Robert Schumann, *Abegg Variationen* op. 1; Urtext edition, edited by Ernst Herttrich (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 2004). 16pp. €6.
Robert Schumann, *Fantasiestücke* op. 12; Urtext edition, edited by Ernst Herttrich (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 2004). 45pp. €9.
Robert Schumann, *Kreisleriana* op. 16; Urtext edition, edited by Ernst Herttrich (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 2004). 42pp. €9.
Robert Schumann, *Faschingsswank aus Wien* op. 26. Urtext edition, edited by Ernst Herttrich (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 2004). 37pp. €8.

Schumann's music often holds secret messages. The title page of the first edition of his op. 1 (1831) mentioned 'Pauline Comtesse d'Abegg'. Schumann admitted to his friend Anton Theodor Töpken this was a deliberate 'mystification' – a mystification, Töpken surmised, to do with the 'musical tractability of the name' as much as any clandestine love interest.[1] A fascination with musical and poetic codes continues in the other pieces under review here: opp. 12, 16 and 26 all are fantasies of sorts. The *Fantasiestücke* and *Kreisleriana* are both indebted to the writings of E.T.A. Hoffmann, while early reviewers described *Faschingsswank aus Wien* (subtitled *Fantasiebilder*) as a companion piece to *Carnaval* op. 9. Further secret messages are added to these pieces by their publication history, a tale of mysterious and retracted dedications and – most problematically – later editions that sometimes substantially alter the original versions. Ernst Herttrich's Urtext edition is thus very welcome although it raises some questions about which text should be considered authoritative.

Herttrich relies almost exclusively on the first editions but refers to autograph manuscripts and sketches where they are available. No mention is made of the Breitkopf & Härtel Collected Edition edited primarily by Clara and Brahms (1881–93), which is odd given that the driving force behind the production of the Urtext presumably has been a reaction against that 'less-than-ideal' version, as John Daverio diplomatically called it (which is now reprinted by Dover).[2] There are two issues here. The first has to do with *Kreisleriana* that, like the op. 6 *Davidsbündlertänze*, Schumann revised for a new edition in 1849–50. Herrtrich takes the later version as definitive, without making reference to the effect this has on interpretations of the music and the possible associations it has with the composer's late style (of which more later). Second, it becomes apparent on comparing the Collected Edition with the Urtext that at least with these pieces there are few significant differences of content between them. The Urtext is better laid out and so easier to play from. The endnotes provide details of altered dynamics and articulation (missing from the Collected Edition), which make interesting reading as Schumann's notation of them is notoriously idiosyncratic.[3] But not everything is referenced as well as it might have been. For example, the most significant alteration to the *Abegg-Variationen* (bars 196–7 of the finale) was found in a later impression of the first edition. The preface explains that it 'most

1 Herttrich, Preface, *Abegg-Variationen*, iv.

2 *Piano Music of Robert Schumann*, ed. Clara Schumann (New York, 1972–80), 3 vols. John Daverio, *Robert Schumann: Herald of a 'New Poetic Age'* (Oxford, 1997), 8. The only reference to the Collected Edition in the four scores comes in the notes to *Kreisleriana*, which observes that Clara changed the time signature of the fourth movement to common time.

3 On this issue see Wolfgang Boetticher's 'Weitere Forschungen an Dokumenten zum Leben und Schaffen Robert Schumanns', *Robert Schumann: Ein romantisches Erbe in neuer Forschung* (Mainz, 1984), 44–5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409800000513 Published online by Cambridge University Press

likely originated with Schumann, even if there is no proof that he forwarded such instructions to his publishers', but it does not say when the version dates from (p. v). Similarly, references or a brief bibliography for the prefaces would have been helpful, although they might be inappropriate in a commercial edition.

The editions of the *Abegg-Variationen* and *Faschingsswank aus Wien* are otherwise relatively straightforward. The autographs of the first three numbers of *Faschingsswank aus Wien* include hardly any dynamics so they are taken from the first edition. Number 4 was originally published separately as 'Fragment from [Schumann's] *Nachtstücke*' in a supplement to the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* in December 1839 but differs little from the subsequent version. Potential problems on attempting an Urtext of Schumann's music are more apparent from the edition of the *Fantasiestücke*. At least eight pieces were composed in July 1837, initiated by Schumann's admiration for the pianist Anna Robena Laidlaw (Herttrich writes Robena Ann Laidlaw in all three translations despite it being listed otherwise in the notes). The original engraver's copy included a piece that was withdrawn during the work's final redaction, included here in an appendix. Another piece originally intended for inclusion in the *Fantasiestücke* was eventually published as no. 8 of the *Albumblätter* op. 124, in 1852. Schumann was frustrated by the length of time it took Breitkopf & Härtel to publish the score. The delay was caused in part by the copy he had provided – a mixture of his own hand and a copyist's, with many corrections, transpositions and cross-references to rewritten sections – which was deemed too untidy. A staff copyist was drafted in to produce a 'clean' version that Schumann had to proofread. The notes to the Urtext thus list five sources: two full autographs, one partial autograph, the copyist's manuscript and Schumann's copy of the first edition. The musical text is largely identical throughout; the major differences between versions occur with regard to dynamics and phrasing. While these are explained in some detail certain decisions could have been better supported. For example, in bar 1 of the first number, 'Des Abends', it is noted that 'all sources have an additional slur on [the upper staff's] g♭–f–e♭' but no such slur is given in the score (p. 43). The reason for this omission, apparently, is that it is not a legato slur. Surely it must mean something in terms of articulation, though, if all versions have it? Why include a piece in the appendix that Schumann decided not to publish but then ignore markings on the manuscripts and first edition?

Breitkopf & Härtel's delay in publishing the *Fantasiestücke* contributed to Schumann not wanting to give them *Kreisleriana*, the first edition of which was instead produced by Tobias Haslinger in September 1838. After Haslinger's death in 1842 his son took over the business and turned his attention to Viennese dance music, allowing other publishers to take over the rights to Schumann's works. The Leipzig publisher Friedrich Whistling bought *Kreisleriana* in 1849. Schumann took the opportunity to revise his popular work, explaining: 'In my earlier days, unfortunately, I very often spoiled my pieces in an entirely mischievous manner. All of this has now been expunged'.[4] A further problem was the title page, which he now thought a bit heavy-handed; a new one could be made, he suggested, 'where perhaps the word "Kreisleriana" peeps out of a fantastical ornament'.[5] Whistling's edition finally appeared in August 1850. Herttrich describes Schumann's alterations as having 'remained within reasonable bounds: the endings of Nos. 4 and 5 were slightly altered, twenty bars were added to a passage in No. 2, and another eight were cut from the same piece. Perhaps the most striking

4 Quoted in Herttrich, Preface, *Kreisleriana*, v.

5 Quoted in ibid.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409800000513 Published online by Cambridge University Press

change is his frequent deletion of *ritardando* marks' (p. v). What are not mentioned here are the alterations made to other passages and how many more repeat marks are included, the latter having been described by Charles Rosen as 'the most deplorable of the revisions'.[6]

Herttrich uses the revised Whistling version as his guide, reporting significant textual discrepancies from the Haslinger print and providing 'a special section in which further differences in this early edition are listed' (p. v). The reason for his preference for the Whistling edition is that it contains the final version proofread by Schumann. Strikingly, there is very little difference between the Urtext and the Collected Edition apart from that the later version is more clearly typeset and gives more details about dynamics. Most of the editorial changes – including the new repeat signs – are noted in the Collected Edition, which also gives the first edition's alternate passages. The Collected Edition even includes some information passed over by the Urtext, such as that the ornament in bar 31 of no. 2 was not present in the first edition. In terms of layout, the Collected Edition sometimes presents the first version more sympathetically. For example, in no. 2, there were originally eight extra bars after bar 145; in other words, the recapitulation of bars 16–28 was exact but in the Whistling edition was contracted. The Collected Edition includes these within the score in smaller notes while the Urtext provides them as a footnote. Clara and Brahms were probably exercising their editorial powers at this point, as excising those eight bars leads to an awkward jump for the melodic line and harmonic phrasing. Herttrich's decision to stay with Schumann's proofread Whistling edition is of course consistent, but it ignores the issue that some of the choices the composer made verge on the unmusical.

The most outspoken critic of Schumann's editing of his earlier works has been Rosen. He considers the addition of repeat signs to bear 'witness to his obsession for underlining any detail that might not be obvious … as if the listener could not be trusted to understand'.[7] As David Ferris has recently discussed, Schumann was concerned from the outset that his music be understood by his audience but that previously manifested itself in recommending performers not to perform his more 'difficult' works (he advised Clara to play 'In der Nacht' and 'Traumeswirren' from the *Fantasiestücke* at her 1838 Vienna recital, but then asked her to replace the latter with the shorter and less complex *Des Abends*).[8] With the revisions of *Kreisleriana* Schumann seems to have been intent on making his challenging music more generally acceptable; or, as Rosen puts it:

> In later years Schumann seems to have been concerned to endow the music with the healthy, rational solidity it lacked. He may have made the early works easier to listen to, but he removed some of their poetry and much of their vitality. Attempting to erase the eccentricity, he made his conceptions more commonplace.[9]

The best examples of the erasure of eccentricity to which Rosen refers can be found in the aforementioned changes to the very last bars of nos. 4 and 5 from *Kreisleriana*. In both cases the harmony is better defined: at the end of no. 4 the right hand's open fifth d–a is filled with an f♯, clarifying the major modality; at the end of no. 5

6 Charles Rosen, *The Romantic Generation* (London, 1996), 705.

7 Rosen, *The Romantic Generation*, 705.

8 David Ferris, 'Public Performance and Private Understanding: Clara Wieck's Concerts in Berlin', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 56 (2003): 389–90.

9 Rosen, *The Romantic Generation*, 677.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409800000513 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the original half cadence is replaced by the tonic chord of G minor. These alterations effect the transition between numbers. The D major chord at the end of no. 4 provides a stronger lead into the G minor of no. 5. Ending on the tonic in no. 5, however, means that the melody of no. 6 cannot float magically up from the final d as it does when the first version is performed as a cycle. The more traditional ending of no. 5 is considered by Rosen to lessen the effect of the opening of no. 6:

> It is … in my experience, difficult to begin [no. 6] persuasively after the revised ending. With the original half cadence, however, the sixth piece seems to arise naturally out of the sonority of the final chord. The original edition makes for a greater unity between the satirical and lyrical pieces, and more closely realises the ideals of E.T.A. Hoffmann.[10]

It seems ironic on considering Schumann's later edition that he wanted a less blatant title page but – it seems – more straightforward music. His compositional style had changed considerably since *Kreisleriana* and it is not really surprising that he should have formed different ideas about the strengths of his earlier works; a preference for the more eccentric versions is no doubt influenced by a modernist appreciation of their progressive elements, which was not Schumann's concern by 1850. Yet the pertinent point here, whether or not we agree with Rosen's assessment, is the validity of accepting the 1850 edition of *Kreisleriana* as the basis for an Urtext.

A brief survey suggests that performers have chosen freely from first and second editions of *Kreisleriana*. Maurizio Pollini, for example, prefers the first edition in his 2002 *Deutsche Gramophon* recording but takes some of the Whistling edition's repeats. Wilhelm Kempff used Clara's edition, using the revised endings in his 1973 recording for *Deutsche Gramophon* as does Imogen Cooper's live BBC recording (1995). Pianists will probably turn to Henle's Urtext edition in search of a portable and reliable edition: those who read the footnotes will find further secret messages from Schumann that may be better decoded by the forthcoming New Complete Edition published by Schott.

Laura Tunbridge
University of Manchester

Jean Sibelius: Symphony no. 2 in D major op. 43, Study Score ed. Kari Kilpeläinen. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 2004. Partitur-Bibliothek 5376, 214 pp. €112.

Among Sibelius's large-scale orchestral works, the Second Symphony is perhaps the best known. It is also, however, one of the most difficult to understand. Its gestures are brutally direct, nowhere more so than in the precipitous brass and string exchanges in the second movement and the searingly affirmative chorale of the final bars. In a poor performance, the symphony can seem too diffuse, its discourse too fragmented to carry genuine symphonic conviction or support a sustained critical response (by comparison with the telegrammatic standards of Sibelius's later symphonies). Yet in reality, the symphony invites a wide range of hermeneutic accounts. It is Sibelius's 'Italian' Symphony, conceived and sketched

10 Ibid., 678.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409800000513 Published online by Cambridge University Press