

SCHUMANN



舒曼 钢琴作品全集

第二卷

Complete Piano Works

Volume II

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

4J0571

Robert Schumann

罗伯特·舒曼

钢琴作品全集第二卷

Complete Piano Works Volume II

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 (Op.9, 11)

克劳斯·席尔德

Klaus Schilde (Op.8, 10)

瓦尔瑟·兰珀

Walther Lampe (Op.12)

上海市第四期教育高地建设项目 (编号: 21023D1)

翻译：张奕明



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 第二卷 / 恩斯特·赫特里希编; 汉斯-马丁·特奥波德等指法编注; 张奕明翻译 - 上海: 上海音乐出版社,

2014.9

ISBN 978-7-5523-0636-1

I. 舒… II. ①恩… ②汉… ③张… 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 192591 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 第二卷

编 者: 恩斯特·赫特里希

指法编注: 汉斯-马丁·特奥波德 等

翻 译: 张奕明

出 品 人: 费维耀

项目负责: 秦展闻

责任编辑: 秦展闻

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: 30.5 插页: 4 谱、文: 244 面

2014 年 9 月第 1 版 2014 年 9 月第 1 次印刷

印数: 1—3,000 册

ISBN 978-7-5523-0636-1/J·0571

定价: 86.00 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个作品,按作品编号升序排列(两首无编号的作品位于第六卷的最后)。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。

第二卷收录了Op. 8~12。这些作品创作于1833至1837年末,并于1834至1838年出版。

快板 Op. 8

舒曼早期热衷于键盘作品的古典曲式,着重研究奏鸣曲式这一维也纳古典主义时期的主要结构形式,之后他的兴趣又转移到了更古老一些的变奏曲式(在Op. 1、5、6和Op. 13中使用)。除了Op. 11、14和Op. 22这三首钢琴奏鸣曲以及《幻想曲》(Fantasie, Op. 17, 原标题为“Sonata for Beethoven”——献给贝多芬的奏鸣曲)之外,这首《快板》同样也是由呈示部、展开部和再现部组成的古典奏鸣曲式作品。这些作品均是舒曼早期钟爱奏鸣曲式并为之作出努力的见证。

关于《快板》的创作日期,出自舒曼本人的各种手稿目录均显示为1831年,其中“1843年作品目录”(Compositionsverzeichnis bis 1843)给出了更精确的信息——“写于年底”。这与在《习作簿5》(Studienbuch V)的早期草稿中发现的题献信息吻合:Sonate dédiée à Moscheles, Decembre

26/31(献给莫舍勒斯的奏鸣曲,1831年12月26日)。《习作簿5》中记录了作品的开头50小节以及第186小节至结尾,篇幅为5页。尽管后来作为Op. 8单独出版,但“快板”这一标题原为题献给伊格纳茨·莫舍勒斯(Ignaz Moscheles)的奏鸣曲第一乐章的。日记以及通信等史料则揭示舒曼曾创作奏鸣曲的其他乐章。1832年1月5日的日记记载:“我对奏鸣曲感到很欣慰。最后一个乐章还未写成,但我感到迷惑,像是病了。”不久后他又告知克拉拉·维克(Clara Wieck)“《B小调奏鸣曲》(Sonata in b minor)与《蝴蝶》(Papillons)均已写完。”——可见1月5日还未写完的末乐章此时也已完成。然而,他似乎对作品并不满意。接下来的一年,无论是在与克拉拉的通信还是其他史料中,这首奏鸣曲都了无痕迹。然而我们几乎可以肯定他还在不断地修改这部作品。最后只有第一乐章保留了下来,看来他应该是毁掉了其余部分的手稿。1833年1月29日,他将这个残存的第一乐章提供给莱比锡的乐谱出版商弗里德里希·霍夫迈斯特(Friedrich Hofmeister),命名为“Allegro di Bravura”(华丽的快板)。舒曼在1833年4月5日给托肯(Töpken)的信中宣称:“Allegro di Bravura”将在复活节前后出版,精确的日期之后告知。然而事情却并不顺利。事实上,这部作品从未找到合适的出版商,而是与早先的《大卫同盟舞曲》(Davidsbündlertänze, Op. 6)一样,由书商罗伯特·弗里泽(Robert Frieze)发表。其准确的出版日期难以确定,因为不同底本中的信息互相矛盾。有一份提供给亨丽埃特·福格特(Henriette Voigt, 舒曼的赞助者和保护人)的副本,为她的26岁生日庆生。上面有舒曼与当时的未婚妻艾妮斯汀·冯·弗里肯(Ernestine

von Fricken)的亲笔题献,落款日期是1834年11月20日。奇怪的是,就在那一天,舒曼联系了弗里肯男爵(Baron von Fricken),询问关于如何体面地在封面上写题献等问题。12月14日,舒曼联系了在维也纳的朋友约瑟夫·菲施霍夫(Josef Fischhof),声明这个作品马上会出炉。也许题献的副本是给亨丽埃特·福格特先睹为快的。因此,我们可以认为这一作品的出版日期大致为1834、1835年之交。

作曲家以及艾妮斯汀·冯·弗里肯(Op. 8的真正题献对象)将这一题献副本送给了亨丽埃特·福格特,以感谢后者多年来对他们二人一贯的支持和帮助。该作品的早期草稿显示题献对象为伊格纳茨·莫舍勒斯,其实舒曼在1834年1月给母亲的家信中曾透露将其题献给他早年在茨威考(Zwickau)的老师约翰·戈特弗里德·孔曲(Johann Gottfried Kuntsch)的想法。最终艾妮斯汀·冯·弗里肯成了题献对象,多少是有将作品作为订婚礼物的涵义,因为之前她父亲刚刚同意了这门婚事。尽管一年后婚约取消,艾妮斯汀对该作品以及作曲家的态度仍然是正面和积极的。正如她父亲1842年秋致信舒曼时所称:女儿经常“带着非常特别的感情”演奏《快板》这一题献给她的作品。

尽管书商罗伯特·弗里泽出版了《快板》(Op. 8),但这对该作品获得人们的认可并无助益。它的命运与《大卫同盟舞曲》(Op. 6)一样,长期遭受冷遇。更有甚者,它还遭到了路德维希·莱尔斯塔勃(Ludwig Rellstab)的尖刻批评。莱尔斯塔勃在杂志《音乐使者伊里斯》(Iris im Gebiete der Tonkunst, 1836年3月4日,第八卷,第10篇,第40页)上撰文,声称他“找不到任何平稳展开的

旋律或者和声,到处都是令人困惑的音型、不协和音及乐段,让听者难以忍受。”另一则于一年前出现在维也纳的杂志《大众音乐指南》(*Allgemeiner Musikalischer Anzeiger*, 1835年,第七卷,第39篇,第154页)上的文章则持更为肯定的态度,然而舒曼自己稍后亦开始持反面的态度。他在自己乐谱副本的最后写道:“这是奏鸣曲的首乐章,我不该将其出版。”令人称奇的是,克拉拉迅速将该作品加入了她的曲目单,并在莱比锡音乐厅(*Gewandhaus*)(1841年3月31日)及其他场所表演。然而,莱尔斯塔勃刻薄的态度,以及缺乏大出版商的支持,还是影响了该作品当时的前途,尽管最终是光明的。1850年末至1853年,舒曼修订出版了五首早期钢琴作品(*Op. 5*、*6*、*13*、*14*、*16*),但他显然忽略了*Op. 8*,尽管出版商舒伯茨(*Schubert*)曾询问过此事。舒曼最终授予后者对该作品的处置权,但仍然没有像对待前述五部作品那样重新修订。直到1863年,新版*Op. 8*才由舒伯茨出版。与初版相比,这一新版本中仅有少量修改。

本卷最后的评注部分提供了弗里泽于1842年推出的重印版信息,以及1863年舒伯茨过世后问世的新版中的改动。

狂欢节 *Op. 9*

《狂欢节》(*Op. 9*)如今是演奏频率最高的舒曼钢琴作品之一,然而现在的听众们也许难以注意到,这部技巧极为艰深、感染力极强的作品见

证了一段最终被放弃的爱情,同时揭示了之前一段爱情的复生^①。1834年4月,舒曼在他老师家遇到了当时未满18岁的艾妮斯汀·冯·弗里肯。舒曼立即疯狂地爱上了她,9月甚至与其秘密订婚,并拜访了新未婚妻的家乡——波西米亚(*Bohemia*)的阿什(*Asch*)小镇。经由另一好友亨丽埃特·福格特^②之手,舒曼给弗里肯小姐寄了一封信,写道:“我发现小镇的名字*Asch*^③非常有音乐性。这四个字母还出现在了我的姓中,更为神奇的是,这是其中仅有的四个与音乐相关的字母!”他在给亨丽埃特·福格特的信中也提到了这四个字母*a¹-eb²-c²-b¹*(即德式记谱法中的*A-Es-C-H*):“这个动机听上去很悲伤。我正激情满满地进行创作,就不多写了,请原谅!”舒曼在回忆1833~1837年往事的日记中写道:“1835年1月,我继续创作狂欢节,这一作品我从1834年12月开始写,当时是在茨威考。在冬天的那几个月(1834~1835),我将乐谱誊清了。”在《狂欢节》中,我们可以发现许多早期作品的影子,比如“前奏”(Préambule)中,有他未出版的《渴望的圆舞曲(*Sehnsuchtswalzer*)主题变奏曲》的开头。毫无疑问,舒曼为这部作品创作的音乐要多于最后定稿的22段。其中部分段落的动机*ab-c-b*(*As-C-H*)或*a-ab-c-b*(*A-Es-C-H*)还出现在了他之后的作品中,比如《彩色的叶子》(*Bunte Blätter*, *Op. 99*)的第6首以及《纪念册页》(*Albumblätter*, *Op. 124*)的第4、11和第17首——这些小品都

有动机——便为狂欢节之“遗珠”。根据《狂欢节》初版之副标题“*Scènes mignonnes sur quatre notes*”(“四个音符”小品集)所示,全曲构建于此四音动机之上,唯有首尾两段例外。

尾段的标题“*Marche des 'David-sbündler' contre les Philistins*”(大卫同盟进攻腓力斯人进行曲)揭示了这部多维复杂作品的另一个重要“维度”——舒曼的“大卫同盟”。这个虚构“同盟”的主要信息,我们已经在第一卷(内有《大卫同盟舞曲》)的前言中介绍过了。狂欢节中的很多小品即以该“同盟”中的人物为标题,比如优西比乌斯(*Eusebius*)和弗洛雷斯坦(*Florestan*)代表舒曼本人的双重性格;齐娅琳娜(*Chiarina*)就是克拉拉;埃斯特莱拉(*Estrella*)即艾妮斯汀·冯·弗里肯。其他标题中的人名来源于即兴喜剧(*commedia dell' arte*)^④。为了便于理解,乐谱最后的“评注”中给出了关于这些人物的简单介绍。

令人不解的是,舒曼一开始并不热衷于出版这部作品。原因之一也许是他与本曲隐含的主人公艾妮斯汀·冯·弗里肯的关系于1835年间逐渐冷淡。同时,他越来越无法忽视自己对于逐渐长成的克拉拉的感情。因此,舒曼直到1835年12月22日才联系了Breitkopf&Härtel出版社,然而后者似乎对这部新作品兴趣不大,因为舒曼在1836年4月将乐谱交给了莱比锡的出版商弗里德里希·基斯特纳(*Friedrich Kistner*)。7月3日,他给基斯特纳寄去了用于刻版的副本,但不知为何,最终出版

① 前者指作曲家与艾妮斯汀·冯·弗里肯,后者指与克拉拉·维克。——译者注

② 钢琴家,亦为舒曼的红颜知己之一。——译者注

③ *Asch* = *ab-c-b*。——译者注

④ 意大利的即兴喜剧 *commedia dell' arte* 又称“假面喜剧”,是16世纪下半叶至18世纪下半叶在意大利出现的一种独特喜剧形式。由于其源于民间,紧贴生活,简单易懂,故一度极为流行,影响深远。在这种戏剧中,主要的角色是“定型”的(可以类比中国传统戏曲中的曹操、李逵等)——这些带着面具上场的角色(面具的功能类似于京剧的脸谱)各有各的极端性格。夸张的姿态与诙谐的语言则是共有的特征。然而每一次演出却是不同的。那是因为演员是根据故事大纲(幕表)进行即兴创作,因此具有极强的现场感和生命力。舒曼狂欢节中的很多人名即取材于这些“脸谱化”的角色。——译者注

商和作曲家并未达成出版协议,尽管相关广告已经发布。10月间,舒曼又将出版一事交付给维也纳的出版商哈斯林格(Haslinger)。就在这时,Breitkopf&Härtel出版社同意出版该作品。舒曼闻讯后应该立即寄出了用于刻版的副本,因为次年5月31日,他向Breitkopf&Härtel出版社讨回了乐谱以便“再做一些删改”。自此之后,诸事顺利。6月2日,他寄回了删改后的副本;7月19日,他收到一份校样;8月,乐谱正式出版。这部作品的题献对象为波兰小提琴家、作曲家卡罗尔·约瑟夫·利平斯基(Karol Józef Lipiński)。他于1836~1839年间一直活跃在欧洲舞台上,在莱比锡巡演时曾遇到过舒曼。

根据Breitkopf版乐谱书名页上的信息,此作品还有一个法语版本,出版商为巴黎的莫里斯·施莱辛格(Maurice Schlesinger)。法语版极为重要,因为它与Breitkopf版非同出一源,包含着一些有趣的差异。舒曼曾于1836年6月11日遇到过这位在德国出生的巴黎出版商,将《狂欢节》交给他是为了其名下《音乐公报》(*Gazette Musicale*)^①的增刊。根据施莱辛格的要求,法语版删除了几首小品,又改动了一些小品的标题。1837年7月,法语版问世,早于Breitkopf版。《狂欢节》在德法两国的遭遇也有所不同:在德国,它是渐渐为人们所接受;而在法国,它一开始就受到了人们的喜爱。弗朗茨·李斯特(Franz Liszt)就是其中之一。在1857年1月9日给舒曼传记作者瓦西耶列夫斯基(W.J.von Wasielewski)的信中,李斯特称这部作品“可以获得与

贝多芬《迪亚贝利变奏曲》一样高的公众认知度。而且在我看来,《狂欢节》比《迪亚贝利变奏曲》的地位还要高,因为它拥有后者所没有的旋律原创性以及简洁性。”1840年3月30日,李斯特在莱比锡音乐厅的独奏会上演奏了此作品,然而他只演奏了22首小品中的10首(此举得到了舒曼的同意)。独奏会的评论出现在《新音乐杂志》(*Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*)^②中,执笔者正是舒曼本人。他写道:“容我就这部作品说几句。它的诞生纯属偶然。我的一个乐友曾经住过一个小镇,其名称中的每个字母恰好都可以转换成音符名……因此这是一个老掉牙的文字游戏了,老巴赫也玩过同样的把戏(B-A-C-H这四个字母在德式记谱法中代表B♭-A-C-B四个音符)。这些小品我很快就完成了……之后我为每首都添加了标题,并把整部作品称为‘狂欢节’。尽管其中诸多内容会让不同的人都感到有趣,但是整体而言,音乐的情绪变化太快太频繁,以至于大部分观众无法接受,毕竟没有人愿意每分钟都被吓一跳。这一点,我的朋友^③并没有考虑到。尽管他的演奏活力四射,感染力极强,可能获得了个别观众的喜爱,但未能引起大部分人的兴趣。”

克拉拉·舒曼经常在私人独奏会中演奏这部作品,或是其中几首小品,但首次公开演奏是在1856年维也纳的独奏会上。在1881年1月4日给一位女性朋友的法语信中,她写道:“至于你问到的关于《狂欢节》的问题,当我丈夫的音乐还不那么有名的时候,我的确会省略《优西比乌斯》《弗洛雷斯坦》《娇艳女子》(Coquette)

以及《表白》(Réplique)这四首小品(她其实还省略了《埃斯特莱拉》)。我不想过分地挑战听众的耐心。不过如今,这样的删减就没有必要了。我总是演奏整部作品。”由此可见,《狂欢节》的地位此时已经不可动摇。

帕格尼尼练习曲 Op. 10

这部作品的创作时间与Op. 3随想曲非常接近。第一卷(包含Op. 3)的前言已经考证了Op. 10的早期创作历史以及背景。

尽管部分乐谱是与Op. 3同时开始初步创作,但Op. 10直到若干年后才成形。前面提过的“作品目录”将1833年定为乐曲的创作时间,但事实上舒曼在之后的几年中仍然继续加工这部作品。他本人对Op. 10的评论(*《新音乐杂志》*第32期,1836年4月19日,第131页始)显示:他在其中改变了对于帕格尼尼原作的处理方式。在本卷“前言”的最后,我们附上了这篇评论的完整版——其中还包括作曲家对每一首练习曲的看法。副标题“de Concert”表明舒曼是想用它在音乐会上公开演奏,而Op. 3则仅私下作为教学训练用曲。为了达成这一设想,Op. 10中的六首练习曲都是舒曼在帕格尼尼原作的基础上进行大幅改编后的成品。而在Op. 3中,唯有第3首的改编幅度较大。关于Op. 3,舒曼在1834年9月给弗里肯上尉的信中直陈自己保留了原帕格尼尼练习曲中很多不适合钢琴演奏的片段,以忠实于原作。但在Op. 10中,他就不那么“忠实”了,在原作的基础上进行了更为自由

① 原为《La Revue musicale》,是巴黎的一本音乐评论的周刊,创刊于1827年。1835年,莫里斯·施莱辛格将其改名为“Revue et gazette musicale”,后改为“Gazette musicale”。施莱辛格还将杂志的范畴从单纯的音乐评论拓宽到诸如文学等各个领域——恰为舒曼兴趣之所在。——译者注

② 《新音乐杂志》由舒曼在25岁时与几位朋友创办,评论时作,宣传思想。舒曼担任主编达10年之久,用不同的笔名撰稿颇多。后来该杂志成为德国最著名的音乐杂志之一。——译者注

③ 指李斯特。——译者注

的改编。应舒曼本人的要求,出版商霍夫迈斯特在《新音乐杂志》上刊登了关于这第二个改编系列作品的通告,其中提到作曲家“对随想曲的处理非常自由、独立,因为他(尽管始终关注帕格尼尼作品的深度和诗意)在原来的‘骨架’上构建更美丽的‘躯体’,且完全去除了小提琴性”。

残存至今的 Op. 10 亲笔手稿为初版乐谱刻版者手中的副本,因此是一份重要的底本。尽管亲笔手稿中每首曲目的标题仍然是“Caprice”(随想曲),但这一术语被他人改为“Etude”(练习曲)。我们凭借这份底本发现并纠正了若干源自刻版者的错误。尽管如此,手稿与印刷本之间仍然存在显著差异,这很可能是由于之后舒曼做了修改。正因如此,初版成为了该作品的主要底本。初版乐谱直到 1835 年 9 月才出现,同样由 Op. 3 (版号 2059) 的出版商发行。在部分副本中,作品号原本是 Œuvre X, 之后紧接 N°2。Op. 10 当时并未受到乐评家的重视,也许是因为他们不想反对舒曼本人在《新音乐杂志》上对这六首改编乐曲的评论,也可能是因为他们仅将 Op. 10 视为 Op. 3 的续篇。

大奏鸣曲(升 F 小调钢琴奏鸣曲) Op. 11

这部作品是舒曼第二次尝试将浪漫主义精神与奏鸣曲式相结合。第一次尝试的成果中仅第一乐章得以保留,并以《快板》(Op. 8) 为名出版(见前文)。舒曼于 1833 年的初夏开始创作 Op. 11, 直到 1836 年才完成。与此同时,他还写了《G 小调奏鸣曲》(Op. 22)。《F 小调奏鸣曲》(Op. 14) 也于 1836 年初开始落笔。

同时期的钢琴奏鸣曲还不得不提《幻想曲》(Op. 17, 原标题为“献给贝多芬的奏鸣曲”), 该作品写于 1836 年秋至 1838 年。

舒曼应该于 1833~1834 年以及 1835 年的最初几个月写完了 Op. 11 的主体部分。然而,出版之前,作曲家又对末乐章做了修改。在他将手稿寄给出版商基斯特纳的时候,他附言表示先给“奏鸣曲的前三乐章,末乐章我还要修改一番,最晚一周后到”。这份稍晚到达的末乐章手稿——另附有两页出自舒曼本人的修改信息——成了如今残存的唯一手稿。前三乐章的手稿遗失。维也纳的音乐之友协会(The Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde) 有两页第一乐章中“活泼的快板”(Allegro vivace) 部分的手写草稿,但并非最终定稿。比如,该部分最开始的五度动机于此未见。这份手稿的日期难以准确判断。首先,其标题为 Fandango^①, 这似乎指向 1832 年,因为其他所有关于舒曼醉心于西班牙舞曲的文献资料均出自那一年。其次,该草稿最后又出现了《托卡塔》(Op. 7) 修正版的片段,而舒曼直到 1833 年才开始创作这一作品。再次,“Fandango”(凡丹戈)这个标题也异乎寻常,因为它是用两拍写成,而非凡丹戈之三拍。舒曼其他现存的凡丹戈均以 6/8 拍写成,因此这首两拍子的作品更显得蹊跷。显然,舒曼当时追求的应该是神似而非形似。这个论点也可通过作曲家的许多日记证实。1832 年 5 月 30 日他记道:“我坐在钢琴旁,脑海中满是凡丹戈的乐思,无法形容的喜悦……当我专心创作《蝴蝶》时,一只漂亮的大蛾子朝我窗前飞来。它离灯很远,因此翅膀并没有被火苗灼伤。多好的兆头! 我将会沉迷于凡丹戈一段时间。天

堂般的乐思,上帝都喜爱的动机。”舒曼的“凡丹戈乐思”也许来源于歌德《威廉·迈斯特的学习时代》(Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre) 第二集第八章中 13 岁的迷娘(Mignon) 向威廉·迈斯特(Wilhelm Meister) 献跳“流行凡丹戈舞”的景象。也可能巧合地来源于时年 13 岁的克拉拉·维克,要知道她与整首《升 F 小调钢琴奏鸣曲》都有许多关联。

许多二次文献(包括 Henle 于 1981 年出版的作品初版中的序言) 反复论证了第一乐章的两个主要动机来源于克拉拉·维克《四首特性曲》(Quatre Pièces caractéristiques, Op. 5) 中的《影像幻想曲: 芭蕾舞的鬼魂》(Scène fantastique · Le Ballet des revenants)。下列两个动机的确出现在了该奏鸣曲“活泼的快板”部分中。



然而事实很可能正相反,是克拉拉借用了舒曼的主题。因为她的《芭蕾舞的鬼魂》应该创作于 1835 年,最早为 1834 年底,那时候舒曼的这首奏鸣曲已经接近完稿。显然他俩早在此时就开始共用并且交换乐思。此外,对于舒曼来说,借用自己以前作品的乐思,或者借用他人的乐思是很正常的,这在当时也是普遍的做法。Op. 11 以“Aria”(咏叹调) 为标题的慢板乐章就借用了舒曼写于 1828 年夏天的歌曲《安娜在这里》

① 凡丹戈(西班牙语: Fandango) 是一种西班牙舞,为弗拉明戈舞的一种,三拍子,速度较快。——译者注

(An Anna), 该歌曲由约翰内斯·勃拉姆斯(Johannes Brahms)在舒曼去世之后首次出版。[《舒曼作品目录》(Schumann Werkverzeichnis), Anh.M2 Nr.7, F大调, 在本乐谱中作为Op. 11的附录出版, 以作比较。]舒曼几乎是一个音一个音地将歌曲改编成钢琴织体。其实该歌曲的一部分早在奏鸣曲第一乐章的引子中就已经出现(奏鸣曲第一乐章第31~36小节与咏叹调乐章的第9~14小节以及第35~40小节相同), 因此引子与慢板乐章建立起了特殊的联系。克拉拉也将这首咏叹调中的素材引用到了自己1835年的作品《钢琴协奏曲》(Op. 7)的慢板乐章中。正是在这一年, 她与舒曼互相表白了爱情——紧挨着舒曼与艾妮斯汀·冯·弗里肯的订婚(后取消)。舒曼曾在1838年2月12日的信中称奏鸣曲是对克拉拉的一次“*cri de cœur*”(心的呼喊)。人们往往认为信中所指的奏鸣曲为Op. 11, 但这是错误的。Op. 14更有可能, 因为舒曼写作这一奏鸣曲的时候, 两人正忍受着被迫分离的煎熬。而Op. 11创作于两人关系紧密之时, 舒曼没有必要表达“心的呼喊”。

1836年6月初,《升F小调钢琴奏鸣曲》出版了。此前舒曼曾试图说服莱比锡的Breitkopf&Härtel出版社以及维也纳的出版商托拜厄斯·哈斯林格(Tobias Haslinger)出版该作, 但未获成功。最后, 弗里德里希·基斯特纳将其出版。在1836年3月19日给出版商的信中, 舒曼放弃了酬金, 只要求获得30份免费的乐谱, 以及“令人印象深刻又不失优雅的书名页; 但是首先, 出版速度要快。因为出于某种原因, 我希望该作品能在6月完成出版”。设计精美的书名页文

字如下: 钢琴奏鸣曲/克拉拉(没有写“维克”的姓!)/弗洛雷斯坦和优西比乌斯献给克拉拉。由于舒曼坚持早日出版, 因此这个版本充满错误。在他的《新音乐杂志》第12期(1836年, 卷五), 他刊登了一个勘误表(Druckfehleranzeige), 列举了20处修正。在这首奏鸣曲的下次印刷中, 这些错误得到了修正, 但更多的错误被发现——主要是添加的连线以及断奏点记号等。茨威考的罗伯特·舒曼故居(Robert Schumann-Haus)保存有首次印刷与二次印刷的作曲家私人副本。这两份资料揭示了一些有趣的事情。在首次印刷私人副本中, 舒曼在末乐章设计了一个供演奏用的删节(见“评注”部分第213小节); 二次印刷私人副本中, 舒曼做了更多的修改——这些修改在第三次印刷的乐谱中得到了实现。1840年6月, 第三次印刷的版本出炉, 其新标题较前两次更为传统: 大奏鸣曲……献给/克拉拉·维克小姐/奥地利皇帝陛下的钢琴演奏者/由/罗伯特·舒曼创作/……新版。

该奏鸣曲所有的手稿均已遗失, 除了上面提到过的两份资料(末乐章的手稿, 以及第一乐章的两页草稿)之外。克拉拉·维克一定拥有完整的手稿, 因为早在该曲出版前, 她就在不同的场合演奏过, 比如1835年9月在门德尔松、肖邦以及伊格纳茨·莫舍勒斯面前。晚些时候, 在舒曼的强烈要求下, 莫舍勒斯在《新音乐杂志》(1836年, 卷五)上写了一份挑剔却又正面的评论: 贝多芬最后饱受忧郁和体力衰退的困扰, 而这首奏鸣曲是在他之后的“真正的浪漫主义信号。浪漫主义被唤醒了, 在我们中间传扬……在所有的浪漫主

义作曲家中, 弗洛雷斯坦^①是最不愿意在纯粹的音乐中故弄玄虚, 玩荒诞不经的把戏的。他对于和声的敏感, 以及他对于音乐素材的处理值得引起注意。”一向热衷于提拔年轻音乐家的李斯特也在巴黎的《音乐公报》(REVUE ET GAZETTE MUSICALE, 1837年11月12日)上发表了热情洋溢的评论。然而, 舒曼看起来还是对这部奏鸣曲处女作感到失望。

奇怪的是, 克拉拉在该作品刚刚创作完的一段时间内经常演奏它, 但之后就将其束之高阁了, 直到1884年才在伦敦的一场独奏会上再次公开演奏这首乐曲。然而, 她显然把该作看得很重要。1841年10月24日, 克拉拉在《婚姻日记II》(Ehetagebuch II)中写道: “今天我们与博迪舍(Bötticher)、希尔施巴赫(Hirschbach, 一个令人难过的天才)以及文策尔(Wenzel)一起吃晚饭。美酒, 音乐。时隔这么多年, 我又一次演奏了《升F小调钢琴奏鸣曲》。崭新的感觉让我很开心! 我认为这是罗伯特最伟大的作品之一。”

幻想曲集 Op. 12

1837年的上半年舒曼并不快乐, 他将其称之为“黑暗时刻”。克拉拉的内心与他有了疏远, 却与作曲家及乐评家卡尔·班克(Carl Banck)^②渐行渐近。与此同时, 舒曼与门德尔松来往颇多, 并专注于研究巴赫。2月至3月期间, 他誊写了整本《赋格的艺术》(Die Kunst der Fuge)。他还对歌德流露出越来越多的兴趣, 而在此之前, 他对其作品只是部分赞赏。1837年5月, 在他的“努力”下, 其竞争对手班克离开了莱比锡。

① 指舒曼。——译者注

② 卡尔·班克(1809~1889), 作曲家, 乐评家。他深受舒伯特的影响, 是1830年前后最著名的艺术歌曲作曲家之一。作为乐评家, 他站在舒曼一边, 并经常为舒曼的《新音乐杂志》撰稿。他还在编辑早期音乐、保留比如斯卡拉蒂(Scarlatti)和马蒂尼(Martini)的音乐方面有所贡献。——译者注

这年春夏,舒曼同时对两位女性态度热忱——女高音威廉明妮·舒罗德-德弗里恩特(Wilhelmine Schuröder-Devrient)以及钢琴家罗贝娜·安·莱德罗(Robena Ann Laidlaw)。舒曼主要是被她们的音乐才能所吸引。莱德罗后来成了《幻想曲集》(Op.12)的题献对象。1837年7月2日,她在莱比锡音乐厅开了一场晨间音乐会,舒曼在场。而在他Op.12的首份完整草稿中,第一首“夜晚”(Des Abends)的创作日期标为“写于1837年7月4日傍晚”,这也许是对他与这位女钢琴家相遇的回忆。至于那次相遇是否激发了整部《幻想曲集》的创作灵感,今日不得而知。无论当时是什么情况,在把乐谱的赠送本寄给莱德罗时,舒曼附言道:“见到你,我留下了愉快而难忘的回忆。如果你浏览我这八首钢琴幻想曲,你会更明白我的话。我不仅请求你的允许,将该曲集题献给你。我还要告诉你,事实上这些音乐属于你。”

《幻想曲集》的最终成稿时间极短,仅为1837年7月4日至19日。一开始被舒曼选择付印的应该不止八首。刻版者手中的原始副本中还包含一首在校对时才被放弃的曲子(参见Op.12的附加作品)。另外一首原本收录于《幻想曲集》的作品为《无尽的悲伤》(Leid ohne Ende),十六年后作为《纪念册页》(Albumblätter, Op.124)的第八首出版。一言以蔽之,《幻想曲集》的灵感来源远远不止作曲家与莱德罗的相遇,必定还包括他与克拉拉的暂时疏远。证据有二,均来自于他与克拉拉的通信。1838

年3月19日,《幻想曲集》刚付印后不久,舒曼在信中写道,对于《最后》(Ende vom Lied)一曲,“一切都最终化为一个愉快的婚礼,但是由你引起的悲痛又回来了,婚礼的钟声与丧钟混成一片。”大约一个月之后的4月21日,他告诉克拉拉他“愉快地发现”《在夜里》(In Der Nacht)一曲讲述了希罗与利安德^①的故事:“这是一则古老而浪漫的传说。演奏此曲时,我无法不想起这样的景象:首先他跳进大海——她呼喊——他回应——他劈波斩浪,安全到达——拥抱——不忍分离又不得不离开——夜幕再次降临……你就是希罗!如果你也坐在灯塔高处,我一定能学会游泳。请告诉我你是不是也觉得这一景象很符合这段音乐。”

舒曼显然在刚写完《幻想曲集》时就试图将其出版。早在1837年7月19日,他就告知Breitkopf&Härtel出版社邮寄一份副本用于刻版。8月7日曲谱按时寄到后,他又请求出版社安排在9月最后一天印出——那天是罗贝娜·安·莱德罗的生日。然而,该作品还是没有能按时付印,出版社收到的供刻版的“手稿”副本太过复杂(“手稿”部分为舒曼亲笔,部分为另一个抄谱员所完成;上面还有许多订正、移位以及交叉引用新添乐段的痕迹),因此出版社不得不雇用另一个抄谱员誊清。当然,新副本还得寄给舒曼校对。由此引发的一系列问题将在曲谱后的评注部分中详细说明。最终,《幻想曲集》完成印刷已经是1838年2月初的事情了。

出版后,该作品立刻引起众人的关注,受到了广泛的欢迎。舒曼的朋友卡尔·克雷根(Carl Krägen)尤其欣喜若狂;作曲家及钢琴家阿道夫·亨泽尔特(Adolph Henselt)甚至早在作品付印之前就在德累斯顿的一场音乐会上演奏了《夜晚》(Des Abends);克拉拉也在1838年3月4日的维也纳音乐会上演奏了其中的几首小品。舒曼一开始建议她演奏《在夜里》(In der Nacht)以及《奇幻的梦境》(Traumes Wirren)。之后他觉得前者太长了,建议用第一首《夜晚》替代。该作品的题献对象罗贝娜·安·莱德罗于1838年11月25日在柏林给作曲家写信道:“你的《幻想曲集》到处都受欢迎!我在但泽(Danzig)与什切青(Szczecin)^②演奏过了,还将在几场晚会上为公主演奏。”弗朗茨·李斯特也注意到了这部作品,于1838年5月初致信舒曼:“你的《狂欢节》与《幻想曲集》以一种特有的魅力将我吸引。我真心喜爱演奏它们。我向上帝保证,能让我这样评价的作品不太多。”(李斯特原信为法语)

*

关于底本及其解读的信息,请参见评注部分。

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

恩斯特·赫特里希
2009年秋于柏林

^① 希罗(Hero)是爱与美之神阿佛罗狄忒(Aphrodite即罗马神话中的维纳斯)的女祭司。利安德(Leander)是某城一少年。两人深深相爱,但他们隔海相望,利安德每个晚上都会泅渡海峡同希罗相会,希罗总是点燃灯塔为爱人照明。但在一个暴风雨之夜,狂风吹灭了灯塔上的灯火,利安德因而淹死。第二天早晨,海浪把利安德的尸体冲到灯塔下,希罗悲痛欲绝,在绝望中投海自尽。——译者注

^② 两者都为波兰地名。——译者注

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 second volume contains opera 8–12, composed between 1833 and the end of 1837 and published between 1834 and 1838.

Allegro op. 8

Schumann early on occupied himself intensively with classical forms of keyboard music, principally with sonata form – the chief genre of the Viennese classical period – and then with the older variation form (used in op. 1, 5, 6, and 13). Besides the three Piano Sonatas op. 11, 14, and 22, and the Fantasia op. 17 – originally entitled *Sonata for Beethoven* – the *Allegro* op. 8 is likewise a classic sonata movement comprising exposition, development, and recapitulation. As such, this early effort bears witness to Schumann's engagement with the genre.

As regards its date of composition, Schumann's various autograph catalogues all give the year 1831. His "Compositionsverzeichnis bis 1843" (Catalog of compositions to 1843) has more precise information, adding "at the end of the year." This accords with the following dedicatory notice found in an early sketch in the "Studienbuch V": "Sonate dédiée à Moscheles, Decembre 26/31." The *Allegro*'s first 50 measures, along with M. 186 ff., are found on five pages of this "Studienbuch V." Though later published singly as op. 8, the *Alle-*

gro was conceived as the opening movement of a sonata dedicated to Ignaz Moscheles. Diary entries and correspondence prove that Schumann penned the other movements as well. In a diary entry dated 5 January 1832 he writes: "I felt blissful with the Sonata – the last movement is not yet written – but I am ailing and confused." A short while later, he reports to Clara Wieck: "Also finished are a Sonata in b minor and a book of Papillons," i. e. he had since completed the Sonata, including the final movement, which had still been lacking on 5 January. Yet he seems to have been dissatisfied with the results. He mentions the work neither in his correspondence with Clara nor in any other source for over a year. It is practically certain that he kept on making new revisions. What ultimately remained was only the first movement; he must have rejected the other sections and destroyed the manuscripts. He offered the first movement as an "Allegro di Bravura" to the Leipzig music publisher Friedrich Hofmeister on 29 January 1833. In a letter of 5 April 1833 he announced to Töpken that: "An Allegro di bravura is coming to the Easter fair – I shall keep you posted on the precise date." Unfortunately, he was unable to make good on this project. The piece actually never found a proper publisher, but was released, like the earlier *Dauidsbündlertänze* op. 6 by the book dealer Robert Friese. It is impossible to determine the exact date of publication, particularly since the sources contain highly contradictory informations: a printed copy offered to Henriette Voigt, Schumann's patron and benefactor, on her 26th birthday contains a dedication signed by himself and his then fiancée Ernestine von Fricken and dated 20 Nov. 1834. Strangely enough, Schumann contacted Baron von Fricken on that very day concerning the formulation of the dedication on the title page. On 14 December Schumann informed his Vienna contact, Josef Fischhof, that the *Allegro* would be coming out "very shortly." Perhaps Schumann had the dedicatory copy for Henriette Voigt separately printed and bound beforehand. We can thus

place the date of publication at the turn of the year 1834/35.

By offering this dedicatory copy to Henriette Voigt, the composer and Ernestine von Fricken, the dedicatee of op. 8, were in a way thanking Voigt for her steadfastly benevolent support of their union. While Ignaz Moscheles was given as the dedicatee in the above-mentioned sketch, Schumann told his mother in January 1834 that he wanted to dedicate the *Allegro* to his old Zwickau teacher Johann Gottfried Kuntsch. The dedication to Ernestine von Fricken can perhaps be seen as a kind of preliminary bridal gift, as her father had just previously agreed to the marriage. Even though the couple broke up the following year, Ernestine maintained a positive opinion both of the composer and of the piece. As her father wrote to Schumann in the autumn of 1842, she always played the *Allegro*, dedicated to her, with a "very special expressiveness."

The fact that the *Allegro* op. 8 was published by Friese did not help its reception. It suffered the same fate as the *Dauidsbündlertänze* op. 6 and remained practically unknown. Moreover, it received a scathing review from Ludwig Rellstab in the journal *IRIS IM GEBIETE DER TONKUNST* (4 March 1836, vol. VIII, no. 10, p. 40). Rellstab claimed that he "[sought] in vain a calmly unfolding melody or a harmony that would remain stable for all of one measure – everywhere nothing but confused combinations of figures, dissonances, passages, in short – torture for us listeners." A more positive review had appeared about a year earlier in the *ALLGEMEINER MUSIKALISCHER ANZEIGER* of Vienna (1835, vol. VII, no. 39, p. 154), but Schumann himself soon came to judge the work negatively. On the end paper of his personal copy he noted: "Was a first sonata movement that I should not have published." Amazingly, Clara soon took this very work into her repertoire and played it at her recital in Leipzig's Gewandhaus on 31 March 1841, as well as on other occasions. Its unfortunate publication by Friese and, probably, Rellstab's withering critique definitely hin-

dered its long-term success. When Schumann published revised versions of his five early piano works op. 5, 6, 13, 14 and 16 in late 1850 and 1853, he significantly omitted op. 8, although the publisher Schubert had expressly asked him about it. Schumann sold him the rights to the work, but refrained from subjecting it to a similar revision to that lavished upon the aforementioned five works. It was not until 1863 that Schubert brought out a *Nouvelle Edition* of op. 8, which has only a few corrections in comparison with the first edition.

The *Comments* at the end of this edition provide information on a new edition published by Friese in 1842, as well as on the changes made in Schubert's posthumous edition.

Carnaval op. 9

Schumann's *Carnaval*, op. 9, is today one of the composer's most frequently played compositions for the piano. Modern listeners will hardly be in a position to notice that these extremely virtuosic and highly effective pieces reflect the story of an ultimately abandoned love affair while intimating the rebirth of a new and yet earlier one. In April 1834 Schumann had met Ernestine von Fricken, then not yet eighteen years old, at the home of his teacher. He promptly fell head over heels in love with her; by September the two young people were even secretly engaged, and Schumann visited his new fiancée in her home town of Asch (Aš) in Bohemia. He then sent a letter to her, by way of Henriette Voigt, in which he described his "discovery that Asch is a very musical name for a town. The same four letters are also found in my name – more than that, they are the only musical letters in it at all." He enclosed a musical quotation for Henriette Voigt herself containing the pitches $a^1\text{--}eb^2\text{--}c^2\text{--}b^1$ ($=A\text{--}Es\text{--}C\text{--}H$ in German letter notation), and added: "It sounds very sorrowful. I'm sitting in the white heat of composing, so please excuse me!" In a retrospective diary entry for the years from 1833 to 1837, Schumann noted that in January 1835 he "continued my work on *Carnaval*,

which had already been started in Zwickau in December 1834 – and wrote it out in fair copy in the winter months [1834–35]." Ideas from earlier pieces found their way into *Carnaval*. For example, the opening of his unpublished variations on the famous *Sehnsuchts-walzer* appeared in *Préambule*. Schumann clearly composed more pieces for this work than the 22 that were printed. Some of them, recognisable from their $ab\text{--}c\text{--}b$ ($As\text{--}C\text{--}H$) or $a\text{--}eb\text{--}c\text{--}b$ ($A\text{--}Es\text{--}C\text{--}H$) motifs, reappeared much later in the collections *Bunte Blätter* op. 99 (no. 6), and *Albumblätter* op. 124 (nos. 4, 11 and 17). As is already intimated in the subtitle of the first edition – *Scènes mignonnes sur quatre notes* (short scenes on four notes) – all of the pieces in *Carnaval* are based on these four pitches, the only exceptions being the *Préambule* at the opening and the *Marche des Davidsbündler* at the end.

The title of the final number points to another important aspect of this multi-layered composition: Schumann's *Davidsbündler* (League of David). The essential information about this fictitious "Davidsbund" appears in the *Preface* to volume I of our complete edition, which includes the *Davidsbündlertänze*. Names of members of the League appear in *Carnaval* as titles of individual pieces. *Eusebius* and *Florestan* represent the two sides of Schumann himself; *Chiarina* is Clara Wieck, and *Estrella* is Ernestine von Fricken. Other titles derive from the *commedia dell'arte*; to aid comprehension, short explanations of each of these characters are provided in the *Comments* at the end of the present volume.

Oddly, Schumann at first showed little interest in seeing *Carnaval* into print. Perhaps one reason was that his relations with Ernestine von Fricken, which had played such an important role in the work's genesis, cooled in the course of 1835 at the same time that he became more aware of his tender feelings toward Clara Wieck, who was gradually maturing into a young woman. It was not until the end of 1835, on 22 December, that

he approached Breitkopf & Härtel, but the publishing house seems to have initially balked at the new work, for in April Schumann offered it to the Leipzig publisher Friedrich Kistner. On 3 July he sent Kistner the engraver's copy: For unknown reasons, and although Kistner had already advertised the work's publication, they ultimately failed to reach an agreement. Schumann then offered *Carnaval* in October 1836 to the Viennese publisher Haslinger. Breitkopf & Härtel now agreed to take it. Schumann must have sent them the engraver's copy by return of post, only to ask for it back on 31 May "as I want to make [...] a few further cuts." Thereafter everything went fairly quickly: he returned the engraver's copy on 2 June, received a set of proofs on 19 July, and could welcome the published volume in August. It is dedicated to the Polish violinist and composer Karel Józef Lipiński, who concertised throughout Europe from 1836 to 1839 and had met Schumann in Leipzig on one of these tours.

The title page of the Breitkopf edition refers to the fact that the work had also been published by Maurice Schlesinger in Paris. This latter edition is important because it was apparently prepared from an independent copy and contains a number of interesting alternative readings. Schumann, who had already met this German-born publisher on 11 June 1836, offered him *Carnaval* as a supplement to his periodical *GAZETTE MUSICALE*. At Schlesinger's request, several pieces were omitted from the French edition while others were retitled. The edition appeared at the end of July 1837, and hence before its German counterpart. While the work only gradually met with acceptance in Germany, it was warmly received in France from the very beginning. One of its first admirers was, once again, Franz Liszt, who, in a letter of 9 January 1857 to Schumann's subsequent biographer W. J. von Wasielewski, referred to *Carnaval* as a work "that will assume its natural place in the public eye alongside Beethoven's 33 Variations on a Waltz by Diabelli, which in my opinion it even surpasses in melodic in-

vention and conciseness.” He placed it on the program of a recital he gave at the Leipzig Gewandhaus on 30 March 1840, when, however, he played only ten of the 22 pieces, with Schumann’s consent. The review of this recital in *NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK* was written by Schumann himself: “Allow me a few words about the composition, which owes its existence to a coincidence. The name of a little town, where a musical acquaintance of mine once lived, consists entirely of letters from the scale [...] There thus arose one of those jeux d’esprit of the sort that have been nothing new ever since Bach used the same ploy [the letters B–A–C–H designate the pitches B \flat –A–C–B in German letter notation]. The pieces were finished in short order [...] Later I gave titles to the pieces and called the collection *Carnaval*. If there are many things in it to please one person or another, the musical moods change too quickly to be followed by a large audience, which does not want to be startled every minute. This, as I said, my dear friend had failed to take into account; and notwithstanding the brilliance and great empathy of his playing, it was perhaps possible to reach this or that individual, but not to raise the entire mass.”

Clara Schumann played the work, or pieces from it, very frequently at her private recitals and performed it in public for the first time at a Vienna recital in 1856. On 4 January 1881 she wrote (in French) to a female pianist friend: “As far as your question about *Carnaval* is concerned, at a time when my husband’s music was not as well-known, I did indeed omit the following four pieces so as not to overly try the patience of the listeners: *Eusebius*, *Florestan*, *Coquette*, and *Réplique* [she also omitted *Estrella*]. But today I believe that an abridgment of this sort is no longer necessary [...] I myself would always play the work in its entirety.” *Carnaval* had found its way.

Paganini Studies op. 10

The op. 10 Études were composed in close proximity to the op. 3 Caprices.

The *Preface* of volume I of this complete edition, which contains op. 3, presents the essential data about the prior history of op. 10, and about the circumstances of its composition.

Although partly drafted at the same time as op. 3, the six Études of op. 10 did not reach their definitive form until some years later. The aforementioned “Compositionsverzeichnis” gives 1833 as their year of origin, but Schumann continued to work on them in the years that followed. His own review of op. 10 for the *NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK* (no. 32, 19 April 1836, pp. 131 f.) reveals that he altered the conception of his arrangements. We reproduce this review, which also comments on each of the six pieces individually, in full following this *Preface*. The words *de Concert* appended to the title already suggest that the new arrangements were intended primarily for public performance, whereas Schumann viewed his op. 3 only as a didactic work for private use. As befits this new conception, all six Études in op. 10 more or less heavily rework Paganini’s original. In op. 3, the same can only be said of no. 3. In September 1834 he told Captain von Fricken that in the Paganini pieces he left “passages that are ineffective on the piano” unchanged in order to “be faithful” to the originals. With the six pieces of op. 10, he distanced himself from this fidelity and proceeded more freely with the source. At Schumann’s wish, the publisher Hofmeister published in the *NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK* an announcement of this second series, in which one reads that the composer “has taken a very free, independent direction in these caprices, in that he – always keeping his eye on the depth and poetry of Paganini – has formed the skeleton into a more beautiful body that completely eschews the violin part.”

The surviving autograph of op. 10 served as the engraver’s copy for the first edition and must therefore be regarded as an important source. While the autograph still refers to each piece as a *Caprice*, this term has been altered to *Etude* in another hand. By consulting the autograph, we have been able to dis-

cover and correct a number of misreadings on the part of the engraver. All the same, the more substantial discrepancies between manuscript and print probably derive from Schumann’s subsequent alterations, so that it is the first edition that ends up having the status of primary source. It did not appear until September 1835, when it was issued by the same publisher as op. 3 (plate number 2059). In some copies the original opus number, *Œuvre X*, is followed by a *Nº 2*. Opus 10 was ignored by the music critics of the time – perhaps because no one wanted to set anything against Schumann’s own review of the six new arrangements in the *NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK*, or perhaps because critics considered this new series only as a sequel to the first.

Piano Sonata in f \sharp minor op. 11

Schumann’s f \sharp -minor Sonata is the second staging post in his efforts to infuse classical sonata form with a new, romantic spirit. Only the first movement of his first attempt remains, and was published as the *Allegro* op. 8 (see above). Work on op. 11 began in early summer 1833, but then dragged on until 1836. He also wrote the g-minor Sonata op. 22 more or less contemporaneously, and seamlessly began work on the f-minor Sonata op. 14 in early 1836. One must also assign to the piano sonatas Schumann’s Fantasia op. 17, which was originally conceived under the title *Sonate für Beethoven*; it was written in the period from autumn 1836 to 1838.

He must thus have carried out the main work on opus 11 in 1833–34 and the first months of 1835. However, shortly before publication, the composer subjected the final movement to a further revision. When he sent the manuscript to the publisher Kistner on 13 April 1836, he wrote that he was initially sending only “the first three movements of the Sonata; the last, to which I want to make some more alterations,” was to follow “in a week at the latest.”

This subsequently dispatched manuscript of the last movement is – along

with two supplementary sheets presumably containing the changes referred to by Schumann – the sole surviving autograph of the final version of opus 11; the manuscript of the first three movements is lost. The Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna has two autograph sheets of the Allegro vivace section of the first movement, but they do not contain the final version; for example, the introductory fifth motif is missing. This manuscript cannot be precisely dated. Its title *Fandango* points to the year 1832, since all other documents testifying to Schumann's interest in this Spanish dance also date from that year. However, at the end of the manuscript there are sketches to the revised version of the Toccata op. 7, which Schumann did not begin until 1833. The title *Fandango* is unusual since the piece is not in the triple meter of a fandango, but in duple meter. Schumann's other fandango sketches – inasmuch as they have survived – are all in (correct) 6/8 time. So why then suddenly one fandango in a (wrong) 2/4 time? Schumann apparently employed the concept more as a poetic metaphor. This is also suggested by a number of diary entries such as the following one of 30 May 1832: "At the piano I was gripped by the idea of the fandango – how incredibly happy I was. [...] And when I began to concentrate on the Papillons, a big, beautiful moth fluttered to the window. It stayed far from the light and did not burn its wings. What a wonderful portent for me. Yet the fandango would not leave my mind for an instant. But it is also a heavenly idea, with god-like figures." Perhaps Schumann's "fandango idea" evoked the image of the 13-year-old Mignon, who danced "the popular fandango" for Wilhelm Meister (in the eighth chapter of the second book of Goethe's *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*). This, incidentally, would also apply to Clara Wieck, who was also 13 years old in 1832–33, and who is connected to the f#-minor Sonata in a number of ways.

In secondary literature (including the preface to the first edition of this work published by G. Henle Verlag in 1981), it has been repeatedly speculated that

Schumann derived the two main motifs of the first movement from a work by Clara Wieck, the *Scène fantastique* · *Le Ballet des revenants* from her *Quatre Pièces caractéristiques* op. 5. Indeed, both the dance-like figure at the beginning of the Allegro vivace section of the Sonata



as well as the contrasting fifth motif



appear in this piece. However, the opposite is probably true: it was Clara who borrowed motifs from Robert. Her *Ballet des revenants* was composed in late 1834 at the earliest, and most likely not until 1835, when the Sonata was already nearing completion. The two were apparently cultivating intense musical exchanges already in this early phase of their relationship. Citations from his own works or from works by other composers are perfectly normal for Schumann, and were common at this time as well. In the slow movement of opus 11, which is significantly titled *Aria*, Schumann recalls his song *An Anna*, written in summer 1828 and first published posthumously by Johannes Brahms (*Schumann Werkverzeichnis*, Anh. M2 Nr. 7, in F major; reproduced in the appendix of opus 11 for purposes of comparison). He transposed the song almost note for note into the piano texture. A quotation from the song is already found in the introduction to the first movement (M. 31–36 of the *Introduzione* are practically identical with M. 9–14 and 35–40 of the *Aria*) and thus links the two movements in a special way. Clara, in turn, quoted from the *Aria* in the slow movement of her Piano Concerto op. 7 of 1835. This was the year in which the pair for the first time confessed their love for each other, fol-

lowing Schumann's interim engagement to Ernestine von Fricken. The oft-reported opinion that his statement (in a letter of 12 February 1838) that the Sonata was "a single *cri de cœur*" for Clara refers to the op. 11, is incorrect. A much more likely candidate is the op. 14 Sonata, which Schumann wrote at a time when the two lovers were separated from each other. Opus 11, on the other hand, was composed at a time of close contact and exchange with Clara, when the connection between the two meant there was no reason at all for such a statement.

The f#-minor Sonata appeared in print at the beginning of June 1836. After unsuccessfully attempting to have it published by Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig and by Tobias Haslinger in Vienna, Schumann finally found a publisher willing to print it, Friedrich Kistner. In his letter to the publisher of 19 March 1836, Schumann waived the honorarium and asked solely for 30 complimentary copies and "a rather striking but graceful title page with many emblems [...] but above all, a rapid production of the edition, as I would like to have it finished in June for a certain reason." The charmingly designed title page reads: *Pianoforte-Sonate. / Clara* [no surname!] *zugeeignet von Florestan und Eusebius* [dedicated to Clara by Florestan and Eusebius]. As a result of Schumann's insistence on having the work published so quickly, the first printing was filled with errors. In no. 12 of his *NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK* (vol. 5, 1836), Schumann published a *Druckfehleranzeige* (list of errata), containing altogether 20 corrections. In the next printing of the Sonata, the errors listed in the supplement were eliminated and a great many other corrections were made (mostly concerning the addition of missing slurs, staccati, etc.). The Robert-Schumann-Haus in Zwickau owns the composer's personal copy of both printings. They contain interesting entries in the composer's hand: in the first, Schumann planned a cut in the closing movement (see comment on M. 213). In the second, there are further emenda-

tions that were carried out in the following printing. This third printing was issued in June 1840 with the following new and more conventional title: *GRANDE SONATE* [...] *dédiée / à Mademoiselle Clara Wieck / Pianiste de S. M. l'Empereur d'Autriche. / par / ROBERT SCHUMANN. / [...] Nouvelle Edition.*

All the manuscripts of the f#-minor Sonata are lost, save for the aforementioned two. Clara Wieck must also have owned a complete manuscript of the work, for she played it on several occasions even before its publication, for example in September 1835 for Mendelssohn, Chopin and Ignaz Moscheles. Later, however, and at Schumann's express wish, Moscheles wrote a review for the *NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK* (vol. 5, 1836) that was critical, but ultimately very positive: Coming after Beethoven, who was plagued in the end by melancholy and decay, this work "is a genuine sign of the romanticism that has been awakened in our day and is spreading around us [...] Among the romantics, Florestan is the one who is the least willing to make an effect at the cost of pure compositional writing through crude dissonances and musical maledictions. His knowledge of harmony and his technical treatment of the material are worthy of attention." Franz Liszt, who promoted young talents throughout his life, also penned a very favourable review in the Paris *REVUE ET GAZETTE MUSICALE* of 12 November 1837. All in all, however, Schumann seems to have been rather disappointed with the reception of his "first-born" Sonata.

Strangely enough, Clara Schumann, who in the period after the work's composition played it so frequently, did not play it in public until 1884, in a London recital. Nevertheless, she apparently thought very highly of the Sonata. In the "Ehetagebuch II" under the date 24 October 1841, she writes: "We had Bötticher, Hirschbach (a sad genius) and Wenzel over for dinner with us on the 24th. There was much drinking and music making; it must have been the first time in years that I played Robert's f#-minor Sonata again – how it delight-

ed me anew! I consider it one of Robert's greatest works."

Fantasiestücke op. 12

The first half of 1837 was not a very happy period in Schumann's life. He himself called it his "darkest hour." Clara was drawing away from him inwardly and forming closer ties with the composer and critic Carl Banck. Schumann in turn strengthened his relations with Mendelssohn and sought distraction above all in a thorough study of Bach, writing out a complete copy of *Die Kunst der Fuge* in February and March. He even took an increasing interest in Goethe, whose writings he had hitherto regarded with some detachment. In May 1837, his rival Banck left Leipzig as the result of an intrigue on Schumann's part.

The composer spent the spring and summer enthusing about two women at once – the soprano Wilhelmine Schröder-Devrient and the pianist Robena Ann Laidlaw – although he was probably attracted primarily by their artistic accomplishments. Laidlaw would later become the dedicatee of the *Fantasiestücke*, op. 12. On 2 July 1837 she gave a matinée recital at the Leipzig Gewandhaus with Schumann in the audience. His first full draft of the opening piece of the op. 12, *Des Abends* (Evening), bears the date "evening of 4 July 1837," probably recalling a meeting with the celebrated pianist. Whether it was this meeting that inspired him to compose the *Fantasiestücke* can, of course, not be determined today. Whatever the case, when sending Laidlaw a presentation copy he wrote: "The time of your stay here will always remain fondly in my memory; and you will discover the truthfulness of these words with still greater clarity in [my] eight fantasy pieces for the pianoforte [...] I have, it is true, not specially asked for permission to dedicate them to you, but they belong to you none the less."

The *Fantasiestücke* ultimately came into being in a very short period of time between 4 and 19 July 1837. Initially there were probably more than the eight

pieces that Schumann selected for publication. The original engraver's copy still contains a piece that he only withdrew during the work's final redaction (it can be found in the appendix to opus 12). Another piece that originally belonged to the *Fantasiestücke* was *Leid ohne Ende* (Sorrow without End), which was only published sixteen years later as no. 8 of the *Albumblätter* op. 124. In short, the genesis of op. 12 reveals a number of aspects that point far beyond Schumann's encounter with Robena Ann Laidlaw and surely relate to his temporary estrangement from Clara. Lively evidence along these lines can be found in two passages from his letters to Clara. On 19 March 1838, shortly after the *Fantasiestücke* had appeared in print, he explained that, in *Ende vom Lied* (End of the Song), "everything ultimately [...] dissolves into a merry wedding – but my distress for you came back at the end, and the wedding bells sound as if commingled with a death knell." Roughly one month later, on 21 April, he told Clara that he had "discovered with delight" that *In der Nacht* (In the Night) recounts the story of Hero and Leander: "It is an old and beautiful romantic legend. When I play *Die Nacht* [*sic*] I can never forget this image: first he plunges into the sea – she cries out – he answers – he swims safely to shore through the waves – now the cantilenas as they embrace – then he must leave but cannot bear to part – until night again enshrouds everything in darkness. – To be sure, I imagine Hero to be exactly like you; and if you were sitting atop a lighthouse I, too, would probably learn how to swim. But tell me whether you too think this image fits the music."

Evidently Schumann set about publishing the *Fantasiestücke* the moment he finished composing them. As early as 19 July 1837, he announced to Breitkopf & Härtel that he would be sending a copy for the engraving. It was duly posted on 7 August, with a request from the composer that the pieces "appear in print on the last day of September" – namely, on Robena Ann Laidlaw's birthday. The matter was delayed, however: the publishers found the engraver's copy

too complex (it was written partly in Schumann's hand and partly by a copyist and contained many corrections, transpositions, and cross-references to sections newly written out) and asked a staff copyist to prepare a new one as a precaution. This in turn had to be sent to Schumann for proofreading. The problems that thereby arose for our edition are thoroughly discussed in the *Comments* at the end of the volume. In the end, the *Fantasiestücke*, op. 12, did not appear until early February 1838.

Once it was published, the opus instantly met with a very warm reception. Schumann's friend Carl Krägen waxed ecstatic about it; the composer and pianist Adolph Henselt played *Des Abends* at a recital in Dresden even before the work had appeared in print; and Clara

Wieck included several of the pieces in the program of her Vienna recital of 4 March 1838. Schumann first advised her to play *In der Nacht* and *Traumewirren* ("Restless Dreams"). Later he felt that the former was too long and recommended in its stead the first piece, *Des Abends*. The dedicatee Robena Ann Laidlaw, writing from Berlin on 25 November 1838, told the composer that "your *Fantasiestücke* give pleasure everywhere; I have played them in Danzig and Szczecin and will play them to the Princess in a couple of evenings." Franz Liszt also took up the cause of the *Fantasiestücke*; writing to his fellow-composer in early May 1838, he exclaimed: "The *Carnaval* and *Fantasiestücke* have captured my interest in an extraordinary way. I play them truly with delight, and

Lord knows there are not many things of which I can say the same" (Liszt's original text is in French).

*

Information on sources and readings may be found in the *Comments*.

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

Berlin, autumn 2009
Ernst Hertrich

罗伯特·舒曼

对 Op.10 的评论

《新音乐杂志》，1836 年 4 月 19 日

我将这些练习曲编号为 10，因为出版商说这样一来乐谱可以“走”得更快一些——很好的可以让我闭嘴的理由。然而悄悄地说，我采用这一作品号（当时 Op.9 尚未诞生）是因为在我看来“X”（10 的罗马数字形式）是一个“深不可测”的数字。而该作品——不管它沉重的低音、密集的德国式中段、丰富的和声还是随处可见的音型变化——应该是一部真正的“帕格尼尼”式的天才之作。如果人们认为这部作品值得称赞，认为它满怀爱与热情地吸收了一个更伟大的大师的乐思并将其进一步发扬光大，我将不胜荣幸。

据说帕格尼尼认为，他的作曲才能比他的演奏才能更值得尊敬。如果有人不同意（或者不愿意同意）这个观点，那就请去看看帕格尼尼的作品吧——特别是那些小提琴随想曲^①（我的 Op.10 的改编来源）。经过构思，我最终呈现的改编作品为原作增添了新鲜感及活力，钢琴上细腻的处理扩充了原作的内涵，使演奏者更容易发挥。在早先出版的改编自帕格尼尼作品的练习曲^②中，我几乎是逐音地照抄原作，只是扩写了和声。而这次我改变了那种学究般的改编方式，希望新版作品能在不损害原作诗意的前提下完满呈现，以至于让读者忘记它们曾经是小提琴作品。为了达到这个目的，我不得不重新塑造，甚至添加和省略不少素材，特别是在和声与作品结构等方面。^③我的此类改编都是三思而后行的，对于这样伟大而值得尊敬的原作，我的确需要审慎。限于篇幅，在这里完整地记录我所做的改编以及我这么做的理由是不现实的。不如让感兴趣的音乐爱好者们去比较原作和我的钢琴改编版，然后决定我的做法是否妥当吧。不过无论好坏，我的改编至少是有启发意义的。

① 原作标题为：24 Capricci per il Violino solo, dedicati agli Artisti, Op.1. Milan, Ricordi (《24 首小提琴随想曲，献给艺术家，Op.1，米兰 Ricordi 出版社）。

② Studien f.d.Pfte.nach Violincapr.v.Paganini (根据帕格尼尼随想曲改编的钢琴练习曲)，附前言等，莱比锡 Hofmeister 出版社。

③ 人们必须要意识到原作是在如何匆忙的情况下创作并付印的。利平斯基 (Lipinski) 先生提到，它们是在不同的时间和地点写成的。帕格尼尼将它们记在乐谱上，随意当作礼物送人。当他的出版商里科尔迪 (Ricordi) 先生请求出版后，他才匆忙间按照回忆写成乐谱。

Robert Schumann

Review of Opus 10

(Neue Zeitschrift für Musik, 19. April 1836)

I assigned an opus number to these Études because the publisher said that they would „go“ better if I did so – a reason to which my many objections could only yield. Secretly, however, I held the „X“ (for I have not yet reached the IXth muse) to be the symbol of the unknown quantity, and the composition – apart from the basses, the denser German middle parts, the opulence of the harmony altogether, and here and there the greater suppleness of form – to be a genuine work of Paganini's. If it is praiseworthy to have absorbed, with love and ardour, the ideas of a higher being, and to have reworked those ideas and brought them forth once again into the world, then I too may perhaps lay claim to praise. –

Paganini himself is said to hold his talents as a composer in greater esteem than his eminent genius as a virtuoso. If one cannot, or at least not to date, fully concur with this opinion, there is nevertheless so much diamantine substance to be found in his compositions – and especially in the violin capriccios*) from which the above Études have been taken, and which have been conceived and brought forth throughout with rare freshness and vivacity – that it is more likely to be further solidified than volatilized by the more elaborate mounting necessitated by the pianoforte. Unlike the publication of an earlier volume of studies based on Paganini**), in which, perhaps to its detriment, I copied the original more or less note for note and merely expatiated upon the harmonies, this time I freed myself from the pedantry of a verbatim transcription, and wish the present version, while sacrificing nothing of the work's poetic idea, to convey the impression of being a self-sufficient work for piano that will cause readers to forget its violinistic origins. The fact that, in order to achieve this, I had to recast, add or omit a good many things, particularly in respect of harmony and form***), is no less obvious than that I always did so with the circumspection that is the privilege of so powerful and estimable a spirit. As it would take too much space to enumerate all the changes I made and my reasons for making them, I leave it to interested lovers of art to decide for themselves whether I have done well, or ill, by comparing the original with the pianoforte version, an occupation which, in any event, cannot be less than instructive. –

By adding the by-line „de concert“ I wished first of all to distinguish the etudes from those in the aforementioned previous volume; more than that, by dint of their brilliance, they are also

*) The title of the original reads: 24 Capricci per il Violino solo, dedicati agli Artisti, Op. 1. Milano, Ricordi.

**) Studien f. d. Pfte. nach Violincapr. v. Paganini [= Studies for the pianoforte based on capriccios of Paganini]. With preface etc., Leipzig, Hofmeister.

***) One must bear in mind the manner in which the etudes came into being, and how quickly they reached print, in order to excuse much in the original. Mr. Lipinski relates that they were written at various times and locations, and that Paganini made presents of them in manuscript to his friends. When his publisher, Signor Ricordi, asked him to publish