

BEETHOVEN



贝多芬

D大调小提琴协奏曲

(钢琴缩谱与小提琴分谱)

Violin Concerto in D major

Op. 61

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

4J1342

Ludwig van Beethoven

路德维希·范·贝多芬

D 大调小提琴协奏曲, Op. 61

钢琴缩谱

编者: 小岛新 (Shin Augustinus Kojima)

前言: 恩斯特·赫特里希 (Ernst Herttrich)

钢琴缩谱: 约尔根·佐默 (Jürgen Sommer)

华彩段与导入句: 罗伯特·D. 列文 (Robert D. Levin)

小提琴谱辅助标记: 沃尔夫冈·施耐德汉 (Wolfgang Schneiderhan)

翻译: 陆平



G. HENLE VERLAG
G. 亨乐出版社提供版权

 **SMPPH**
上海音乐出版社
WWW.SMPPH.CN

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

贝多芬·D大调小提琴协奏曲 / 小岛新编; 陆平译 - 上海: 上海音乐出版社, 2017.10

ISBN 978-7-5523-1451-9

I. 贝… II. ①小… ②陆… III. 小提琴 - 协奏曲 - 德国 - 近代 IV. J657.213

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2017) 第 218798 号

© Authorized by G. Henle Verlag, München

Chinese Translation Copyright © 2017 by Shanghai Music Publishing House

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

书 名: 贝多芬·D大调小提琴协奏曲

编 者: 小岛新

译 者: 陆 平

出 品 人: 费维耀

责任编辑: 王 琳

封面设计: 翟晓峰

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 上海市打浦路 443 号荣科大厦 200023

网址: www.ewen.co

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: 13.5 乐谱: 108 面

2017 年 10 月第 1 版 2017 年 10 月第 1 次印刷

印数: 1 - 2,000 册

ISBN 978-7-5523-1451-9/J · 1342

定价: 50.00 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

“对于贝多芬的协奏曲，行家们的意见一致：它写得很美，但乐曲的连续性似乎时常遭到彻底的中断，而一些平平的乐段不停反复，很容易令人厌倦。……同时，人们担心贝多芬如果继续沿着这条道路走下去，将会损人不利己。音乐将迅速变得使不太精通艺术规则和约束的人无论如何都不会喜欢，反而会被杂乱无章的乐思和几件乐器为刻画乐曲开头特点时制造的连续不断的骚动所压垮，他会带着不愉快的感觉，精疲力尽地离开音乐会。总的说来，听众对这部协奏曲以及克列门特的即兴演奏出奇地满意。”

1807年初，约翰·内波穆克·莫泽在发表于《维也纳戏剧报》上的评论中如是写道。那时，贝多芬的《小提琴协奏曲》在1806年12月23日刚举行了首演。我们今天或许会将这些话语视作吹毛求疵的评论者发表的无足轻重的观点，毕竟观众显然很喜爱这部协奏曲；然而，我们必须将莫泽的评论放到当时的美学背景之下来解读。实际上，一旦我们对这部作品的来龙去脉、曲式设计及其他情况有了更为清晰的概念，他的评论就变得完全合理了。就他对未来的预见力而言，贝多芬富有开拓性的创造力后来的确得到证实是打破一切音乐形式界线的发展路线的基石。至于这部协奏曲的评论文章本身，要知道这部作品在首演时的形式与我们今天所知的完全不同，尤其是第一乐章彻底背离了当时的曲式概念，完全将悬念留到终曲的结尾。

这首协奏曲的起源情况相当不清楚。最新研究显示，贝多芬动笔写出全稿的时间不早于1806年11月的最后几周。换言之，他最多只花了五周的极短时间就将整部作品付诸纸上。这一发现符合当时的记述，据称弗朗茨·克列门特首演钢琴部分时是“视谱弹奏而且事先未经排练”。

我们无法得知贝多芬用了多久来酝酿写作小提琴协奏曲的计划。他可能在1806年11月前就已经着手创作了，因为在仅存的草稿上，动笔日期很可能是当年9月或10月。无论如何，亲笔手稿（现存于维也纳的奥地利国家图书馆）包含大量的创作痕迹，空白五线谱上写有无数草稿。因此我们有把握猜测，这首协奏曲是在巨大的交稿压力下写出的，而且贝多芬是一边“创作”一边落笔的。

这些特殊情况对作品本身产生了影响。我们注意到在第一乐章中，贝多芬用到一个简化的曲式图，它只是大致上遵循了常规的奏鸣曲—快板曲式，这倒造就了如此大胆的曲式设计以及第一与第二主题的巧妙结合。相比之下，我们在此看到五个主题群几乎像一首混成曲一般交织在一起，没有明显的内聚力。习惯了奏鸣曲—快板曲式的听众所听到的很可能是“杂乱无章的乐思”。相反，没有受过良好音乐熏陶的听众则在优美的旋律中找到了乐趣，这的确可以视作“一些普通乐段的不停反复”。

贝多芬在首演之后对他的协奏曲——或者更准确地讲是小提琴部分——进行了彻底的修订。人们至今还在争论这次修订的价值。有人声称这是首演之前，贝多芬在克列门特的要求下修订的。十九世纪伟大的贝多芬学者古斯塔夫·诺特博姆相信，修订的理由是原版中的技巧要求过高。他

甚至极端地坚持认为许多乐段“在修改后获得了操作上的可行性，但失去了某些音乐上的意义”。诚然，诺特博姆论文是在质疑贝多芬评估、判断自己劳动成果的艺术价值的能力，毕竟他最终交付刊印的是协奏曲的修订版。为避免这种进退两难的窘境，许多学者同样认为先前版本更胜一筹，专横地质疑最终发行版本的真实性。而实际上，修订版与克列门特毫不相干，也与原始版本超出了当时通常的技术要求并无瓜葛。最后，位于维也纳的艺术工业局在1808年出版的首版经过了作曲家本人的校对和认可。

贝多芬常在试听作品首次（通常是半公开的）演出后频繁对其“医治”。一部作品脱稿得如此之快，在首演前可能几乎没排练过，更不用说“试听”了，这部作品对他而言该有多大的动力啊！令人颇为惊讶的是，贝多芬决定仅修订独奏部分，而其余部分不作改动。或许他认真考虑了那些批评意见，并在有些单调的小提琴音型中，发现了让莫泽变得如此惶惑不安的“一些平平乐段的不停反复”。通过重写首要的独奏乐器，他赋予这部协奏曲在同类体裁作品中的深远历史地位。没有贝多芬的先例，就不会有勃拉姆斯的小提琴协奏曲。的确，勃拉姆斯的独奏部分在主题上比贝多芬的更复杂精细，独奏者很少在主题上居于乐队之先或者引导音乐的进程。正相反，在一段段音乐中，贝多芬每次都愿意让独奏者演奏伴奏音型和装饰音、邻音装饰音和琶音。他修订作品的主要原因很显然是为了给这些音型增添更多变化与活力，从而避免陷入“令人厌倦”的千篇一律。新版本赋予装饰音型更大的对比，中断过分“机械化的”模进，引入反向进行，偶尔加强曲式上的结构关联。

第二乐章“浪漫曲”在修订中未被改动并非巧合。其开头是一个十分舒缓的如歌主题，相继出现了四次：加强音器的弦乐、单簧管、大管和乐队全奏。我们又一次看到，独奏小提琴起先只是装饰了主要旋律，但此刻与主要主题贴近得多。在第二段中，它呈现了一个属于自己的全新主题，此时是它自己陈述。在终曲里，与第一乐章不同，独奏者在主题的争辩中扮演了更重要的角色，即便他的这部分依旧受到大量音型的支配。这部分也经过大幅修改。仅有的未经改动的乐段是很少的几处，出现在独奏小提琴中的回旋动机的原始形态。

以上所述都可在亲笔手稿中清楚地查到，因为贝多芬用黑色墨水添加了所有的改动，而其余笔迹是浅褐色。然而即使是亲笔手稿中的改动也不等于最终的文本，它们仅仅构成临时阶段，有点像一组可选演奏方案，贝多芬保留了从中做出最终选择的权利。印刷版有时甚至会在单个小节内

从原始文本跳到可选版本，然后再回到原始文本。这惊人的一切都能在乐谱上看到，却不能在演奏中听到。独奏小提琴部分看起来是那么优雅，那么稳健又顽皮。我们丝毫感觉不到这是在作曲过程的不同阶段调合而成的——如何赞扬都不为过的高超艺术成就！

钢琴乐谱中包含的独奏小提琴部分再现了“全集版”（《贝多芬作品集》，第4卷，系列3，亨乐出版社，1973年）中的原始文本。读者可查阅后来出版的述评，由笔者于1994年该卷编者小岛新去世后所写。这份述评详细陈述了这部协奏曲的各个不同版本。还包含了对“全集版”中该卷的一些补遗和勘误，毋庸多言，这些全都写进本钢琴缩谱的文本里了。沃尔夫冈·施耐德汉还为小提琴部分标注了一些必要的小改动。弗洛里安·松莱特纳非常好地承担了改动的工作，还为弓法标记做了一些必要添加。

括号内的记号由编者根据相似处

所加。另一方面，加标记的小提琴部分中，括号内所添加的限于弓法和分句标记为演奏建议，由沃尔夫冈·施耐德汉加入。指法仅在换把时标注。适用于八度的通行法则是用1指和4指演奏；在违背这一规则时，会以适当的指法标出。上、下弓标记仅在要中止琴弓的上、下进程时添加。0标记仅写在需用空弦演奏的音符上。

乐队伴奏的钢琴缩谱以“全集版”的文本为依据。

罗伯特·列文是本卷的华彩段和导入句的作曲者，他感谢弗洛里安·松莱特纳和丹尼尔·斯泰普纳提出的宝贵建议。作为对这些华彩段的补充，亨乐出版社还单独发行了贝多芬为小提琴协奏曲的钢琴版所写的原始华彩，由沃尔夫冈·施耐德汉为小提琴改编。

恩斯特·赫特里希
2003年春于沙尔肯巴赫

Preface

"The connoisseurs' verdict on Beethoven's concerto is unanimous: it concedes many a beauty, but acknowledges that the continuity often seems completely disrupted, and that the endless repetitions of a few common passages may easily become wearisome [...] At the same time, one fears that if Beethoven continues along this path he will do a disservice to himself and to his audience. Music might quickly reach a point at which those not thoroughly versed in the rules and strictures of art will take no pleasure in it whatsoever, but will be crushed beneath a jumbled heap of ideas and an uninterrupted tumult from a few instruments intended to characterize the opening, and will leave the concert with an unpleasant sense of exhaustion. In general, the audience was extraordinarily pleased with the concerto, and with Clement's improvisations."

Thus Johann Nepomuk Möser in a review published in the *Wiener Theater-Zeitung* in early 1807. The première of Beethoven's Violin Concerto had just taken place on 23 December 1806. Today we might regard these words as the insignificant opinion of a minor rearguard critic. After all, the audience evidently liked the concerto. Yet Möser's review must be read in the aesthetic context of its time; indeed, once we form a clearer picture of the work, its origins, its formal design and so forth, his views come to seem perfectly reasonable. As far as his prophecy for the future is concerned, Beethoven's ground-breaking creativity did in fact prove to be the point of departure for a line of development that would burst the bounds of all musical forms. As for his critique of the concerto itself, it is useful to recall that, at its première, the work was given in a

completely different guise from the one we know today, and that the first movement in particular departs radically from the formal notions of the time and suspends them completely at the end of the finale.

The origins of the concerto are fairly obscure. Recent studies have shown that Beethoven started to write out the full draft no earlier than the final weeks of November 1806. In other words, he committed the entire piece to paper in the incredibly short time span of at most five weeks. This discovery is consistent with contemporary accounts, according to which Franz Clement allegedly played the solo part "at sight and without previous rehearsal" at the première.

We have no way of knowing how long Beethoven may have ruminated on the plan to write a violin concerto. He had probably already set to work on it prior to November 1806, for the sole surviving sketch most likely dates from September or October of that year. Whatever the case, the autograph score (preserved today in the Austrian National Library in Vienna) contains myriad traces of compositional labor, with countless sketches entered in the blank staves. We may therefore safely assume that the concerto was written under enormous deadline pressure, and that Beethoven was still "composing" it while in the act of writing it out.

These special circumstances had repercussions on the work itself. In the very first movement we note that Beethoven has employed a simplified formal schema, only loosely following the customary sonata-allegro form that otherwise allowed him to produce such bold formal designs and ingenious combinations of first and second themes. Here, in contrast, we find five thematic complexes threaded together almost like a medley, with no apparent cohesion. Listeners attuned to sonata-allegro form easily heard this as a "jumbled heap of

ideas." Conversely, less well-educated members of the audience found pleasure in the tuneful melodies, which can indeed be viewed as "endless repetitions of a few common passages."

After the première Beethoven subjected his concerto – or more precisely the violin part – to a thorough revision. Until very recently the value of this revision has been a matter of controversy. Some have claimed that it was made at Clement's request before the première took place. The great nineteenth-century Beethoven scholar, Gustav Nottebohm, believed that the reason for the revision were the excessive technical demands of the original. He even went so far as to maintain that many passages "gained in executability from the changes but lost something of their musical significance." Admittedly Nottebohm's thesis casts doubt on Beethoven's ability to assess and judge the artistic value of his own labors, for after all it was the revised form of his concerto that he saw into print. To avoid this dilemma, many scholars who likewise felt that the earlier version was superior have peremptorily questioned the authenticity of the published version. In reality, however, the revision had nothing to do with Clement, nor do the technical demands of the original go beyond what was customary at the time. Finally, the first edition, published by the *Bureau des Arts et d'Industrie* in Vienna in 1808, was proofread and authorized by the composer himself.

Beethoven frequently "doctored" his works after trying them out in their initial, often semi-public performances. How much greater his incentive to do so with a work that had arisen so quickly and had probably scarcely been rehearsed, much less "tried out," before its première! It is astonishing enough that Beethoven only saw fit to revise the solo part and not the rest of the work. Perhaps he had taken the critics to heart

and discovered, in the somewhat bland and uniform violin figurations, the “endless repetitions of a few common passages” over which Möser became so exercised. By reworking the solo instrument as a first among equals, he gave his concerto a seminal position in the history of the genre. Brahms’s Violin Concerto is unthinkable without Beethoven’s earlier example. Granted, Brahms’s solo part is thematically more intricate than Beethoven’s, where the soloist rarely claims thematic precedence over the orchestra or directs the course of the music. On the contrary, for large sections at a time it is content to play accompaniment figures and ornamentation, neighbour-note embellishments and arpeggios. The main reason for his revision was quite obviously to lend greater variety and vitality to those figures and thereby to avoid the danger of “wearisome” monotony. The new version adds greater contrast to the embellishment figures, breaks off excessively “mechanical” sequences, introduces contrary motion and occasionally underscores the structural relations of the form.

It is no coincidence that the middle movement, a “romance,” was unaffected by these revisions. It opens with a very gentle song-like theme that appears four times in succession: in muted strings, clarinet, bassoon and orchestral tutti. Once again, the solo violin at first merely embellishes the main melody, but now it is far more closely related to the principal theme. In the second section it presents an entirely new theme of its own and ultimately leads with a cadenza to the final rondo, where this time it states the theme itself. In the finale, unlike the first movement, the soloist takes

a larger role in the thematic argument, even if his part is still dominated by a wealth of figuration. This part, too, was heavily reworked. The only passages left untouched are those few moments where the original form of the rondo motif occurs in the solo violin.

All these things can be clearly traced in the autograph score, for Beethoven entered all his changes in black ink whereas the rest of the writing is light brown. Yet not even the changes in the autograph represent the definitive reading. They merely form an interim stage, somewhat like a set of alternatives from which Beethoven reserved the right to make a final selection. At times the printed version even jumps from an original reading to the altered version and back again within the space of a single bar. It is astonishing to see all these things in the score and yet not to hear them in performance. The solo violin part seems so elegant, so poised and playful. Nowhere do we sense that it was concocted from various stages in the compositional process – a masterly achievement that can hardly be praised too highly!

The solo violin part contained in the piano score is a reproduction of the urtext as appearing in the Complete Edition (Beethoven Werke, volume 4, series 3, G. Henle Verlag, 1973). Readers are hereby referred to the later critical report prepared by the present author in 1994 after the death of the volume’s editor, Shin Augustinus Kojima. This report contains a detailed account of the various versions of the concerto. It also contains a few addenda and corrigenda to the complete edition volume, all of which, it goes without saying, have been worked into the text of our piano re-

duction. This has also necessitated a number of minor changes in the violin part marked up by Wolfgang Schneiderhan. These changes, and a few additions deemed necessary for understanding the bowing marks, were kindly undertaken by Florian Sonnleitner.

Signs given in parentheses are editorial additions based on analogous points. Parenthesized additions printed in the marked violin part are, on the other hand, confined to bowing and phrasing marks inserted by Wolfgang Schneiderhan as suggestions for interpretation. Fingering is marked only in cases in which a change of position occurs. A general rule applying to octaves is that these are played with the 1st and 4th fingers; deviations from this ruling are indicated by appropriate fingering. Up- and down-bow marks have been added only where the upward and downward course of the bow is intended to be interrupted. Only those notes are to be played on the open string that are furnished with a zero symbol.

The piano reduction of the orchestral accompaniment is based on the text of the Complete Edition.

Robert Levin, the composer of the cadenzas and lead-ins appearing in our volume, extends his thanks to Florian Sonnleitner and Daniel Stepner for their valuable suggestions. As a supplement to these cadenzas, Henle has also issued, in a separate volume, Beethoven’s original cadenzas from the piano version of his Violin Concerto, retranscribed for the violin by Wolfgang Schneiderhan.

Schalkenbach, spring 2003
Ernst Herttrich

Ludwig van Beethoven

路德维希·范·贝多芬

D 大调小提琴协奏曲, Op. 61

钢琴缩谱

编者: 小岛新 (Shin Augustinus Kojima)

前言: 恩斯特·赫特里希 (Ernst Herttrich)

钢琴缩谱: 约尔根·佐默 (Jürgen Sommer)

华彩段与导入句: 罗伯特·D. 列文 (Robert D. Levin)

小提琴谱辅助标记: 沃尔夫冈·施耐德汉 (Wolfgang Schneiderhan)

翻译: 陆平



G. HENLE VERLAG

G. 亨乐出版社提供版权

协奏曲

创作于 1806 ~ 1807 年

Allegro ma non troppo

Opus 61

Violine

Klavier

8

13

18

p dolce

cresc. sf

p

f

f

p

dolce

22

Measures 22-27 of a musical score. The system begins with a treble clef staff containing a whole rest. The piano accompaniment starts in measure 22 with a *cresc.* marking. The right hand features a series of chords and arpeggiated figures, while the left hand plays a steady eighth-note accompaniment. A *f* (forte) dynamic is indicated in measure 25. The system concludes in measure 27 with a *dimin.* (diminuendo) marking and a *pp* (pianissimo) dynamic.

28

Measures 28-31 of a musical score. The treble staff has whole rests. The piano accompaniment begins in measure 28 with a *ff* (fortissimo) dynamic. The right hand plays chords and rests, while the left hand continues with an eighth-note accompaniment. The system ends in measure 31.

32

Measures 32-34 of a musical score. The treble staff contains chords and eighth notes. The piano accompaniment continues with eighth-note patterns in the left hand and chords in the right hand. The system concludes in measure 34.

35

Measures 35-38 of a musical score. The system features a complex texture with rapid sixteenth-note passages in both hands. Multiple *sf* (sforzando) markings are used throughout the system to indicate accents. The system ends in measure 38.

A

39

Measures 39-42 of a musical score, marked with a section letter 'A'. The treble staff contains a melodic line with eighth-note patterns, starting with a *p* (piano) dynamic. The piano accompaniment in the left hand consists of a simple eighth-note accompaniment. The system concludes in measure 42.

43

Measures 43-47 of a musical score in G major. The right hand features chords and arpeggiated figures, while the left hand plays a steady eighth-note accompaniment. A piano (*p*) dynamic marking is present in measure 43.

48

Measures 48-52 of the musical score. The right hand continues with chordal textures, and the left hand features a more active eighth-note line. Dynamics include *pp* (pianissimo) in measure 50 and *sempre p* (sempre piano) in measure 51. Triplet markings (*3*) are shown in measures 51 and 52.

53

Measures 53-56 of the musical score. The right hand has a melodic line with some chromaticism, and the left hand continues with eighth-note accompaniment.

57

Measures 57-60 of the musical score. The right hand features a descending melodic line, and the left hand maintains the eighth-note accompaniment.

61

Measures 61-64 of the musical score. The right hand has a melodic line with a crescendo (*cresc.*) in measure 61, followed by fortissimo (*f*) and *sf* (sforzando) markings in measures 63 and 64. The left hand continues with eighth-note accompaniment.

65

pp *cresc.*

70

f *ff*

74

f

B
77

ff

82

sf *sf* *sf* *p*

88

p *sf* *sf* *p*

94

99

p *dolce*

104

cresc. *sf* *p*

110

f *p* *sf* *sf*

114

dimin.

p

C

118

dolce
p

dolce

121

f

124

dolce

p

127

130

134

138

142

149

154

Measures 154-158. The system consists of a single melodic line in the treble clef and a piano accompaniment in the grand staff (treble and bass clefs). The key signature has two sharps (F# and C#). Measure 154 features a triplet of eighth notes. The piano part provides harmonic support with chords and single notes.

159

Measures 159-162. The system continues with the same melodic and piano parts. Measure 159 has a 'cresc.' marking. Measure 162 has a 'cresc.' marking. The piano part features sustained chords and moving lines.

163

Measures 163-166. The system continues with the same melodic and piano parts. Measure 163 has a 'f' marking. Measure 164 has a '(dimin.)' marking. Measure 165 has a 'dolce' marking. Measure 166 has a 'p' marking. The piano part includes a 'sf' (sforzando) marking in measure 164.

167

Measures 167-170. The system continues with the same melodic and piano parts. Measure 167 has a 'cresc.' marking. Measure 170 has a 'poco cresc.' marking. The piano part features sustained chords and moving lines.

171

Measures 171-175. The system continues with the same melodic and piano parts. Measure 171 has a 'f' marking. Measure 172 has a 'f' marking. Measure 173 has a 'f' marking. Measure 174 has a 'f' marking. Measure 175 has a 'f' marking. The piano part features sustained chords and moving lines.

D

176 *f* *dolce*

182

186

190 *poco cresc.*

194 *f*

199 *p*

This musical score is for a piano piece, likely a sonata or concerto movement, in D major. The tempo is marked 'D' (Allegretto). The score consists of six systems of music, each with a right-hand melody and a left-hand accompaniment. The key signature has two sharps (F# and C#). The time signature is 4/4. The score includes various musical notations such as slurs, ties, and accidentals. The dynamics range from piano (p) to forte (f). The score includes various musical notations such as slurs, ties, and accidentals.