐曲在开头部分重复了克拉拉的主题,而这一主题在整部奏鸣曲中占有举足轻重的地位(参见前文)。舒曼对第一乐章做了大刀阔斧的修改,令人惊奇的是,有几处他竟然重新采用了手稿中的原谱。第三四乐章改动甚小,截然不同的是,终曲由先前的6/16拍改写成了2/4拍。

上文曾提过,舒曼在1849年至

1853年间重新再版过其他五首作品,与其中的大多数作品相比,作品Op. 14的改动处尤其之多。因此,G.亨乐出版社决定将两个版本均完整印出,老版为《无乐队协奏曲》,新版为《大奏鸣曲》。舒曼生前未公开发表的手稿部分,即最早的第一首谐谑曲和被弃用的“克拉拉·维克行板”主题变奏曲,在此次出版时,我们将其排在附录里。《谐谑曲》最先是由约翰内斯·勃拉姆斯编辑的,他同时还编订了《G小调奏鸣曲》(Op. 22)中初版的终曲,由瑞士的出版商里特-比德尔曼于1866年发行。两首变奏曲由G.亨乐出版社在1983年首次出版,当时将其放在附录中,1983年版是现在这一版的前身。

童年情景 Op. 15

1838年的头几周,舒曼的日子过得积极乐观,新作也层出不穷。“逍遥自在,睡觉、工作、快活、写作,一直到星期五。”他在1838年2月9日至10日的日记中这样写道。就连和克拉拉·维克订婚而逐步升级的争吵也没有影响他创作的兴致。恰恰相反,此事似乎反倒激发了他的创作灵感,使得他思如泉涌、妙笔生花。他写出了《新事曲》(Op. 21)以及“约三十曲动听小作”,3月17日他在写给克拉拉的信中说,从中“挑选出12首来,取名《童年情景》”。其他数段后来被用到《彩色叶子》(Bunte Blätter, Op. 99)和《纪念册页》(Albumblätter, Op. 124)里去了。2至3月间的日记里多次提到这些新作:“夜里,几桩孩提时的温馨情景”(2月17日),“写下一首小曲,叫它《梦幻曲》(Träumerei)”(2月24日),“晚间,又一段F大调‘童年情景’[可能是指《火炉旁》(Am Camin)]”(2月25日),“噢!我东写西写,创作了优

美的《无比的幸福》(*Glückes genug*) 和《新事曲》(*Novelletten*) 中的《波兰舞曲》”(3月11日)。

很奇怪,在上文所引用的写给克拉拉的信中,舒曼只提到了12首小品。这遗失的第十三段小品究竟是后来所写的,还是后来在已经写好的小曲中直接“挑选”出来的,这已经无法弄清了。不管怎样,仅仅四天之后,舒曼就把作品手稿寄给了 Breitkopf & Härtel 出版社:“敬请留意随信附上的《童年情景》。它本可编入《新事曲》的附录,但依我看来还是单独出版较妥。”作曲家与出版商很快达成协议,由出版社支付给舒曼三个路易金币的酬金,舒曼还希望作品“迅速刻版印刷”。

事与愿违,该曲的出版不知何故被长期拖延着。1838年4月15日,作曲家还向克拉拉透露,“你(5月15日)到这儿的时候,《童年情景》肯定已经出版了”,舒曼八月份写信给作家兼民歌收藏家安东·威廉·祖卡马尼奥(Anton Wilhelm von Zuccalmaglio)说:“您和我的名字都会出现在即将问世的《童年情景》里。”我们不知道此处所称的题献为何未能兑现,但《童年情景》出版的时候并没有附上献辞。虽然舒曼在1838年12月19日写信给维也纳的布赖特科普夫,想要“对《童年情景》进行修订”,到了1839年1月6日,他又去信催促他们“抓紧时间刊印我的作品”(《书简》中的第467和第482条记录),但是他显然一直等到1839年2月下旬才拿到第一批乐谱的成品。

1839年3月,当舒曼终于将第一版乐谱寄给克拉拉时,她被这部新作打动了,3月21日至22日,她写信给舒曼说:“真是太高兴了。(……)

这首作品的确是专属于咱们两人的,不是吗?它萦绕在我脑中挥之不去,如此简约纯朴,如此暖人心房,真是‘乐如其人’。”弗朗茨·李斯特的反应也很值得一提。舒曼当时一直与李斯特频繁通信,他在3月19日让维也纳的出版商哈斯林格寄了本第一版的乐谱给李斯特。1839年6月5日,李斯特(从法国)回信道:“我要好好感谢您,大作《童年情景》为我带来了毕生最大的欢愉。您是否知道,我有一个三岁大的女儿,大伙儿都说她简直就是个天使(……)好吧!我亲爱的舒曼先生,每星期都有那么两三次,我要在晚上把《童年情景》弹给她听。我把头一段弹给她听,反复了二十遍而不往下弹,她真是陶醉其间,而您应该可以想象得出,和她相比我自己对这套作品的喜爱更是有过之而无不及。毫无虚言,我相信,如果您能在此亲眼得见此景的话,一定会高兴坏的。”通过李斯特的反应,我们可以注意到几点:其一,这是该新作广受好评的一个例证;其次,这还体现出《童年情景》一个至今仍无法回答的问题,即它到底是写给孩子还是大人的?

舒曼自己对此也显得反复多变。例如,在一封1839年4月3日写给约瑟夫·菲施霍夫(Joseph Fischhof)的信中,他提到:“对孩子们来说,《童年情景》很容易上手。”他还向出版社提过,要把谱子设计得“可爱”一些,1853年11月他要了一本乐谱“给我孩子,小家伙们要弹这曲子。”反之,在1848年10月6日写给卡尔·莱纳克(Carl Reinecke)的信中,他特意提醒对方注意,《童年情景》和《少年曲集》(Op.68)之间有着根本区别:“这是大人在同大人回首往昔,

而在《圣诞曲集》(*Christmas Album*, Op. 68 的原名)里,则更多是少年心中的虚幻、预感和来世。”而舒曼在看了著名乐评家路德维希·莱尔斯塔勃(Ludwig Rellstab)的一篇关于《童年情景》的评论文章后所说的一番话也显得意味深长,这篇文章发表在1839年8月9日出版的《音乐艺术学科观察》(*IRIS IM GEBIETE DER TONKUNST*) 期刊上。从1839年9月5日舒曼写给从前的老师海因里希·多恩(Heinrich Dorn)的信中,我们能看到这段话:“我再也找不到比雷尔施塔勃对我《童年情景》更拙劣、更短浅的评论了。他觉得我就像坐在一个大声哭闹的小孩儿面前,试着找出与之相配的音符一样。但他恰恰说反了!我倒并不否认在我创作时,脑中浮现出不止一个小孩儿。这些标题当然是后来添上去的,这只不过是给了演奏和理解一点小小的暗示。

克莱斯勒偶记 Op. 16

1839年3月15日,舒曼从维也纳写了封信给他的一位崇拜者,来自比利时—卢森堡的迪南地区(Dinant)的西莫南·德·西勒(Simonin de Sire)。舒曼在信中谈到了最近的新作——《童年情景》《幻想曲》(Op.17),《阿拉伯风格曲》^①《花之歌》《幽默曲》,以及《克莱斯勒偶记》:“其中我最喜爱《克莱斯勒偶记》。这一标题只有德国人才能理解。克莱斯勒是 E.T.A. 霍夫曼(E.T.A.Hoffmann)小说中的人物,是位古怪不羁、风趣机智的乐长。他身上发生的很多趣事你都会很喜欢的。其他作品我都是先写完,后起标题的。”

换言之,舒曼打从一开始就为这部作品想好了“克莱斯勒偶记”

① 又译《花纹》。——译者注

的标题。他一心想用音乐来描绘霍夫曼的这个人物,甚至可以说,作为一名作曲者,他将自己融入了克莱斯勒的个性。舒曼从E.T.A.霍夫曼的文集《卡洛式的幻想小品集》(*Phantasiestücke in Callots Manier*)中借用了标题,《克莱斯勒偶记》是文集集中的主要两章。霍夫曼的文集出版于1814至1815年,包含了新写作的故事和短文,以及早年出版的一些作品。纵观他的全部作品,在《幻想小品集》中,音乐成分占有着重要的地位(霍夫曼本人也是位作曲家)。霍夫曼文集的开篇是著名的《骑士格鲁克》(*Ritter Gluck*),据称这一故事可能源自他在梦境中与故人主人宫的奇遇。紧接着便是《克莱斯勒偶记》的第一章,描写了克莱斯勒身上发生的一连串故事,之后还有几篇纯粹探讨音乐理论的文章,例如《论贝多芬的器乐作品》(*Beethovens Instrumental-Musik*)。继《克莱斯勒偶记》第一章之后,是霍夫曼著名的《唐璜》(*Don Juan*)历险记。乐长克莱斯勒这一虚构的人物在霍夫曼的作品中还是时常出现。故事总是描写克莱斯勒不顾世俗眼光,为了实现艺术抱负而上下求索,直至迈向发狂的边缘。

在舒曼的《克莱斯勒偶记》里充满着怪诞有时甚至是粗俗的元素,看上去总像是即兴写作的小品,听起来却直接体现出了霍夫曼的浪漫主义艺术观,当时的人们普遍认为,这种艺术观集中在了克莱斯勒这一人物身上:“他浑身上下都充满着神力,当被灵感激发之时,他能像孩子般虔诚地全情投入。他能以浪漫主义精神世界的全新语言来表达自己的内心,并且不自觉地将其呈现出来(……)他从心底里自发而出的这些特殊才能,可以洋溢在喜气洋洋的圆圈舞里,任何能够看到这些奇才的人,心

中都会萌发出一种永无止境、不可名状的渴望。”(节选自《克莱斯勒偶记》的第二章,标题为“崇拜的影子”(Ombra adorata))。

显然,舒曼的《克莱斯勒偶记》是分两部分创作完成的。他在1838年4月14日写信给克拉拉说:“你都快把我变成一个话痨外加一个十八岁的狂热崇拜者了——我不知道自己会怎么样。可是克拉拉,这段音乐现在还在我脑海中,而这些优美的旋律始终挥之不去。简直想不到,自从上次给你去信之后(3月19日),我又写完了一整套新作。我要给它取名‘克莱斯勒偶记’。你和你的形象在曲中扮演了主角,我要把它题献给你——是的,非你莫属。当你从曲中认出你自己时一定会嫣然一笑的。”无论如何,舒曼在这里所说的,肯定没有完全涵盖作品的全部八个段落,在不到两周之后,即4月27日的日记里,我们看到他这样写道:“在纪念册里写了一段急板,送给来自德累斯顿的少校妻子赛尔夫人(Madame Serre)。”由于少校妻子从她的纪念册中把这一页抄了出来,而且这份抄本还保存了下来,所以我们确信这段“急板”正是全曲第一段的初稿(为了此次出版,我们查阅了这份抄本)。又过了一周,即5月3日,舒曼在日记中吐露:“为一封(克拉拉写来的)信等了三个春日——又花四天写出了《克莱斯勒偶记》——开出一片新天地——(……)满怀激情地写下《克莱斯勒偶记》中的一段,g小调、 $\frac{3}{8}$ 拍,中间有一段d小调的三声中部。”此段很可能就是第八段。

如此看来,《克莱斯勒偶记》中的八段乐曲显然是分两个阶段创作的,第一阶段是从3月19日到4月13日,而第二阶段是从4月底到5月初。它们的创作顺序同舒曼在首版中的

排序是不一致的,虽然第八段或许是最后创作的。

早在5月8日,舒曼就请他在维也纳的朋友约瑟夫·菲施霍夫帮忙,为这部新作找一家出版商:“标题是《克莱斯勒偶记》/为钢琴而作的幻想曲/献给克拉拉·维克小姐/作品号——(……)我的稿费和《交响练习曲》一样(同样是由哈斯林格出版)。——一定要在米迦勒节(即9月29日)之前出版(这是先决条件,否则我就拿给布赖特科普夫去了,他们的出价还更高一些呢)。”结果,他在5月26日把刻版用稿寄往维也纳了。在7月6日的一封信中,他还把题献辞改掉了——是克拉拉自己让他这么做的,她担心如果题献给她的话,会让她和父亲的关系变得更加紧张。7月23日,舒曼把勘定过的校样寄回出版社,作品于9月初如期出版。

1850年8月,Op. 16的修订版由莱比锡的弗里德里希·韦斯特林(Friedrich Whistling)出版。[这一新版的出版原因,可参见前言中关于《交响练习曲》(Op. 13)部分的注解。]1849年,韦斯特林从作品原来的出版商哈斯林格手里购得了《克莱斯勒偶记》和《艾辛多夫艺术歌曲》(Eichendorff Lieder, Op. 39)的版权,1849年8月25日,他把再版的计划告诉了舒曼,并问道,对于即将推出的新版“是否需要修改某些地方”。舒曼在9月2日就说会寄一份修改稿给韦斯特林,却直到11月下旬才寄出。他在11月20日的附信中写道:“我大幅度地修改了《克莱斯勒偶记》。很遗憾,我早年间常常蓄意破坏了自己的曲子。这些地方现在都被我删了。”尽管信里这么写,但是舒曼的修改还是控制在合理范围内的:对第四和第五段的末尾稍作改动,在第二段中加了一个二十小节的

段落,又在第二段中另外去掉了八小节。或许最明显的变化是多次去掉了 *ritardando* (即“渐慢”)记号。舒曼认为他经常蓄意破坏了自己的早期作品,很可能就是指这些大量的速度变化,后来他不再喜欢这样写了。

在我们此次原作版正文中印出的正是这一韦斯特林修订版。我们将哈斯林格版中与当前版本存在明显不同之处标注在脚注里。

*

有关底本和文本的信息可参见此版末尾的《评注》部分。

《评注》部分中提及的所有图书馆都友好地提供了底本乐谱,以供编者和出版社使用,在此一并致谢。

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 third volume contains opus numbers 13–16, which were composed between autumn 1834 and spring 1838 and published between 1836 and 1839. Schumann had three of the four works – op. 13, 14 and 16 – republished later, in new, revised editions. In the case of

op. 13 and 14, the differences between the respective versions are so great that we have printed both versions in their entirety.

Symphonic Études op. 13

The genesis of the *Symphonische Etüden* is highly complicated and involved several distinct stages. In April 1834 Schumann had met Ernestine von Fricken. By September they were already secretly engaged. In that same month Ernestine's father, Baron Ignaz Ferdinand von Fricken, sent him a set of variations on a theme of his own invention, probably for flute and piano. Schumann responded rather critically by letter on 19 September, finding fault above all with the theme itself. Nevertheless, perhaps as a favour to the father of his fiancée, he began to write his own set of variations on the theme, intending, as he told the Baron in the same letter, to call them “variations pathétiques” and to “paint its pathetic element in various hues, if there be any such element within it.” Indeed, the earliest surviving autograph manuscripts for opus 13 still refer to the individual pieces as “variations” rather than “études” and call Étude XII a “Finale.” This finale evidently caused Schumann some difficulty, for on 28 November he wrote to the Baron: “I'm still stuck in the finale of my variations. I'd like to elevate the funeral march [the theme is called *Marcia funebre* in the earliest autograph] bit by bit into a triumphal march and, moreover, instill some dramatic interest, but I can't escape the minor mode; and in the act of creation, an ‘intention’ often causes one to stumble and become too material.” Looking back later, Schumann noted in his diary that “the *Symphonische Etüden* [...] were written out in fair copy in the winter months [of 1834–35].”

This fair copy is dated 18 Januar 1835 at the end and contains a dedication to *Madame la Baronne de Fricken née Comtesse de Zedtwitz*. Thus, a set of variations on a theme by the father was to be dedicated to the mother and played by the daughter, uniting his fian-

cée's entire family in a single piece of music. This autograph only contains Études I, II, IV, V, X and XII plus the five variations reproduced in the appendix to our edition, as well as an unfinished piece printed at the end of this appendix. Nonetheless, Schumann apparently considered the piece finished for the time being, for he used the autograph as the basis of a copyist's manuscript which, however, was of no further relevance to the work's textual transmission and can no longer be traced. On 22 December 1835 he offered Breitkopf & Härtel a group of “brilliant sonatas,” “symphonic variations,” and “Fasching” (i. e. *Carnaval*, op. 9) for publication. This is the first appearance of the epithet “symphonic” that would later become an identifying tag for these pieces. It was only gradually that he decided in favour of études, only to return to the original term, variations, in the later print of 1852.

After Breitkopf & Härtel were unable to decide whether to accept the new work, Schumann turned in February 1836 to Haslinger in Vienna, who eventually accepted the work for publication. Initially he may have sent the above-mentioned copyist's manuscript to Vienna for use as an engraver's copy, for it is fairly unlikely that the final version with the six additional études (III, VI–IX and XI) was ready at this time. True, his letter to Haslinger speaks of “*Dauidsbund Études*” rather than variations, as in the letter to Breitkopf; but the pieces had apparently not yet been placed in their final order, for in a letter of 13 June Haslinger inquired about the definitive sequence of the études. Only the surviving engraver's copy, another copyist's manuscript, contains all twelve pieces and places them in their definitive order, implying that it must have been posted to the publisher after 13 June 1836. Here the separate items are now referred to as Études I to XII. Whether this new designation, and perhaps even the composition of the missing Études, relate to Schumann's meetings with Chopin in September 1835 and September 1836, as has occasionally been conjectured, remains a matter of

speculation. In any event, on 18 September 1836, four days after his second meeting with Chopin, he confided to his diary: “Composed études with great pleasure and excitement. Spent the entire day at the piano.” The possibility cannot be dismissed that some of these were the Études added to complete the set.

For various reasons, the publication of the *Symphonische Etüden* was considerably delayed. It was not until 17 May 1837 that Haslinger sent the composer a set of proofs, which he only returned on 6 June. Thereafter things proceeded swiftly, and the first copies left the press that same month. The work now bore a dedication à son ami William Sterndale Bennett à Londres. Bennett was an English pianist, conductor, and composer who studied with Mendelssohn at the Leipzig Conservatory in 1836–37, during which time he joined Schumann’s intimate circle of friends. The dedication to *Madame la Baronne de Fricken* in the autograph was discarded: Schumann had already broken with Ernestine in late summer of 1835 and permanently terminated their engagement towards the end of the year. Viewed in this light, the gestation of the *Symphonische Etüden* also reflects the history of a failed love affair. The first edition does not even mention her father as the author of the theme, merely pointing out that “les notes de la mélodie sont de la composition d’un Amateur”.

At first the *Symphonische Etüden* made little headway with the public. Clara Wieck played three of the pieces at a Leipzig recital on 13 August 1837. Schumann commented in retrospect on 11 February 1838: “I only heard you play twice in two years [...] but it seemed to me the most perfect thing imaginable; I still remember the way you played my Études; you cast them as nothing short of masterpieces – something that audiences do not know how to appreciate.”

Along with the piano pieces op. 5, 6, 14 and 16, as well as the *Liederkreis* op. 39, the *Symphonische Etüden* take

their place among those works that Schumann revised to varying degrees and had republished in the years 1849–53. From the beginning, these new versions were subjected to a great deal of interpretative analysis by Schumann scholars, nearly all of whom sought the reason for the reworkings in Schumann’s changed aesthetic views, but were unable to explain why he revised these six works in particular. Various factors suggest that the new release of the six works may have been prompted by their respective publication situations: op. 5 and op. 6 had been issued in Leipzig by Robert Friese, who was a book dealer and not a music publisher. In a letter to the music publisher Hofmeister dated 5 November 1842, Schumann expressed his feeling that this was the reason why the two works were “almost totally unknown,” and that “this would certainly change as soon as a proper publisher showed interest in them.” The four other works had been published by the Viennese music publisher Haslinger between 1836 and 1842. After the death of Tobias Haslinger (1842), his son Carl had begun increasingly to specialise in Viennese dance music. When, on 30 March 1845, Schumann offered him a 4-hand version of the *Ouverture, Scherzo und Finale* op. 52, together with a book of songs, he received a refusal. This shift of focus in Haslinger’s publication policy was also noticed by German publishers. Julius Schuberth of Hamburg tried to acquire op. 13, 16 and 39 from Haslinger, but only succeeded with the *Symphonische Etüden* op. 13.

Schumann planned a whole series of changes for the new edition. By 3 November 1849 he had already dispatched his corrections to the publisher, apparently entering them in a copy of the 1837 print. But for unknown reasons the new edition had to wait until February 1852. In some external details it returns to the form in which it was transmitted in the manuscript sources – the individual pieces are again called “Variation”, and the final number is once again labelled “Finale”. Its title page bears the remark *Edition nouvelle revue*

par l’Auteur. While it retained the added designation “Études,” the supplementary “Symphoniques” is missing, and is replaced by the addition “en forme de Variations.” In spite of this, the title to this day remains *Études Symphoniques* or *Symphonische Etüden*. Schumann once more deleted Etudes III and IX of the 1837 edition, which were anyway not composed until a late stage. He also deleted the introduction to Variation IX (Etude XI), and made some formal alterations to the Finale (Etude XII). Save for some small details, the remaining pieces are unchanged.

At first, contemporary trade journals took no notice of the changes in this “Edition nouvelle.” The first persons to give them closer attention were Wilhelm Joseph von Wasielewski, in his biography of 1858, and Adolf Schubring, in his article *Schumanniana. Nr. 3: Neue Ausgaben von Schumann’schen Clavierwerken der ersten Periode* for the *NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK* (1861). Schubring claimed that the formal alterations in the Finale may have been “merely a blunder.” This is most unlikely, for they are not mentioned in the correspondence between Schumann and Schuberth, and the composer would hardly have condoned such a “blunder.” On the other hand, Schubring was evidently allowed to consult the aforementioned copy of the 1837 print with Schumann’s corrections for the second version. He reported that this copy also contained corrections for Études III and IX in the hand of the composer, who evidently decided only later to drop them from the new edition. In 1861 Schubring issued a third edition combining the two earlier versions. As a result, today’s pianists normally play from the 1852 version, but frequently add Études III and IX from the 1837 version and almost invariably reinstate the deleted introductory measure to Variation IX. This conflation of the two versions is untenable, and we have therefore refrained from including Études III and IX, and the said introductory measure, in our new edition of the 1852 version. They belong in a different historical context.

Piano Sonata in f minor op. 14

As noted above in respect of the *Symphonische Etüden*, Schumann's opus 14 is likewise one of several works by this composer to exist in two versions: in this case as the *Concert sans Orchestre*, published in 1836, and as the *Grande Sonate*, published in 1853. As can be seen in the extant autograph, the work was originally conceived as a sonata in five movements. At the end of the manuscript is the date 5^{ten} Juni 1836. This means that the f-minor Sonata was written after the g-minor Sonata, which was given the higher opus number 22. The reason for this is that opus 22 was not printed until 1839, even though it was basically completed in October 1835; only the new finale, composed at a later date, was still missing.

Permeating the work is the motif of an *Andantino de Clara Wieck*. It is introduced at the beginning of the opening movement, then showcased as the theme of the variation movement before returning in the Scherzo II; moreover, it also makes several appearances in an early version of the final movement. Schumann had a very good reason for incorporating a motif by Clara Wieck into the Sonata: after the interlude of his engagement to Ernestine von Fricken (see the *Preface* to opus 13), his relationship with the not-yet 16-year-old Clara Wieck had deepened once again in the summer of 1835. "Together with Clara every day," he noted in his *Leipziger Lebensbuch II*, a diary covering the period from October 1831 to March 1833 and a retrospective glance from 28 November 1838 to the time in between. Numerous entries (for 1835) testify to their steadily growing relationship. But there are also references to the separation imposed by Clara's father in mid February 1836 and which was to last one and a half years: "Letter from Wieck · Separation from Clara · Dismal year 1836 · Letter from Clara in June and exchange of letters · Composed the *Concert sans Orchestre* in the summer · Completely separated from Clara following my own decision." In a letter of 12 February 1838 to Clara, Schumann

confirms once again how much his opus 14 was connected with all these events, especially with the separation. Listing everything he did during this period, he writes: "4) I wrote a concerto for you – and if this does not make clear my love for you, this one sole cry of the heart for you in which, incidentally, you did not even realise how many guises your theme assumed (forgive me, it is the composer speaking) – truly you have much to make up for and will have to love me even more in the future!"

On 8 March 1836, Schumann wrote to the work's future dedicatee Ignaz Moscheles that he "has written a new sonata which I would like to preface with your name." Was the Sonata thus already completed at this point in time? If so, why are the sketches to the slow movement and to the Scherzo I dated April 1836, and why did Schumann note in his *Leipziger Lebensbuch II* that he had written the piece "in the summer" of 1836? There is no unequivocal answer to these questions. What is ascertainable is that the publisher had acknowledged receipt of the new Sonata in a letter dated 30 March, and that Schumann retrieved the manuscript and revised the work again during the early summer, at which time he radically reworked the final movement in particular (the autograph contains only the beginning of the original version of the finale; the new version is notated on different paper). According to the date on the autograph, this revision was completed on the 5^{ten} Juni 1836.

In the meantime, Schumann had clearly decided to have only three of the original five movements of the new work printed, and to give it the title *Concert*. It is not known what prompted him to take this decision, although the idea seems to have come from the composer himself. Haslinger responded on 13 June: "I think that your idea of a concerto is wonderfully in tune with the times (and one should always move with them), and I entirely approve [...] In my non-authoritative opinion as publisher, I should think that a short preface [...] might be expedient, in which it would be made clear that this concerto was

conceived for piano alone, if this cannot be expressed on the title page in a few words. The object is new, and should be seen as new and pace-setting." It is possible that, stimulated by Haslinger's idea, Schumann came upon the idea of calling the piece *Concert sans Orchestre* in the new, three-movement form. On 2 July he requested the posting of galley proofs by 20 July. He seems to have received them punctually and returned them on 30 July. The publication was actually released in September; engraving, proofreading, printing and production had taken less than three months. Apart from the two Scherzi, two Variations on the *Andantino de Clara Wieck* were also left out of the printed edition. Like the Scherzi, they, too, were crossed out in the autograph.

Critics gave the Sonata a varied reception. One should remember that in 1836 Schumann had not yet found general recognition. As the dedicatee, Ignaz Moscheles received one of the first copies and, in his letter of thanks, openly expressed that the work was not suitable for a merely superficial audition and could only be understood by those "who are knowledgeable in the loftier language of the heroes of Art." Concerning the title, he objected that the work "did not fulfil the requirements of a concerto, though it possesses the characteristic attributes of a grand sonata." And as to the many dissonances, he wrote: "The suspensions, whose resolutions may only occur 2 or 3 measures later, are often harsh, though justified. In order not to be disturbed or offended by them, one must be an experienced musician who can appraise the situation beforehand and wait to see how all the contradictions will be resolved." Schumann published the letter in his *NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK* (24 February 1837) and, in closing, added the following short comment: "So be it. Florestan and Euseb [the personifications of Schumann's double nature invented by the composer], make yourselves worthy of such a benevolent judgment by continuing in the future to be as demanding on yourselves as you are at times on others."

A revised edition of op. 14 was published in 1853 by Julius Schuberth in Hamburg. It carried the title *Grande Sonate*, but now included only the second Scherzo. (The reasons leading to this new edition may be found in the corresponding commentary in the *Preface* for the op. 13 *Symphonische Etüden*.) Schuberth had tried to buy the op. 13, 16 and 39 from Haslinger, but was successful only in the case of the *Symphonische Etüden* op. 13. He seems to have been unaware of opus 14 at first, and it was perhaps Schumann himself who drew his attention to it. In any event, Schuberth wrote to Schumann on 19 May 1850: "The concert sans orchestre is now my property and I am enclosing it here for correction. Are you inclined to write a Scherzo for it? You have already laid down the title as 3^{te} Sonate."

This passage is interesting from two points of view: On the one hand it shows that Schumann had clearly intended from the start to release the piece again, now under the title *Sonate*. Perhaps he really had taken to heart the above-noted objection of the dedicatee Ignaz Moscheles. On the other hand it was not Schumann's own idea to reinsert the Scherzo II of the original version into the new edition of the work, but a suggestion from an outside source.

Schumann's "Briefbuch" (correspondence book) contains the following entry for 25 October 1850: "Schuberth / Hamburg / he can have the violoncello pieces [op. 102] for 18 Ld'or, the Scherzo to the Concerto for 3 Ld'or." It is not entirely clear whether one can conclude from this that Schumann had already sent the piece to the publisher by then. In any event, he did not send the complete work to Hamburg until 13 June 1852. The delay was most likely due to business problems that plagued the publisher and caused the postponement of honorarium payments to Schumann over a long period.

Schuberth presumably based his edition on a corrected copy of the Haslinger edition of 1836, in which extra sheets had been inserted. This is at least suggested by a number of errors common to

the two editions. As to the newly added Scherzo, Schumann must have had a new manuscript made. On 5 June 1853 – thus almost exactly one year after he had sent the engraver's copy to the publisher – that Schumann sent a letter "with corrections to op. 14" to Hamburg. The Sonata was finally published in July. Just as with the other, previously published revisions, the new edition of the Sonata op. 14 was not noticed by contemporary music critics. Schumann seems to have held it in high esteem, for when Johannes Brahms visited him in September/October in Düsseldorf, he had Clara play his f-minor Sonata to him (entry of 8 October 1853 in the *Haushaltbuch*).

The most visible new feature of the revision in comparison with the edition of 1836 is, of course, the insertion of the Scherzo. It is not by chance that Schumann chose the Scherzo II, which, judging from its various names in the autograph (*Scherzo 2^o. Promenade [...] Intermezzo*), was first conceived as a kind of interlude. After all, this piece begins by echoing Clara's theme, but plays a very significant role in the entire Sonata (see above). Schumann made many major corrections to the first movement; amazingly, he even restored the original text of the autograph at several points. The changes are minor in the third and fourth movements, although the contrary impression initially arises through the rewriting of the 6/16 metre in 2/4 time in the Finale.

In comparison with most of the other above-mentioned five works that Schumann caused to be reprinted in revised editions between 1849 and 1853, opus 14 was subjected to particularly extensive changes. G. Henle Verlag has thus decided to reproduce both versions, the *Concert sans Orchestre* and the *Grande Sonate*, in their entirety. The parts of the autograph left unpublished during Schumann's lifetime – the original first Scherzo and two discarded Variations from the *Andantino de Clara Wieck* – are reproduced in the appendix to this edition. The Scherzo was first edited by Johannes Brahms along with the original finale of the g-minor Sonata op. 22

and issued in 1866 by the Swiss publisher Rieter-Biedermann. The two variations were first published in 1983 by G. Henle Verlag in the appendix to the predecessor of this present edition.

Kinderszenen op. 15

The first weeks of the year 1838 were a positive and very creative period for Schumann. "Whiled away the time until Friday in dreams, work, happiness and composition," he noted in his diary for 9/10 February 1838. Even the escalating controversy over his engagement to Clara Wieck could not dampen his creative spirits. On the contrary, the situation actually seemed to inspire him, and new works flowed from his pen. He wrote the *Novelletten* op. 21 and "about 30 sweet little things," from which he "selected twelve and called them 'Kinderszenen'," as he wrote to Clara on 17 March. Some of the other pieces may later have found their way into the *Bunte Blätter* op. 99 and the *Albumblätter* op. 124. Entries appear in his diary throughout February and March concerning the new pieces: "In the evening a few sweet little children's scenes" (17 February), "composed a little thing called 'Träumerei'" (24 February), "during the evening, another 'Kinderszene' in F major [probably *Am Camin*]" (25 February), "Oh, I wrote a few things here and there, and a delightful 'Glückes genug' and a Polonaise for the *Novelletten*" (11 March).

It seems curious that Schumann mentions only twelve pieces in the above-quoted letter to Clara. It is impossible to determine whether the still-missing 13th piece was written afterwards or simply "selected" later from already existing pieces. In any event, Schumann sent a manuscript to the publisher Breitkopf & Härtel only four days later: "I recommend the enclosed Kinderszenen to your kind attention. They were intended to form the appendix to the *Novelletten*, but I think it would be better if they appeared in a separate volume." Composer and publisher quickly agreed on the honorarium of three Louis d'or and Schumann expressed his desire

for an "expeditious engraving and printing."

For reasons that cannot be determined, considerable delays befell the printing of the work, in spite of Schumann's wish. On 15 April 1838 the composer was still intimating to Clara that "the 'Kinderszenen' will no doubt be finished by the time you arrive [on 15 May]," and in August he wrote to the author and folksong collector Anton Wilhelm von Zuccalmaglio that he would be "finding his name along with mine on 'Kinderszenen', which will be appearing shortly." We do not know why the dedication announced here was not carried through; the *Kinderszenen* were published without a dedication. Although Schumann wrote to Breitkopf from Vienna on 19 December 1838 requesting "a revision of the Kinderszenen," and wrote again on 6 January 1839 in order "to speed up the printing of my works" (entries nos. 467 and 482 in the "Briefbuch"), he evidently did not obtain his first printed copies until late February 1839.

When, in March 1839, Schumann was finally able to send Clara a copy of the first edition, the new work moved her – as she wrote him on 21/22 March – "to a state of true delight. [...] It's true, isn't it, that they belong only to the two of us? I simply can't put them out of my mind, they are so simple, so heart-warming, so very 'you'." – Also of great interest is Franz Liszt's reaction. Schumann was engaged in an active correspondence with Liszt at that time and on 19 March had asked the Viennese publisher Haslinger to send Liszt a copy of the first edition. Liszt replied (in French) on 5 June 1839: "As to the Kinderszenen, I owe you one of the most invigorating joys of my life. You know, or perhaps you do not know, that I have a three-year-old daughter, about whom the entire world concurs that she can be nothing but an angel [...] Eh bien! My dear Monsieur Schumann, I play the Kinderszenen to her in the evening two or three times a week; she is utterly delighted – and myself even more so, as you can imagine – when I repeat the first reprise twenty times for her, with-

out proceeding any further. Truly, I believe you would be most satisfied with this success if you were here to see it." Liszt's reaction is interesting from several points of view: it stands as an example of the generally positive reception of the new work, and also raises the question that still attaches to the *Kinderszenen* to this day: were they written for children or adults?

Schumann himself was not consistent in this matter. In a letter to Joseph Fischhof of 3 April 1839, for instance, he said that "the Kinderszenen are very easy for children." He had also expressed his wish to the publisher for a "pretty" design for the volume, and in November 1853 requested a copy "for my children, who would like to play them." Conversely, in a letter of 6 October 1848 to Carl Reinecke he expressly drew his correspondent's attention to the fundamental difference between the *Kinderszenen* and the *Album für die Jugend* op. 68: "They are reminiscences by a grown-up for grown-ups, while the Christmas Album [the original title of op. 68] rather contains make-believe, presentiments and future states of mind for those who are still young." Also significant is Schumann's comment on a review of the *Kinderszenen* by the famous critic Ludwig Rellstab which appeared in the journal *IRIS IM GEBIETE DER TONKUNST* on 9 August 1839. Schumann's words appear in a letter of 5 September 1839 to his old teacher Heinrich Dorn: "I have never seen anything more inept and small-minded than what Rellstab wrote about my Kinderszenen. He seems to think I sit a screaming child in front of me and look for the matching notes. But it is just the opposite! Yet I cannot deny that I had more than one child in my mind while composing. Of course the titles were added later, and are nothing more than subtle hints for the interpretation and comprehension."

Kreisleriana op. 16

On 15 March 1839, Schumann sent a letter from Vienna to his Belgo-Luxembourgian admirer Simonin de Sire in Dinant. In it, he spoke of his most recent compositions – the *Kinderszenen*, the

Fantasie op. 17, *Arabeske*, *Blumenstück*, *Humoreske*, and *Kreisleriana*: "Of these I love 'Kreisleriana' the most. Only Germans will be able to understand the title. Kreisler is a figure created by E. T. A. Hoffmann, an eccentric, untamed, witty Kapellmeister. There are many things about him that you will like. In other works of mine, the titles never come to me until after I have finished the composition."

In other words, Schumann had the title *Kreisleriana* in mind for this opus from the outset. He deliberately set out to translate Hoffmann's figure into music or, in a manner of speaking, to project himself as a composer into Kreisler's personality. He borrowed the title from E. T. A. Hoffmann's collection *Phantasiestücke in Callots Manier* (Fantasy Pieces in the Manner of Callot), the two main sections of which are given over to the *Kreisleriana*. Hoffmann's collection, which appeared in print in 1814–15, combined new tales and essays with several earlier publications. As in all his writings, music plays a large role in the *Phantasiestücke* (Hoffmann himself was a composer). The collection opens with the famous story of Hoffmann's dream-like encounter with *Ritter Gluck*. It is followed immediately by the first section of *Kreisleriana*, a series of tales taken from the life of Kapellmeister Johannes Kreisler, and by such some purely music-theoretical essays such as that on *Beethovens Instrumental-Musik*. This first section of *Kreisleriana* is then followed by Hoffmann's famous tale, *Don Juan*. The fictitious character of Kapellmeister Kreisler also crops up elsewhere in Hoffmann's oeuvre. Time and again, the stories turn on the fulfilment of true artistry in the teeth of the everyday world, which drives Kreisler, in his ceaseless quest, to the brink of madness.

The fantastic, sometimes scurrilous, always seemingly improvised pieces in Schumann's *Kreisleriana* sound like direct echoes of Hoffmann's notion of romantic artistry, a phenomenon then generally thought to be personified in the figure of Kreisler: "He is veritably permeated by a divine force; and surrendering with childlike piety to what-

ever the spirit happens to stir up within him, he is able to speak the language of the uncharted romantic realm of the spirit; and he unconsciously summons forth [...] all these splendid phenomena from his innermost being, that they might fly through life in radiant round-dances and instill an insatiable and unnameable longing in everyone capable of seeing them." (Thus a quote from the second chapter of *Kreisleriana*, which bears the title "Ombra adorata.")

Schumann's *Kreisleriana* were apparently composed in two parts. On 14 April 1838 he wrote to Clara: "You are turning me into a chatterbox and an eighteen-year-old fanatic – I don't know what all is to become of me. But Clara, this music in me now, and these beautiful melodies all the time – just think, I've finished another entire volume of new pieces since my last letter [19 March]. I want to call it 'Kreisleriana'. In it, you and an idea of you will play the main role, and I wish to dedicate it to you – yes, to you and to no-one else. – You will smile so sweetly when you recognise yourself in it." Schumann cannot have been referring to all eight of the pieces, however, for less than two weeks later, on 27 April, we find him writing in his diary: "Composed a Presto for the album of Madame Serre, the major's wife, in Dresden." As the major's wife made a copy of this leaf from her album, and as that copy has survived, we know that this *Presto* was none other than a first draft of No. 1. (We were able to consult this copy for the purposes of our edition.) Another week later, on 3 May, Schumann confided to his diary: "Spent three wonderful spring days awaiting a letter [from Clara] – and then turned out the *Kreisleriana* in four days – completely new worlds open up – [...] Composed in white heat a *Kreislerstück* in g minor and 6/8 meter with a d-minor trio." This was probably piece no. 8.

The eight pieces of *Kreisleriana* thus apparently originated in two stages, the first between 19 March and 13 April, and the second between the end of April and the first days of May. Nor is it likely that they were written in the order in which Schumann placed them in the first edi-

tion, although No. 8 was probably composed last.

As early as 8 May Schumann turned to a Viennese acquaintance, Joseph Fischhof, with a request to help him find a publisher for the new work: "The title is *Kreisleriana* / Fantasies for Pianoforte / Dedicated to Mlle. Clara Wieck / Op. – [...] My fee is the same as for the *Études symphoniques* [also published by Haslinger]. – The print should be finished by Michaelmas [29 September] (this is a primary stipulation, for I would otherwise prefer to give it to Breitkopf, who also pays more)." In the event, he sent the engraver's copy to Vienna on 26 May. He also had the dedication changed in a letter of 6 July: Clara herself had asked him to do so, fearing that a dedication to her would only worsen her already strained relations with her father. Schumann returned the corrected proofs to the publisher on 23 July, and the work duly appeared in print in early September.

A revised version of the op. 16 appeared from Friedrich Whistling in Leipzig in August 1850. (On the reasons that led to this new edition, see the explanatory text in the *Preface* to the op. 13 *Symphonische Étüden*). Whistling had acquired the *Kreisleriana* and the op. 39 Eichen-dorff Lieder from their original publisher, Haslinger, in 1849; he informed Schumann of the new arrangement on 25 August 1849 and asked whether "there was anything he wished to change" for a forthcoming new edition. On 2 September Schumann announced that he would send him a corrected copy of the print, which, however, was not posted until late November. In his cover letter of 20 November he wrote: "The *Kreisleriana* have been heavily revised. In my earlier days, unfortunately, I very often spoiled my pieces in an entirely wilful manner. All of this has now been expunged." Schumann's changes, notwithstanding the remarks in his letter, remained within reasonable bounds: the endings of Nos. 4 and 5 were slightly altered, 20 measures were added to a passage in No. 2, and another eight were cut from the same piece. Perhaps the

most striking change is his frequent deletion of *ritardando* marks. Schumann's belief that he often wilfully spoiled his earlier pieces may well have related precisely to these many changes of tempo, which he obviously no longer cared for.

It is this revised Whistling version that is reproduced in the main body of our urtext edition. The most significant textual discrepancies in the Haslinger print are reported in footnotes.

*

Information on the sources and readings may be found in the *Comments* at the end of the present edition.

The editor and publisher thank all libraries mentioned in the *Comments* for kindly putting the source material at their disposal.

Berlin, autumn 2009
Ernst Herttrich

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)

第三卷

前言	VII
Preface	XIII

交响练习曲十二首

XII Études Symphoniques
Op. 13 (1837)

主题 · Thème	1
练习曲一 · Étude I	2
练习曲二 · Étude II	3
练习曲三 · Étude III	5
练习曲四 · Étude IV	7
练习曲五 · Étude V	8
练习曲六 · Étude VI	10
练习曲七 · Étude VII	12
练习曲八 · Étude VIII	14
练习曲九 · Étude IX	16
练习曲十 · Étude X	18
练习曲十一 · Étude XI	20
练习曲十二 · Étude XII	23

附录

Appendix

变奏一 · Variation I	34
变奏二 · Variation II	36
变奏三 · Variation III	40
变奏四 · Variation IV	42
变奏五 · Variation V	44
亲笔手稿中的未完成变奏 · Unfinished Variation from the Autograph	46

变奏曲形式的练习曲

Études en forme de Variations
Op. 13 (1852)

主题 · Thema	49
------------------	----