

**EDITORIAL STRATEGIES OF ARTUR SCHNABEL
IN THE PUBLICATION OF LUDWIG VAN BEETHOVEN'S PIANO SONATAS****РЕДАКТОРСЬКІ СТРАТЕГІЇ АРТУРА ШНАБЕЛЯ
У ПУБЛІКАЦІЯХ ФОРТЕПІАННИХ СОНАТ ЛЮДВІГА ВАН БЕТХОВЕНА**

УДК 780.8:[780.616.432:78.082]

DOI: 10.31500/2309-8155.23.2023.294859

Xu DexinPh.D. Student, Ukrainian National
Tchaikovsky Academy of Music
e-mail: xu_dexin@i.ua**Сюй Десінь**Аспірант, Національна музична академія
України імені Петра Чайковського
orcid.org/0009-0004-0457-0550

Abstract. Among the most outstanding achievements of the Viennese classics are the 32 piano sonatas by Ludwig van Beethoven (1770–1827). The complexity of the stage reading of the author's concept of these cycles requires a thorough study of the author's text. In this context, it is essential to turn to the editions of these works with their reliance on performance specifics. The study of the peculiarities of the edition of Beethoven's 32 sonatas made in the first half of the twentieth century by Artur Schnabel, an outstanding Austrian pianist and researcher of Beethoven's works, will enrich modern knowledge about the style of Beethoven's piano works. In his editions of Beethoven's sonatas, Schnabel managed to capture the ideas that encourage creative reflection and, therefore, are not intended to be taken literally in the process of stage performance.

Schnabel's approach to editing as a unique musical interpretation combined research, text, and pedagogy. His musical thinking and scientific intuition in his editorial approach to Beethoven's sonatas are based on the close connection between the aural and graphic components of the author's idea. Schnabel's editorial notes are systematically verified, and their extensive nature testifies to his rich experience in mastering the German composer's piano works. In general, Schnabel's edition contains many additions in terms of both text and performance: the researcher offers versions of melismas, adds interpretations of tempo marks and extensive comments on the grouping of measures, etc.; a large number of remarks relate to dynamics, hidden polyphony, articulation, and the nature of performance. Schnabel's edition is an artistically and practically comprehensive and valuable work in terms of performance, methodology, and history of music.

Keywords: sonata cycle, textual criticism of music, editorial work of Artur Schnabel, 32 sonatas for piano by Ludwig van Beethoven, author's text, urtext, musical interpretation.

Introduction. The piano sonatas by Ludwig van Beethoven (1770–1827) represent the highest achievements of the Viennese classics in the piano performance of the first half of the twentieth century. All respectable concert pianists include the sonata cycles of the German composer in their performance programs. Each musical text is open to cooperation with the interpreter; 32 sonatas by Ludwig van Beethoven are no exception. This feature led to the formation of a great cohort of performers and editors of Beethoven's piano works. Among them, in the twentieth century, one can single out the excellent work of Artur Schnabel, an outstanding Austrian pianist, composer, and researcher. His research on interpreting Beethoven's heritage enriched modern ideas about its performance and stylistic components and outlined entire areas of the stage realization of his music. The contribution of this article is the study of Schnabel's editorial work on and textual criti-

cism of Beethoven's 32 sonatas, namely his efforts aimed at preserving the integrity of the intended performance.

Literature Review. The writing of the article necessitated the study and analysis of academic works that highlight Ludwig van Beethoven's life and work — a collection of academic articles *Problems of Interaction Between Art, Pedagogy and Theory and Practice of Education. Beethoven — Terra Incognita* (2015); studies on genre, style, and form of Beethoven's piano music — Adolf Bernhard Marx (Marx, 1997); works on the theory and practice of piano performance of Beethoven's heritage by Natalia Kashkadamova (Kashkadamova, 2017), Charles Rosen (Rosen, 2020); studies on the specifics of Artur Schnabel's playing, editing and cultural skills by Claudio Arrau (Arrau, 1957), César Saerchinger (Saerchinger, 1957), Marina Smirnova (Smirnova, 2006); and works by Artur Schnabel himself (Schnabel, 1933; 1942; 1988).

The paper aims to reveal the specific features of Schnabel's approach to the editing of Ludwig van Beethoven's piano sonatas.

The objective of the paper is to characterize the genre and style of Schnabel's textual criticism of music, and their origins in the context of the twentieth-century piano performance.

Results and Discussion. It is important in the context of the stated problem to outline the historical retrospective of editing Beethoven's piano sonatas during the second half of the nineteenth century. The engagement of researchers and famous performers of that era with Beethoven's legacy makes it possible to trace the problem of the performance style discourse of Beethoveniana in the Romantic era. In these editions, "along with deep insights into the essence of Beethoven's genius, one finds the essential transient signs of the performance of the era" (Kashkadamova, p. 380), which were summarized to some extent in the textual criticism of Artur Schnabel (1927).

Almost all of Beethoven's 32 sonatas were published in various editions during the composer's lifetime. It is known that performers and connoisseurs of Beethoven's piano style were eagerly awaiting the printed presentation of each new sonata by the famous master. However, the first complete edition of 32 sonatas was published only in the 1860s. At the same time, the textual criticism of the sonatas remained almost unchanged compared to the lifetime editions of these works (Beethovens, 1862–1865).

In this regard, it is important to note the involvement of Beethoven's pupil Carl Czerny, the famous Austrian composer and piano teacher, in the editing of Beethoven's works. A performer and popularizer of Beethoven's piano works, Czerny in his *Vollständige theoretisch-practische Pianoforte-Schule* op. 500, he was one of the first to turn to the textual interpretation of the teacher's sonatas. First of all, he raises the issue of the figurative and semantic inspiration of individual sonatas, while highlighting, in his opinion, the problematic aspects of Beethoven's fingering, dynamics and pedaling, and other performing and expressive components of Beethoven's style. A separate important aspect, according to the researcher, was the issue of the tempo and rhythmic component of the sonatas. Thus, Czerny was perhaps the first to put tempo marks on the metronome for almost every piano sonata by Beethoven, emphasizing categorically that this is exactly the tempo chosen by the teacher in the interpretation of his own piano heritage.

Ignaz Moscheles, who frequently communicated with the composer in Vienna during 1808–1820, makes similar arguments in the preface to his edition of Beethoven's piano sonatas (1858). It is significant that Czerny's and Moscheles's metronomic instructions do not always coincide, although both musicians emphasized that this is Beethoven's original tempo. The *Andante* tempo of Sonata No. 10 is an example of such a discrepancy.

1860 saw the publication of the 10-volume collection of Beethoven's works edited by Franz Liszt. A composer and admirer of Beethoven's work, Liszt edited the piano sonatas, emphasizing broad phrasing leagues, specific dynamic marks. Further, Liszt introduced special phrasing marks.

A new stage in the editing of Beethoven's sonatas begins with the "instructive Ausgabe mit erläuternden Anmerkungen für Lehrende und Lernende" ("instructive edition with explanatory notes for teachers and students") by Sigmund Lebert and Hans Bülow (1870s). Lebert edited the

early works of Beethoven, and Bülow edited the later works, starting with Op. 53. By this time, Beethoven's sonatas had become part of the repertoire and there was an urgent need for special instructional publications for students and teachers. In his comments, Bülow explains the structure of the work, highlights polyphonic parts, draws attention to typical student mistakes, and provides "formulas" for technical training.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, interest in the author's text grew, and accordingly, publications appeared that combined textual and educational features, and the designations of author and editor were significantly distinguished (for example, there are a number of editions by Frederick Lamond, Leo Weiner, Heinrich Schenker, and other famous performers and researchers of Beethoven's heritage of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries). It is on these principles that the textual criticism of Beethoven's piano concepts by Artur Schnabel, a representative of the Austrian piano school, is based. His approach combines aspects of performing interpretation of Beethoven's heritage, deep involvement in Beethoven's style, and an internal dialog with the editions of Beethoven's sonatas published during the second half of the nineteenth century, and also his own compositional skills.

Artur Schnabel, a representative of the Austrian piano school, deeply understood Beethoven's piano concepts based on his performing work, his prolific editorial activity, and partly due to his compositional skills. In the first half of the twentieth century, Schnabel was considered an intellectual pianist who avoided superficial effects in his performance. According to critics of the time, "his performance revealed a depth and spirituality in the interpretation of the Austrian and German music heritage, especially the works of Beethoven and Schubert" (Cortot, 1986, p. 33). His most famous audio recording is *Beethoven's Complete Piano Sonatas*, created in 1932–1935. At that time, Artur Schnabel was the first to record the complete collection of 32 sonatas by the German composer¹. As a researcher of Beethoven's work, Schnabel was interested in the components of his musical and performing language. The expected outcome of these scholarly and performing interests was the publication in 1927 of the 32 sonatas by Ludwig van Beethoven, edited and commented on by Schnabel. First published in Germany, Schnabel's edition quickly gained popularity among pianists and Beethoven scholars, and for Artur Schnabel himself, it was one of the first steps he made to systematize and generalize his vision as a performer of the German composer's legacy. The impetus for Artur Schnabel to edit Beethoven's 32 sonatas was his realization of the need to fundamentally update the established approaches to reading the piano heritage of the nineteenth century that dominated in the early twentieth century. In general, in his editorial work and textual research on the 32 sonatas, we can observe the greatest possible intensification of the expressive range of the performance, available at that time: "the expansion of the dynamic scale and the impulsive volume change, the unprecedented intensification of tempo contrast in the movements" (Fletcher, 1972, p. 13).

In his approach to understanding the integrity of the idea of 32 sonatas as a certain metatext, a kind of Genesis, Artur Schnabel starts from the idea of Beethoven's absorption and transformation of the artistic and historical experience of the time, the orientation of his ideas towards the future. Therefore, for Schnabel, it is important to understand the genre and style of Beethoven's piano sonatas in their stage modifications. The editor emphasizes the significant influence of the canon of Viennese classicism on Beethoven's ideas during the first period in Sonatas Nos. 1–15. Composed under the obvious influence of certain stylistic patterns of Joseph Haydn and Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, the degree of complexity of these sonatas, according to Schnabel, surpasses almost everything written for the keyboard of that time. The sonatas of the next period, Nos. 16–27, reflect further transformations of Beethoven's genre and style. The composer, according to Schnabel, seems to break the established boundaries of the sonata genre. Sonata No. 18 lacks a slow movement, but the composer introduced a Scherzo and a Minuet. Only the three-movement Sonata No. 26 has the author's program titles: *Das Lebewohl, Abwesenheit, Das Wiedersehen*.

¹ Due to its historical significance, in 2018, Artur Schnabel's recording of 32 Beethoven sonatas was included in the National Recording Registry at the Library of Congress.

In the late period of his life, in anticipation of the expanded virtuosic and expressive possibilities of the new six-octave concert grand piano of the English company Broadwood, Beethoven composed his last five sonatas, Nos. 28–32, which were experimental in form and complex in musical language for the time. This peculiar Beethoven's look into the future defines Schnabel's editorial paradigm about the integrity of the artistic idea of Beethoven's sonata, which is based on the reading of the sonatas from the perspective of Beethoven's achievements during the late period of his career. This conception of Beethoven's heritage influenced the formation of a great cohort of young European pianists, reviving Beethoven's authentic style, based on a deep study of all graphic components of the author's text.

From the point of view of the tasks set, it is natural that Artur Schnabel turned to editing as a particular type of musical interpretation, which combined research, textual criticism of music and pedagogy. Musical thinking and scholarly intuition in his editorial work and textual research on Beethoven's sonatas are based on the close connection between the aural and graphic components of the author's idea. We also trace the significant influence of Schnabel's own performing style on the process of editing Beethoven's sonatas. While realizing Beethoven's ideas, Schnabel's attention was directed to the development of the authorial integrity, spatial and temporal coherence of interpretation, which was achieved through the distinct elaboration of a wide range of stylistic elements of the performance.

Schnabel's editorial notes are systematically verified, and their extensive nature testifies to his rich experience in mastering the German composer's piano works. In general, Schnabel's edition contains many additions in terms of text and performance — the researcher offers versions of melismas, adds interpretation of tempo marks and extensive comments on the grouping of measures, etc.; a large number of remarks relate to dynamics, hidden polyphony, articulation, and the nature of performance. It is worth mentioning Artur Schnabel's comments on meter and rhythm, hence certain patterns of tempo changes that occur at the level of minor deviations from the main tempo. As Marina Smirnova notes, "tempo deviations are caused by psychological changes that influence the course of musical processes <...> tempo indications clearly follow the development of the composer's thought" (Smirnova, p. 130).

The fingering solutions in Schnabel's edition embody the distinct features of intonation, articulation,agogic, rhythmic and sound in Beethoven's style. The fingering is weighed according to the logic of the intonational unfolding of motifs, phrases and more significant constructions that require flexibility and elasticity from the pianist's hand, where the very "fingering principles in the edition of Artur Schnabel are of a triple nature: they reflect the composer's attitude, the principles of the harpsichordist era, and romantic attitudes, which creates a unique system of editorial textual criticism of music" (Smirnova, p. 148).

Schnabel's edition of Ludwig van Beethoven's 32 sonatas is exceptionally detailed, full of scholarly commentary and subtle psychological observations, which generally reflects the editor's desire to comment on minor details of Beethoven's text. In writing the commentary, he followed the principles of Franz Liszt, the pedagogue, who, during his lessons with his students, sought to indicate everything in musical scores.

Artur Schnabel's comments summarize the regularities of Schnabel's scholarly and performer's thinking and attempt to reconstruct the artistic and aesthetic visions of Beethoven's time. However, from the standpoint of contemporary piano composition, his edition is also not perfect in terms of textual criticism of music. In the twentieth century, especially in its second half, many highly authentic editions of Beethoven's sonatas appeared, based on more accurate textual solutions¹.

¹ Among the most famous textual editions of the twentieth century, we should single out the Beethoven editions by Karl Adolf Martinsen, Donald Francis Tovey, Bertha Antonia Wallner, Joseph Fischer, Claudio Arrau, Massimiliano Damerini, István Máriássy, Tamás Zászkaliczky, and others.

The post-Schnabel editions of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries develop the main trends initiated by the outstanding Austrian performer and scholar of Beethoven's heritage. The contemporary approach to editing Beethoven's sonatas is intended to objectively reflect the stylistics of Beethoven's idea alongside the interpretation of the original author's text.

By studying the textual history of the 32 sonatas, Artur Schnabel sought to thoroughly research the rhythmic formulas of Ludwig van Beethoven's pianism, to find the key to understanding the nature of the piano style, and thus to outline the stylistic boundaries of the performance of Beethoven's work. The immersion in Schnabel's edition brings us back to one of the most challenging creative issues — the freedom of stage performance and its limits.

Schnabel's performance commentaries, no matter how detailed, are always variable and can, therefore, be read in different ways in practice. Based on a combination of the desire to revive the authentic Beethoven text and pedagogical and performing understanding, it reflects a deep individual involvement in the core of Beethoven's music.

For Schnabel, it was essential to build a coherent dramaturgy of the historical collection both in the performance version and in the edition of the 32 sonatas. It is known that Schnabel performed Beethoven's sonatas in a cycle of seven concerts. Each of the concerts included four to five sonatas organized into microcycles. The first concert comprised Sonatas 15, 31, 1, 16. The second concert comprised Sonatas 18, 28, 22, 8, 3. The third concert comprised Sonatas 2, 23, 19, 27, 11. The fourth concert comprised Sonatas 12, 17, 5, 6, 26. The fifth concert comprised Sonatas 4, 14, 10, 29. The sixth concert comprised Sonatas 13, 21, 20, 30. The seventh concert comprised Sonatas 9, 7, 25, 24, 32. Essentially, he created a new original reading of all the sonatas as a single cycle that is dramatically unified, originally planned from an interpretive standpoint, and inspired by symbolism and figurative and semantic visions.

Despite some imperfections in textual criticism, Artur Schnabel's edition contains many essential components for creating a convincing stage interpretation. As a scholar and an accomplished pianist, he relied heavily on artistic intuition, an essential component of interpreting Beethoven's legacy. The editor's assumptions behind certain decisions were based on a deep study of the intonational nature of Beethoven's music. First of all, this is reflected in the author's interpretation of pitch, alteration marks, clarification of rhythm, dynamic and articulation scales, and the graphic component of the text itself in terms of voice distribution. As for the latter, the editor's clarifications regarding errors in notation were usually concise but open to scholarly interpretation.

For Artur Schnabel, an important component of a successful performing interpretation is the creation by the performer of an idea of the work as an integral system, considered in the interrelationships and interaction of all the main expressive means, in the unity of content and form, realized in the spacetime continuum of the author's intention. In other words, understanding the integrity of the sonata cycle includes determining the relationship between the artistic level of the work and the means of its realization. Reflecting on the integrity of Schnabel's editorial textual criticism, we mean its realization on a certain multiple basis, when a type of connection between the components is formed in which the combined elements acquire a new quality that is not unique to them. The final performance version of a musical work, in contrast to the composer's text and editor's text, can also be called the performer's text.

At the same time, Artur Schnabel, as a scholar, actively interprets Beethoven's text in the field of articulation and accentuation. "The leagues, as well as the accents and the designation of the method of sound production in the original, are sometimes solved with obvious imperfection — especially in early works, which is why the editor considered it his right to change them according to the logic, meaning and taste: to shorten, lengthen, add, decipher. He did not specifically stipulate these changes. All other additions of the editor are engraved in small print or placed in brackets" (Fletcher, 1972, p. 42). A performer who is guided by Schnabel's edition of the 32 sonatas

should take into account that the methodology of the editorial work primarily reflects the historical conventions of the development of piano performance in the first half of the twentieth century, but it is not sufficient from the standpoint of contemporary textual criticism of the German composer's music. However, it sheds light on the specifics of the drama of the stage realization of the uniqueness of this monumental work.

As for the dynamic unity of the idea, one of the important components of the editorial interpretations of Beethoven's piano sonatas was Schnabel's desire to unite the music, which is full of recitatives, complexly organized musical time, improvisation, by finding a certain internal pulsation. For example, one of the principles of constructing a culminating build-up is to start the crescendo quieter than the previous motif, then maximize the sound power, bringing the polarity of the sound to the limit with gradual acceleration.

In Artur Schnabel's performance concepts, deciphering Beethoven's melismatics is essential¹. While editing Beethoven's 32 sonatas, he worked out this melodic and intonational component in great detail with regard to the traditions and conventions of the eighteenth century. Schnabel emphasized that "the performance of melisma requires deep knowledge and rich imagination from the pianist. The traditions of performing melisma were gradually lost over time, and superficial knowledge in this area led to the impoverishment of performance and sometimes to significant distortions of the composer's idea" (Schnabel, 1933, p. 12). Interpretations of melismatics are found in Schnabel's edition in almost all sonatas, accompanied by detailed comments. Often, the editor offers several options of performing melisma, thus demonstrating his desire for freedom of choice, inviting the performer to a kind of co-creation in interpreting the essence of Beethoven's intention.

The editor's recommendations on trill performance are detailed (especially in Sonata No. 32, *Arietta*; Sonata No. 29, *Allegro risoluto*). Based on Beethoven's manuscripts, Schnabel carefully analyzes the author's recommendations regarding this vital component of the performance, which also highlights the issue of the performer's right to freedom of choice in performing trills according to his taste and capabilities. The performance of trills in Schnabel's creative vision is closely connected with the performance dynamics, accentuation, intonation, and rhythmic expressiveness.

Artur Schnabel's editorial comments on tempo marks are original and analytically profound, aimed at revealing the regularities of the performance tempo and architectonics of the work and its dramatic balance in the temporal and spatial unfolding of the musical fabric. It is known that Ludwig van Beethoven, in comparison to his predecessors, significantly expanded and enriched tempo notation. In his desire to reveal the dramatic nature of the work's development as fully as possible, the composer uses Italian (nowadays a generally accepted universal version of the notation) and German terminology (for example, tempo notation in Sonatas No. 27 and No. 28). In this regard, the opinions of researchers of Beethoven's work and editors of his sonata oeuvre were divided. Many were rather pessimistic about this bilingual principle of tempo marks. However, Schnabel did not share this opinion; moreover, he continued and developed this principle, supplementing many editions of the German composer's works with his tempo marks.

His editorship clearly shows the evolution of Beethoven's interpretation of tempo. We encounter editorial interpretations of Beethoven's tempi in the commentaries of many sonatas. In this context, Schnabel follows the tradition of Liszt, who, in his tempo rhythmic visions of Beethoven's sonatas, took into account the author's tempo marks but, during the performance, could im-

¹ Deciphering melismatics is also found in the editions of Schnabel's predecessors, particularly Hans von Bülow. In several cases, Bülow even offers performers various exercises to improve their skills. However, compared to Schnabel's visions, Bülow's recommendations are usually unambiguous and do not allow different interpretations. Bertha Antonia Wallner and Conrad Hansen, in their urtext editions of Beethoven's 32 sonatas, have not entirely resolved the issue of performing melismatics, in particular trills, either.

plement these marks quite freely. As an essential component of his editorial approach, Artur Schnabel's comments on the nature of music are also directly related to metronomic notes¹. The editor makes metronomic notes in almost all sonatas at the beginning of each movement². Artur Schnabel's tempo decisions in interpreting Ludwig van Beethoven's legacy were realized through a sharply conflicting juxtaposition of sonata parts, which allowed the performer to rethink the dramatic features of the cycle's development.

In addition to the metronomic tempo marks at the beginning of each movement, Schnabel's edition contains detailed metronomic notes within the movement, which allowed the editor to comment flexibly on the development of musical thought. In the slow movements of Beethoven's sonatas, as a performer, Artur Schnabel takes considerable freedom when it comes to tempo, which is also often reflected in the scale of his metronome values. However, in his editorial commentary on the sonatas of Beethoven's early and partly of his middle period, Schnabel treats metronomic freedom quite cautiously. In most sonatas of the middle and late periods, Schnabel's metronomic notes are detailed, aimed at preserving Beethoven's idea, following Beethoven's comments in the first editions of his sonatas. As an editor, Artur Schnabel only suggests an artistic and expressive solution, leaving it to the performer to find the acceptable limits of its realization. In other cases, the metronome serves as a warning against undesirable exaggerations.

For Artur Schnabel, articulatory expressiveness is essential in any melodic construction. According to his principles of intonation, Schnabel avoids emphasizing strong beats in fast tempi. In the stage performance of fast passages, he started with unstressed beats, which gave his performance flexibility, tension, and explosiveness in reading the compositional intent of the sonatas. Thus, the specifics of Schnabel's sound and other components of his unique performing style were reflected in a rather detailed manner in his editorial notes.

In the field of dynamics, Schnabel continues the tradition of Bülow, who, unlike Liszt, recorded not only dynamic contrasts but also enriched the entire range of dynamic grades. In Beethoven's 32 sonatas edited by Schnabel, several editorial remarks and comments are aimed at the expressive performance of melody. Schnabel adds the upper and lower notes to reveal the hidden polyphony.

As a performer and editor of Beethoven's texts, Schnabel unconditionally accepted the German composer's principles of pedaling. In his edition of the sonatas, he always preserved the composer's pedaling notes. In the notes, he indicates Beethoven authorship of these pedaling notes and does not offer any parallel solutions. Schnabel's pedaling notes in his edition are somewhat unevenly distributed. In several sonatas, they are absent; in others, they are minimal; elsewhere, they are highly detailed (mainly in slow movements).

The fingering principles in the textual criticism of Schnabel's Beethoven sonatas are aimed not only at performance convenience, but also largely develop the authenticity of the style, which, according to the editor, corresponds to the essence of Beethoven's expression, and also solve a number of musical and performance issues: phrasing, articulation, dynamic, rhythmic, and agogic components.

The pianist's fingering recommendations require mastery of the perfect finger *legato* with the utmost flexibility of the hand and the calmest possible hand position. Therefore, Schnabel's fingering is not accessible to every pianist, artistically and technically. However, one can fully implement Schnabel's remarks and comments only by following his fingering recommendations. This applies to tempi, rhythmic music performance, sound, and pedaling. In general, the extraordinary ap-

¹ The system of metronomic notation is one of the main editorial innovations in Schnabel's edition of the 32 sonatas by Ludwig van Beethoven, aimed at providing a more correct reproduction of Beethoven's style.

² The only exception is Sonata No. 29, where the metronomic notes were made by Beethoven himself.

proach of the editor and the pianist in interpreting the fingering principles of performing Beethoven's music establishes Artur Schnabel as an innovator in the field of piano technique.

Conclusions. Schnabel's edition of Ludwig van Beethoven's 32 sonatas is one of the most significant editions of the German composer's works. From the point of view of performance, it is helpful when the interpreter has experience and, therefore, can formulate ideas about the personal style of the German composer. In this work, Schnabel managed to capture the ideas that encourage creative comprehension and are not intended to be taken literally in stage realization. It is no coincidence that Artur Schnabel advised pianists to turn to his edition only after they had formulated their concept of interpreting Beethoven's music.

One hundred years have passed since Schnabel created his edition of the Beethoven sonatas. During this time, we can observe periods of enthusiasm for this edition by performers, but there were also periods of lukewarm attitude toward it. Nevertheless, Schnabel's edition is an artistically and practically comprehensive and valuable work in terms of performance, methodology, and history of music.

References

1. Arrau, C. (1952, February). Artur Schnabel: Servant of the Music. *Musical America*, 42, 31.
2. Beethoven, L. (1935). *32 Sonatas for the Piano*. Ed. Artur Schnabel. Text in German, French, and English. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc.
3. Beethoven, L. (1862–1865). *Kritische Gesamt-Ausgabe der Werke Beethovens*. Serie XVI (3 B-de). Sonaten. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
4. Cortot, A. (1986). *Rational Principles of Piano Technique*. Hal Leonard Corporation.
5. Fletcher, S. (1972). Schnabel and Piano Technique. *Clavier*, Vol. 11.
6. Hanzburh, H. I., (Ed.). (2015). *Problemy vzaiemodii mystetstva, pedahohiky ta teorii i praktyky osvity* [Problems of Interaction Between Art, Pedagogy and Theory and Practice of Education]. Vol. 45. Beethoven — terra incognita. Kharkiv I. P. Kotlyarevsky National University of Arts. Kharkiv: Vydavnytstvo TOV "S. A. M." [in Ukrainian].
7. Kashkadamova, N. (2017). *Fortepianno-vykonavske mystetstvo Ukrainy. Istorychni narysy* [Piano Performance Art of Ukraine. Historical Essays]. Lviv: KINPATRI LTD [in Ukrainian].
8. Marx, A. B. (1997). *Musical Form in the Age of Beethoven: Selected Writings on Theory and Method*. Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.
9. Rosen, C. (2020). *Beethoven's Piano Sonatas: A Short Companion*. Yale University Press.
10. Saerchinger, C. (1957). *Artur Schnabel: A Biography*. London: Cassel & Company LTD.
11. Schnabel, A. (1933). *Reflections on Music*. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press.
12. Schnabel, A. (1942). *Music and the Line of Most Resistance*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
13. Schnabel, A. (1988). *My Life and Music*. New York: Dover Publications ; Gerrards Cross, Eng. : C. Smythe.
14. Smirnova, M. (2006). *Artur Schnabel i ego epoha* [Artur Schnabel and His Epoch]. Saint Petersburg [in Russian].

Література

1. Кашкадамова Н. Фортеп'янно-виконавське мистецтво України. Історичні нариси. Львів: КІНПАТРИ ЛТД, 2017. 611 с.
2. Проблеми взаємодії мистецтва, педагогіки та теорії і практики освіти : зб. наук. ст. Вип. 45. Бетховен — terra incognita / Харк. нац. ун-т мистецтв імені І. П. Котляревського ; ред.-упоряд. Г. І. Ганзбург. Харків: Видавництво ТОВ «С. А. М.», 2015. 244 с.
3. Смирнова М. Артур Шнабель и его эпоха. Санкт-Петербург, 2006. 351 с.

4. Arrau C. Artur Schnabel: Servant of the Music // Musical America. 1952. Vol. 42, February. P. 31.
5. Beethoven L. Kritische Gesamt-Ausgabe der Werke Beethovens. Serie XVI (3 B-de). Sonaten. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, [1862–1865].
6. Beethoven L. 32 Sonatas for the Piano / Ed. Artur Schnabel. Text in German, French, and English. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc, 1935.
7. Cortot A. Rational Principles of Piano Technique. Hal Leonard Corporation, 1986.
8. Fletcher S. Schnabel and Piano Technique // Clavier. 1972. Vol. 11.
9. Marx A. B. Musical Form in the Age of Beethoven: Selected Writings on Theory and Method. Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
10. Rosen C. Beethoven's Piano Sonatas: A Short Companion. Yale University Press, 2020.
11. Saerchinger C. Artur Schnabel: A Biography. London: Cassel & Company LTD, 1957.
12. Schnabel A. Reflections on Music. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1933.
13. Schnabel A. Music and the Line of Most Resistance. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1942.
14. Schnabel A. My Life and Music. New York: Dover Publications ; Gerrards Cross, Eng. : C. Smythe, 1988.

ДЕСІНЬ С.

РЕДАКТОРСЬКІ СТРАТЕГІЇ АРТУРА ШНАБЕЛЯ У ПУБЛІКАЦІЯХ ФОРТЕПІАННИХ СОНАТ ЛЮДВІГА ВАН БЕТХОВЕНА

Анотація. Серед найвищих здобутків віденських класиків — 32 сонати для фортепіано Людвіга ван Бетховена (1770–1827). Виконавське прочитання авторської концепції цих циклів потребує ретельного вивчення авторського тексту. У цьому контексті важливим є звернення до редакцій цих творів з їхньою опорою на виконавську специфіку. Дослідження особливостей редакції 32 сонат Л. ван Бетховена, яку здійснив у першій половині ХХ століття Артур Шнабель, видатний австрійський піаніст і дослідник творчості Бетховена, збагатить сучасні уявлення про стилістику бетховенської фортепіанної творчості. У редакції бетховенських сонат А. Шнабеля вдалося зафіксувати ідеї, що спонукають до творчого підходу у їх концертному виконанні.

Звернення А. Шнабеля до редагування як особливого виду музичної інтерпретації поєднало у собі науково-пошукову, текстологічну та педагогічну діяльність. Музичне мислення та наукова інтуїція у його редакторській текстології сонат Бетховена базується на тісному зв'язку між слуховими і графічними компонентами авторського задуму. Редакторські зауваги А. Шнабеля є системно вивіреними, а їхня розгалуженість свідчить про багатий професійний досвід в опануванні фортепіанної творчості німецького композитора. Загалом редакція Шнабеля містить чимало доповнень як у текстологічному, так і виконавському аспектах — дослідник пропонує варіанти виконання мелізмів, додає розшифрування темпових вказівок та розлогі коментарі щодо групування тривалостей тощо; велика кількість ремарок відноситься до динаміки, прихованого багатоголосся, артикуляції, характеру виконання. Редакція А. Шнабеля в художньому та практичному плані є надзвичайно цілісною та цінною як виконавська та методично-історична праця.

Ключові слова: сонатний цикл, музична текстологія, редакторська робота Артура Шнабеля, 32 сонати для фортепіано Людвіга ван Бетховена, авторський текст, уртекст, музична інтерпретація.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 08.09.2023