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INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this study is to assemble in one source as much of the historical data pertinent to the D Major Cello Concerto of Joseph Haydn as is possible in such a work. Many articles have been written over the years concerning this concerto. The major concern of these articles has been whether or not Haydn actually composed the D Major Cello Concerto. All of the known arguments will be approached and discussed and some conclusions will be drawn. It is interesting to note that all such arguments were published before the whereabouts of the autograph manuscript was widely known. The present author was able to obtain a microfilm copy of the autograph from the Austrian National Library in Vienna to whom he is deeply indebted. This microfilm has proven itself invaluable in this study. Many references to the autograph will be made throughout this work, especially in Chapters Three and Four, dealing with the Gevaert changes and the current editions of the concerto.

This leads to a second purpose of this paper. That purpose is to determine which of the current editions of the D Major Cello Concerto follows the manuscript most accurately. There have been many published editions of this concerto and presently there are more than eight to choose from. The decision of which edition to use when studying this piece is largely a matter of personal taste, but one should take into consideration whether or not the edition used is authentic. At this time there is an appalling lack of critical editions in the cello

v
repertoire, with only the Bach Suites and the Beethoven and Brahms Sonatas available in such editions. Critical editions do not always contain the most effective bowing and fingerling indications, but a well-schooled player can reach his own conclusions concerning correct notes, dynamics, phrases and articulations. Authentic scores eliminate the questionable indications of ill-informed and misguided editions; the serious music student will try to determine what the composer really wanted. It is the real concern of this author that in the forthcoming years there will be more critical editions of the cello repertoire made available to both students and teachers.

Just a note concerning translations. Translations on page 10 and 14 are by Josef Marx. All others, unless otherwise noted in the footnotes, are mine.
CHAPTER 1

HAYDN AT ESZTERHÁZA

On May 1, 1761, Joseph Haydn, then twenty-nine years old, signed the contract which determined the course of his life for the following twenty-nine years. He was now in the employ of Prince Paul Anton Esterhazy and would be serving as subordinate to Gregor Werner, the Ober Kapellmeister. Werner had been in the service of the Prince for twenty-eight years and it was decided when Haydn was first employed that Werner would remain in charge of the church music and Haydn would take lead as Vice Kapellmeister of the "Cammer Musique". Werner, during Haydn's first years of service, was old and in ill health and Haydn, consequently, gradually took over more and more of the total responsibility.

On March 1, 1762 Prince Paul Anton died, less than eleven months after he had engaged Haydn. His successor was his brother, Nicholas, to whom Haydn gave his longest and most devoted service. Nicholas's love of pomp, which earned him the nickname of "The Magnificent", displayed itself in the richness of his attire and in the lavishness with which he surrounded himself with every cultural adornment appertaining to a prince. He was an ardent and discriminating

music lover and himself an aspiring performer, like most noblemen of his time. The instrument of his choice was one now obsolete, the Baryton, a curious hybrid between a viola da gamba and a guitar: its difficulty and its oddness appealed alike to his vanity.

After successfully providing masses, operettas and orchestral music for the formal entry of Prince Nicholas into Eisenstadt on May 2, 1762, Haydn so pleased the Prince with his work that his salary was raised by two hundred florins a year, from four hundred to six hundred. This sum was considerably more than Werner's, a fact which can hardly have sweetened the old man's temper.

There was also growing concern for the fact that the Prince took Haydn and most of the musicians to Eszterháza for long periods of time, leaving Werner and a few musicians in Eisenstadt to tend to the church music there. Werner was becoming insanely jealous of Haydn and at the end of 1765 he wrote a letter to the Prince accusing Haydn of what amounted to criminal negligence in the management of the Castle Choir, its music library and its instruments. There were three results of this accusation: (1) The so-called "Regulatio Chori Kissmartoniensis", instructing Haydn in all his duties and ordering him to draw up a detailed catalog of the Eszterháza music archives and instruments; (2) Haydn's Entwurf-Katalog, an immensely valuable thematic catalog drawn up about 1765 by Haydn, which the composer kept up to date until after the London visits; (3) A set of new Baryton pieces. The Prince also

2. Landon, Chronicle and Works, p. 118.
recommended that Haydn compose more diligently than heretofore - hence
the Entwurf-Katalog, to show graphically how many works Haydn had composed
up to 1765. There was nothing Haydn could do about the other vicious
accusations Werner had made. No doubt the Entwurf-Katalog and the new
Baryton pieces were responsible for the happy fact that the whole affair
was soon forgotten.

On March 3, 1766, Werner died. Haydn's promotion was not
assured by the contract he was working under but Prince Nicholas was
certainly satisfied with Haydn and his promotion to full Chapel Master
took place, in a sense, so automatically that there is no known written
record of it in the Esterhazy Archives.

On the first day of January, 1779 a new contract was drawn up
between Prince Nicholas and Haydn which replaced the old one of May 1,
1761. Many of the clauses of the old contract were changed by omitting
some rather offensive wording and also some of the provisions. Listed
below are the main provisions of the 1779 contract:

1. Herr Haydn is to conduct himself in a manner which is
Christian and God-fearing.

2. Herr Capell-Meister is to treat his subordinates at all
times with great goodness and forbearance.

3. The party of the second part [Haydn] agrees to perform
any music of one kind or another in all the places, and
at all the times, to which and when H. Highness is
pleased to command.

4. The party of the second part should not, without special

3. Landon, Chronicle and Works, p. 118.
4. Landon, Chronicle and Works, p. 119.
permission absent himself from his duties, nor from the
place to which H. Highness has ordered the musicians.

5. Both contractual parties reserve the right to cancel the
agreement.

6. Herr Capell-Meister will receive every two years one winter
and one summer uniform, alternately, according to H.
Highness's discretion. Then the contract lists the amount of money, wine, firewood,
wheat, rye, beef, candles, cabbage and beets together, and forage for
two horses that Haydn would receive in return for his services to the
Prince. The above list of duties does not look especially taxing unless
one remembers that Prince Nicholas was an ardent music lover. Haydn
carried the weighty responsibility for all of the music making for the
pleasure of the Prince. Geiringer writes of this time:

The number and variety of the duties expected from Haydn
are staggering. There is no great conductor today who has to
do one half of what was required of Haydn. Three different
spheres of activities were entrusted to him. He was conductor,
which meant daily practice with orchestra and singers and very
frequent performances; he had to compose a great part of the
enormous amount of the music performed; finally, he was an
important officer of administration, uniting in his person the
positions of librarian, supervisor of instruments, and chief
of musical personnel. All of this Haydn did, and he performed
his duties extremely well.

During just the first two years as Assistant Capellmeister,
Haydn wrote five violin concertos, a cello concerto in C which was lost
until the 1960's, a double bass concerto and two horn concertos. The
concerto seems not to have been a favorite form of his, because later in
life he wrote concertos only when they were expressly commissioned.

5. Landon, Chronicle and Works, p. 42.

Probably the early works were written to please his orchestra members. He was extremely busy and when he wrote out the score of the first horn concerto he mixed up the staves of the oboe and first violin and wrote on the score, as he corrected his mistake, "Written while asleep".

During the period of time that Haydn was in the Eszterhazy employ he wrote ten keyboard concertos, four violin concertos, two cello concertos, one double bass concerto, at least two horn concertos, a flute concerto, five concertos for two lire organizzate and a concerto for violin and cembalo. The dates of composition for some of these works are not known and there are spurious works, not listed above.

The two well known cello concertos by Haydn were both written during the Eszterhazy period. The first one in C Major was probably composed in either 1765 or 1766 and was written for Joseph Weigl. Weigl played cello in the Eszterhazy orchestra from May, 1761 until the end of May, 1769. Haydn was a great friend of this fine musician and he also wrote the beautiful and taxing cello solos of Symphonies Nos. 6-8 for him.

In 1764 Weigl married Anna Maria Scheffstoss, a soprano in the employ of Eszterhazy, who had a light flexible voice with considerable sustaining power. Haydn chose her especially for two attractive roles in his operas and for the taxing soprano part in the Stabat Mater. Haydn and his wife were godparents to Joseph, the eldest son of the Weigl - Scheffstoss union, and later to Anton Aloysius. Joseph Jr.

later delighted Haydn's fatherly heart by winning fame as a composer before the century was over. The Weigls moved to Vienna where Joseph Sr. joined the Court Orchestra and remained in that position for the rest of his professional life.

The C Major Cello Concerto was lost for almost two hundred years. Only the first theme was known. This was contained in the catalog of Haydn's works which he assembled and also in the Pohl Biography of 1882. The Concerto was rediscovered in Prague by H. C. Robbins Landon in 1961. Since its rediscovery, the C Major Concerto has enjoyed immense popularity and has been repeatedly performed by the world's leading cellists.

The second cello concerto, in D Major and the subject of this paper, was composed in 1783 for Anton Kraft, cellist in the Eszterháza Orchestra from January 6, 1778 until the end of September, 1790. Kraft was popular with Prince Nicholas, who heard him in Vienna and engaged him at once. The Prince was godfather to Kraft's first child, Nicholas, born in December, 1778, and destined to be a great cellist himself. Kraft, who later went to Vienna and played in the Grassalkovics Orchestra, was also a composer. He wrote trios for two barytons and cello as well as string quartets and other works. He studied composition for

8. Landon, Chronicle and Works, p. 54 and 82.
a time with Haydn. In 1796 he joined the Lobkowitz Capelle and in 1802
he and his son, Nicholas, intended to join the Esterhazy Orchestra but
their fees were too high. Prince Nicholas II nevertheless gave him a
yearly present of six Eimer "officers" of wine from the princely cellars.
Kraft was also the cellist Beethoven had in mind when he composed his
11
Triple Concerto op. 56. Kraft died in 1820.

The period from 1766 to 1790 was a very busy time in Haydn's
life. It is difficult to imagine how he was able to perform so many
duties in such a grand manner. He did, however, engage in some sporting
activities. We read from Griesinger's account:

Hunting and fishing were Haydn's favorite pastimes during
his stay in Hungary [at Eszterháza], and he never forgot that
he once brought down with one shot three hazel-hens, which
appeared on the table of Empress Maria Theresa. Another time
he aimed at a hare, only shot off his tail, but at the same
time killed a pheasant that chanced to be close by; and his
dog, pursuing the hare, strangled itself in a snare. In
riding Haydn developed no skill, because after he had fallen
from a horse on the Morzin estates, he never again trusted
himself to mount. Even Mozart, who liked riding horseback
for exercise, was always made fearfully anxious by it.

Griesinger continues:

Prince Nicholas Esterhazy had a connoisseur's taste and was
a passionate lover of music, as well as a good violinist. He
had his own opera, comedy theater, marionette theater, church
music and chamber music. Haydn had his hands full. He
composed, he had to conduct all the music, help to rehearse
everything, give lessons and even tune his own clavier in the
orchestra. He oftentimes wondered how it had been possible
for him to write so much when he was obliged to lose so many
hours in mechanical tasks...12

11. Landon, Chronicle and Works, p. 73.

12. G. A. Griesinger, Biographical Notes Concerning Joseph
Haydn, trans. by Vernon Gotwals, (Madison: University of Wisconsin
Although it must be said that Haydn's outward circumstance was anything but brilliant, it nevertheless provided him with the best opportunity for the development of his many-sided talents. 'My Prince was satisfied with all my works; I received approval; as head of an orchestra, I could undertake experiments, could observe that which enhanced an effect and that which weakened it, thus improving, adding to it, taking away from it, taking risks. I was cut off from the world; there was no one in my vicinity to make me unsure of myself or to persecute me; and so I had to become original.'

CHAPTER 2

IS HAYDN'S D MAJOR CELLO CONCERTO AUTHENTIC?

The Cello Concerto in D Major by Joseph Haydn was composed in 1783. During this period of Haydn's life at Eszterháza he was extremely busy composing and performing operas for the princely household. It is difficult to imagine where he found the time to compose this large concerto. The concerto was written for the cellist, Anton Kraft, as was noted in the previous chapter. We know that Kraft was a composition student of Haydn's because in 1799 Kraft had three sonatas for violoncello published by Johann André of Offenbach-am-Main. In this edition's title page, Kraft is expressly listed as Haydn's pupil. In the 

biography of Haydn by Karl Ferdinand Pohl, published in 1882, Pohl mentions that Kraft was found among Haydn's pupils of 1779.

There has been a long-standing controversy concerning Haydn's authorship of this concerto. The controversy stems from this statement made by Gustav Schilling in his Encyclopädie der Gesamten Musikalischen Wissenschaften.

...denn eben dieses Concert Krafts ist dasjenige Violoncelconcert, welches später, nach Haydns tode, als Nachlass


von ihm auch unter seinem Namen (Offenbach bei André) gedruckt wurde, und bis zur Stunde noch allgemein für ein wirkliches werk Haydns behalten wird, während es doch, was Schreiber Dieses aus bester Quelle weiss, unserem Kraft angehört.³

[Just this very concerto by Kraft is the one which later, after Haydn's death, was published posthumously under his name (André, Offenbach) and up to now considered a genuine work of Haydn's, whereas the writer of these lines has it from the best source that it belongs to our Kraft.]

This statement by Schilling was made in the biography of Anton Kraft. There is one major fallacy in Schilling's statement, however. He says that the concerto was published by André after Haydn's death. This is not true. The concerto was published by Johann André of Offenbach-am-Main 'd'après le manuscrit original de l'auteur' in 1804, and was thereafter reprinted by Vernay in Paris. The concerto, then, was published a good five years before Haydn's death on May 31, 1809. We can safely assume that Schilling's "best source" was Nicholas Kraft, Anton's son, who lived in Stuttgart from 1814 to 1834 while he worked as first cellist in the Royal Orchestra and stayed even longer after he retired (after his ten year losing battle with a finger injured while tuning the cello) until his death in 1853. Schilling's work was written during that period in Stuttgart. Schilling signed his various contributions "Sch", and the Kraft article is signed at the bottom of the account of Nicholas Kraft, with an "A". No list is given by which to identify this initial; it does not belong to any of the contributors named on the title page. This, however, does not detract in any way


4 Landon, Chronicle and Works, p. 569.
from the validity of Schilling's argument since the contributor "A" had the same opportunity to know Nicholas Kraft as had Schilling.

In 1932 a German musicologist, Hans Volkmann (the son of composer Robert Volkmann), published an article entitled "Ist Haydns Cello-Konzert Echt?". This scholarly article appeared in the Berlin journal Die Musik. In the article Volkmann refers to the Schilling biography of Anton Kraft, uses the statement quoted above and bases his entire argument on Schilling's biography. He proceeds further to say that Kraft's own cello concerto in C Major is very similar to the D Major Concerto:


[The first movement strides in with splendor, the final rondo "alla cosacca" hurries on in saucy gracefulness. The middle Romanze in E Major weaves through high melodic beauty, the instrumentation is carefully selected. Whoever wrote this concerto could have also created the concerto in question, even if inwardly it is totally different. In both concertos the solo cello is led very high, while it, in the surely authentic D Major Concerto of Haydn, predominantly moves in the middle range - an instance, that in the question of authenticity, speaks strongly for Anton Kraft.]

In 1936, shortly after the above article was written, Donald Francis Tovey wrote:

... I find no difficulty in giving Kraft the credit for a very pretty piece of work in a form in which Haydn never put forward his full powers, and which, if genuine, would have belonged to a period at which his style and forms were imitable enough to tempt many publishers to secure a market for other composers by ascribing their works to a master whose early popularity was so remarkable... Now that I have no doubt, I shall in the future give Anton Kraft the credit for his very pretty work; and I shall expect my audience not to be snobbish about it.6

Jens Peter Larsen defends the authorship of Haydn in his authoritative study of the Haydn tradition, citing as evidence the former existence of the autograph of this concerto.

In 1946, Karl Geiringer published his definitive biography of Haydn. In this volume he refers to the Volkmann argument in a footnote, and in discussing the controversy surrounding the authenticity of the concerto he mentions that some have attributed the D Major work to Anton Kraft. In discussing the compositions of Kraft Geiringer continues:

But there is nothing among Kraft's known, and incidentally rather mediocre, compositions to justify the attribution of a masterpiece like the D Major Concerto to him, while this work certainly finds a place among the compositions of the mature Haydn.8

In 1948 the German-American musicologist-music publisher, Josef Marx, published an edition of the Sonata for Cello and Piano op. 2 no. 2 by Anton Kraft. In the rather lengthy introduction to this sonata, Marx


states, in refutation of Geiringer's comment about Kraft's "rather mediocre" compositions:

A comparison with what is available of yet other alleged Haydn cello concerti shows not one authentic or even doubtful composition which is in any way comparable to the D Major Concerto as regards tessitura, double stopping, and the general requirements of virtuosity. Nor is there any similarity to be found in the cello parts of other works of Haydn. On the other hand, both Volkmann and Altmann have found the comparison with the only known authentic concerto of Kraft, op. 4, to yield many similarities in the treatment of the cello as regards the criteria mentioned above. A comparison with other works of Kraft ... allows us to go further and to state that the treatment of the cello as found in the D Major Concerto is never met with again in any of the known works of Haydn whereas it is identical with that found in every one of the known works of Kraft. Geiringer's very statements: 'the part of the solo cello is not only brilliant but all the other instruments look to it for leadership' is typical of Kraft's work and betokens a cello virtuoso as the author of this work rather than a composer. An unprejudiced study of Kraft's music shows that he is by no means a mediocre composer and that he had sufficient ability to make his authorship of this concerto, with or without Haydn's help, at least plausible.9

This argument is a very convincing one in behalf of Anton Kraft but it does not, nor do the others, take into account the Haydn Autograph Manuscript. During the time that all of this was discussed the manuscript was considered lost. However, in an article entitled "Ein Haydn-Autograph und sein Schicksal: Das Cello-Konzert in D-dur op. 101", Leopold Nowak informs us that the autograph is in the possession of the Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. During the Second World War it was placed in the salvage basement by Dr. Erwin Luntz (d. Vienna, 1949). In 1947 the autograph was uncovered with the whole

music collection in which it is still found today. Nowak then received the assignment from the general direction of the Austrian National Library to research and establish something about its history and the previous owners of the Autograph Manuscript. According to Nowak, André, who first published this concerto in 1804, must have used the autograph. The subtitle "Edition d'après le manuscrit original de l'auteur", certainly points to that conclusion. Also, the opus number and the foreign handwriting on the title page of the autograph could point back to André (see Fig. 1, p. 15). Concerning the whereabouts of the autograph in this early time there is nothing known. In the middle of the nineteenth century, it was written (by an unknown hand in the thematic catalog of the works of Haydn by Aloys Fuchs) that the autograph was in the possession of a Dr. Meinert, in Dresden.

The next report comes from the collection of materials of K. F. Pohl's for his biography of Haydn. Therein is found a note, again written by an unknown hand:


[Autograph in the possession of Court cond. Dr. Julius Rietz in Dresden. Title: Concerto per il Violoncello di me]


11. Aloys Fuchs, who died in 1853 in Vienna, was an official in the Royal War Council, but also an educated music lover who possessed a valuable collection of composer autographs. His Haydn Index came into the possession of the City Library of Berlin (now the Prussian State Library).

Fig. 1. Title page of the autograph manuscript of the Haydn D Major Cello Concerto
Guiseppe Haydn mp. 1783. At the end: 'Laus Deo'. 33 sheets with 65 written pages. Oblong pages of 10 lines each."

On Pohl's own file card, corrected according to this note, it says further: "Köchel fand das Autograph dei Kofkapellm. Dr. Julius Rietz in Dresden." [Köchel found this autograph in the possession of Court conductor Dr. Julius Reitz in Dresden.] The time that these notes were written is not known but Nowak speculates that it was probably around 1880. He also comments that it could have been after the printing of the second volume of his Haydn Biography (1882), but it must have been before 1887, the year of Pohl's death.

From this time on the autograph was lost for nearly seventy years. It did not come forth in the Haydn celebration years of 1909 or 1932, even with the essay by Volkmann in circulation. Nor did it appear for the new edition of the concerto printed by Eulenburg in 1935. Only in 1947 was it finally brought back to light.

In his biography of Haydn, Leopold Nowak, in 1961, states that the concerto must be by Haydn. He continues:

Die Reife der Form, die Geschmeidigkeit und melodische Fülle der Themen wie überhaupt Empfindung und Klarheit der Gedankenentwicklung können nur einen Haydn zum Urheber haben.15

[The maturity of the form, the suppleness and melodic wealth of the themes, as well as the overall perception and clarity of the development of thought can have only a Haydn as its author.]

Rosemary Hughes, in the revised edition of her biography of Haydn, states that Jens Peter Larsen "successfully championed" the D Major concerto as an authentic work of Haydn. This was done, she said, even before the discovery of the autograph.

In the most extensive and conclusive biography of Haydn ever published, H. C. Robbins Landon states his own conviction that Haydn wrote the concerto. About the argument concerning the authenticity of the work, Landon writes:

There is no mystification in all this. Nicholas Kraft undoubtedly heard from his father that Haydn and Anton Kraft had collaborated on the concerto: the 'cello part was certainly 'tailor-made' for Kraft, and all those brilliant technical effects - indications for flageolet notes (marked 'flautino' in the autograph and André: see I, 175), for various strings ('sul G' at I, 50, 'sul D' at I, 153) are never found in Haydn's earlier C Major Violoncello Concerto (VIIb: I) - show that this is a typical eighteenth century attempt on the part of the composer to display the talents, tone and musicianship of his soloist.16

The rediscovery of the manuscript has fairly well proven that Haydn composed the concerto. Nowak observes:

The score points entirely to Haydn's own hand. The small elegant noteheads with the slender flags, surely written in haste, but still with a neat appearance and a clarity that defies any obscurity.17

In the excerpt from the Landon biography above, he mentions that none of the special effects found in the D Major concerto are found in the C Major concerto. In discussing the D Major concerto one must refer,

16. Landon, Chronicle and Works, p. 570.
for comparison, to the C Major work, written approximately eighteen years earlier. In Josef Marx's article he states that there is "not one authentic or even doubtful composition [by Haydn] which is in any way comparable to the D Major concerto as regards tessitura, double stoppings and general requirements of virtuosity". The discovery of the C Major concerto in 1961, of course, refutes this statement. In the C Major work there are similar high tessitura passages, double stop passages and the "general requirements of virtuosity" are just as high, if not higher, than in the D Major concerto.

It is generally accepted that Haydn wrote the C Major concerto for Joseph Weigl, the first cellist in the Court Orchestra from 1761 to 1769. Haydn was very close to the Weigls, as is evidenced by their calling upon the Haydns to be godparents to both of their children born during this time.

There is, however, no indication that Haydn had a similar relationship with Kraft. It is known that Kraft himself chose the Prince as godfather to all of his children but one, for whom Haydn was called upon. The Prince himself engaged Kraft in 1778; this was an exceptional practice. Although there is no proof that Haydn had a poor relationship with Kraft, there is no evidence that points to an exceptionally good one, either. It becomes evident, then, that Kraft could have taken lessons in composition from Haydn: first of all, to boost his own composing skills; and secondly to have the name of the famous Haydn associated with his own. There is also some evidence that Haydn

discouraged Kraft from his composition lessons "when Haydn began to fear that the restless diligence with which Kraft devoted himself to these studies would estrange him from his instrument which, after all, was the reason for his already having made a great name for himself in the 19 musical world". Schilling, in referring to these lessons and compositions that Kraft turned in to Haydn for criticism, writes:

The first of these was a violoncello concerto. ...Haydn, recognizing its excellence, preferred, for the reason stated above, to withhold his judgment rather than to give it against his real convictions, and thus left the manuscript among his papers; Kraft, therefore, of the opinion that he had created something without value, since Haydn was completely silent about it, out of artistic shame, never asked for it.20

Whether this in fact did happen, or if this was the D Major concerto, we cannot be sure. But if Kraft did give Haydn a concerto that was not returned and Haydn used Kraft's sketchs to write a concerto of his own, this could possibly explain why Haydn did not even attempt to sell the concerto to a publisher until 1804, when, because of memory lapses and ill health, he strengthened his efforts to put as many of his compositions as he could to good financial use.

If Haydn did indeed use Kraft's themes in composing the D Major concerto, this could, in part, explain why some who have written about this work have been so strong in criticising the work. Sir Donald Francis Tovey wrote (in referring to the first themes of the concerto):

The first [theme to the first movement] surprises us by being based on a cliché we would have thought peculiar to Mozart. My knowledge of the lesser contemporaries of Haydn and Mozart is

severely limited by my patience, and I have not found this cliché elsewhere. But in the slow movement the same cliché is followed by one equally peculiar to Haydn.

Nobody can tell me the exact notes of the tune 'Here we go gathering nuts in May'; but everybody agrees that the finale of Haydn's cello concerto is suspiciously like it. And perhaps the wicked people who, with the late Mr. Rudyard Kipling among them persecuted the miso-auto-bureaucrat squire J.P. and M.P. for Huckle, may have reverted to the Haydn archtype when they turned this innocent tune into The Village that Voted the Earth Was Flat. At all events, bars 5 and 6 of... the finale irresistibly remind me of

Flat as my hat
Flatter than that!

But we digress. And so does Haydn.21

H. C. Robbins Landon in his Haydn: Chronicle and Works, speaking of this concerto, writes:

...This concerto has been the delight of 'cellists the world over - less the delight of audiences, who are obliged to listen to passages of fabulous virtuosity which are the pride of the soloists and anathema to any except the highly trained listener: the work sounds extremely long: the 8/8 opening Allegro moderato also probably enjoyed a huge cadenza, as did the other two movements; there is, moreover, an extraordinary lack of tension in this music. ...'Here we go gathering nuts in May' springs, of course, to the cynical Anglo-Saxon mind when we encounter the pleasant rondo meanderings of the Finale (6/8), which is full of virtuoso passages fascinating to the soloists and painful to the listener (e.g. bars 119 ff., where one always cringes to hear if the octaves will be in tune, which they occasionally are). One remembers with sadness and perplexity that for many years, this concerto would be the only work by Haydn in the yearly season of the Boston Symphony or the Philadelphia Orchestra. And not only are we used to another concerto language from Mozart, and at this very period too, but in every respect the earlier C Major 'Cello Concerto by Haydn is far more interesting for the listener: the Finale generates an electric tension of which the D Major work never even has a spark. And our ears are now attuned to the greatest of all Haydn's concertos: that for trumpet and orchestra in E Flat.

21. Tovey, Essays, p. 63.
Against any and all of these sister works, Haydn's famous D Major 'Cello Concerto will simply not stand up, except as an exercise for 'cellists! 22

I cannot agree with Mr. Landon's feelings about the concerto at hand, but I am not unbiased in my opinion either.

Did Haydn really compose this Cello Concerto in D Major? Yes, he did, as the existence of the autograph manuscript proves. But whether or not he composed all the themes for the three movements of the concerto is not certain.

CHAPTER 3

THE EDITION OF THE HAYDN D MAJOR CELLO CONCERTO
BY FRANCOIS AUGUSTE GEVAERT PUBLISHED IN 1890

Francois Auguste Gevaert was born on July 31, 1828 in Huysse, near Audenarde, in Belgium. At the Ghent Conservatory, during the years 1841-1847, he studied piano and composition. After his graduation from the conservatory he spent time in Paris, Spain, Italy and Germany where he was in demand as a composer. After his return to Ghent in 1852, and until 1861, he composed nine operas in quick succession. In 1867 he was appointed chorus master at the Paris Opera. From 1871 until the year he died he was director of the Brussels Conservatory, in which position he gave evidence of a remarkable talent for organization. As conductor of the 'Concerts du Cons.' he exerted a far reaching influence through his historical concerts, producing the works of all nations and periods. For thirty-seven years he was the soul of this institute, which became one of the best music schools in the world. Gevaert died at the age of 80, in Brussels, on December 24, 1908.

In 1890 Breitkopf und Härtel published the first edition of the Haydn D Major Cello Concerto to appear after the André edition of 1805.

This new edition was edited by G. A. Gevaert. It is assumed that Gevaert used a copy of the old André edition in making his arrangement, since the whereabouts of the autograph at that time was not known.

Gevaert made many changes in the concerto, but not as many as Grützmacher made in the Boccherini B-Flat Cello Concerto. Gevaert cut out parts of the first movement; he left the second almost intact, adding only one measure at the end; and he cut and added material in the third movement. In addition, he added pairs of flutes, clarinets and bassoons to Haydn's original oboes and horns. The reasons for the cuts in the first movement, which will be discussed in detail later, are not understandable unless he was trying to shorten the lengthy first movement to make it more accessible to the listener. The changes in orchestration clearly made the concerto more interesting to perform, since a full-sized orchestra could now perform the work. Gevaert also composed cadenzas to all three movements.

The 1890 Gevaert edition of the Haydn D Major Cello Concerto has enjoyed immense popularity. It was this edition of the concerto that brought the work before the public so often during the first half of the twentieth century. There are still many cellists, in fact, who perform the Gevaert edition.

The Gevaert version is published by Breitkopf und Härtel and can be purchased even today. In 1960 International Music Company in New York City published another edition of the D Major Concerto, using the Gevaert Piano reduction (which corresponds to the orchestral version, in piano reduction) with the cello part edited by Leonard Rose.
I purchased this edition by Rose in 1968 to use in my early study of the concerto. When this edition was compared with Navarra's recording (using a version, possibly Klengel, which follows more closely the André edition), confusion ensued. I enquired about this discrepancy to my cello instructor who could not give me the answer. This incident was probably the determinant that eventually led to this investigation.

The changes that Gevaert made in the first movement are as follows (measure numbers will be those corresponding with the Eulenburg study score No. 769 of the Concerto):

Measures 65-70 are omitted.

Fig 2. I Allegro moderato, measures 64-72.
Fig. 2. I Allegro moderato, measures 64-72, continued.

Measures 82–97 are omitted.

Fig. 3. I Allegro moderato, measures 82–99.
Fig. 3. I Allegro moderato, measures 87-99, continued.
Fig. 3. I Allegro moderato, measures 87-99, continued.

Measures 136-152 are omitted.

Fig. 4. I Allegro moderato, measures 135-153.
Fig. 4. I Allegro moderato, measures 135-153, continued.
Fig. 4. I Allegro moderato, measures 135-153, continued.
One measure is added between measures 166 and 167. This added bit of meandering extends the length of time spent approaching the cadence. At measure 179, one half measure is added to make the solo cello trill on "e" a whole measure long rather than one half measure long.

One observes that the following alterations are made in the actual form of this movement which, of course, is in Sonata Allegro design: A retransition section in the exposition is omitted (see Fig. 2); several measures of the closing section of the exposition and the statement of the first theme in the development are omitted (see Fig. 3); and the first theme statement with the accompanying transition section to the second theme in the recapitulation is extracted (see Fig. 4). These, in addition to the changes listed immediately above, make the cuts and additions a total of 38 of the 189 measures for the entire movement. This represents about a two-and-one-half minutes cut from the total of fourteen minutes that it takes to perform this movement. Were all those changes in the form of the concerto needed just to eliminate two-and-one-half minutes of music? Probably not.

The second movement, in the Gevaert edition, has only two changes from the original. First, Gevaert added the cadenza in measure 62 and second, he also added an extra measure at the end to lengthen the final cadence. Gevaert added, to the three eighth notes of the original, one more eighth note plus a quarter tied to an eighth in the extra bar, thus making the final A major chord much longer.

The Rondo has several minor changes. In both the original and the Gevaert one can find a fermata at the end of the main theme on the
long held "a' " at measures 8, 33, 41 and 102; but Gevaert added one, going in to the d minor section at measure 110.

Gevaert also added a twenty-five measure cadenza between measures 171 and 172 (of the original) at which point Haydn may have intended a cadenza to be performed, which we can infer only from the presence of a fermata in bar 171.

Gevaert also omitted measures 180-187.

Fig. 5. III Allegro, measures 179-191.
The most extensive changes made by Gevaert occur in the first movement. These other differences are not as major as those in the opening Allegro moderato.

Gevaert made many small changes in the solo cello line itself. Again, most of these take place in the first movement. These minor changes in the solo cello line are illustrated as follows and listed are the measures in which they occur (in correspondence with the Eulenburg study score):

Original.

![Original Allegro moderato, measures 31-33.](image)

Gevaert.

![Gevaert Allegro moderato, measure 34.](image)
Fig. 7. I Allegro moderato, measure 34, continued.

Original.

Fig. 8. I Allegro moderato, measures 44-46.

Original.

Fig. 9. I Allegro moderato, measures 59-64.
Fig. 9. I Allegro moderato, measures 59-64, continued.

Fig. 10. I Allegro moderato, measures 71-76.
Fig. 11. I Allegro moderato, measures 98-102.

Fig. 12. I Allegro moderato, measures 125-127.
Fig. 13. I Allegro moderato, measures 161-164.

Fig. 14. I Allegro moderato, measures 165-170 (Note: one measure added in the Gevaert).
Fig. 15. I Allegro moderato, measures 171-175.

Fig. 16. I Allegro moderato, measures 177-179.
In addition to the changes shown above, the following are small changes that Gevaert made in the first movement:

Measure

41. mordents added to first b and f#
54. turn added between first two notes
57. turn added between first two notes
108. on second half of first beat, octave skip to g" instead of e"
110. on second half of first beat, octave skip to f#" instead of d"
153. no turn in Gevaert in between first two notes
160. no turn in Haydn in between first two notes
169. appoggiatura added to third beat.

In the Adagio, Gevaert did not make any changes in the solo cello line.

The Rondo does have some changes, but they are not nearly as extensive as those in the first movement. Additions by Gevaert in ornamentation are as follows:

Measure

7. mordent added to second f#
40. mordent added to second f#
71. mordent added to b
73. mordent added to c#'

In measures 111-118 Gevaert employs the solo cello on the melody where Haydn orchestrated this section without the solo cello. In the second passage of octaves, at measure 159, note the difference between Haydn and Gevaert:
Fig. 17. III Allegro, measures 157-170.

At measure 171 Gevaert added this 25 measure long cadenza which is not in the original.

Fig. 18. III Allegro, measure 171.
Fig. 18. III Allegro, measure 171, continued.

From measures 188 to the end Gevaert added the following to the solo cello line:

Fig. 19. III Allegro, measures 188-205.
In the original, all that Haydn wrote for the solo cello was the following from measures 192-194:

Fig. 20. III Allegro, measures 192-194.

Listed in this chapter are the many changes that Gevaert made in the D Major Cello Concerto. It is fairly clear that these changes were made to render the concerto more accessible to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century concerto audiences. However, to remain true to Haydn's intentions, cellists should perform the D Major Cello Concerto in its original form.
CHAPTER 4

THE CURRENT EDITIONS OF THE D MAJOR CELLO CONCERTO

In discussing the different editions of the Haydn D Major Cello Concerto which are currently available there are two categories which need to be discussed: the full scores, and the cello and piano versions. Obviously the versions for cello and piano (reduction of the orchestra parts) are purchased more frequently than the full scores. First, then, the orchestral scores.

There are two critical editions of the score of the D Major Concerto. One is published by the Austrian National Library. This edition was published in 1963 in full score and was edited from the autograph by Leopold Nowak. H. C. Robbins Landon, in Haydn: Chronicle and Works, says of this edition:

Unfortunately there are very bad mistakes (missreading of Haydn's abbreviations

![Music notation]

and similar matters): A proposed article on the subject by Karl Trötmüller for the HJBII was withdrawn because Nowak was then director of the music division and Trötmüller feared the consequences of his devastating review.1

The other critical edition of the score is the Eulenburg Study Score No. 769. This is the revised version of the Wilhelm Altmann

publication of 1935. This new revised version was edited by Hans-Hubert Schönzeler in 1962. Schönzeler used the autograph in the preparation of this edition. The 1935 Altmann edition was based on the André printing of 1804. The Altmann revision did come remarkably close to the original text but the more recent Schönzeler version is correct in every detail, as I have verified through my comparative study of the Schönzeler edition and the autograph manuscript.

Other scores available are the Breitkopf and Härtel, which is based on the Gevaert version, and the two editions published by Kalmus. Kalmus publishes both the Gevaert and the original versions. The Kalmus Gevaert is undoubtedly a copy of the Breitkopf score, while the Kalmus original version is based on the André print of 1804. All other publications not mentioned above are either based on the Gevaert or the André versions of the concerto. The Eulenberg score then, is the most accurate one available. Eulenberg also publishes the individual parts for the concerto, edited by H. C. Robbins Landon.

The cello and piano versions of the D Major Cello Concerto are numerous; only a selected few will be taken into account here. The edition which appears to be most readily available is that of the International Music Company, edited by Leonard Rose. This is based on the Gevaert version of the concerto and is therefore not highly recommended. It does, however, contain two very good cadenzas for the first movement by Leonard Rose.

The Schirmer publication of the cello solo and piano part of the D Major concerto was edited and revised by Joachim Stutschewsky and first
printed in 1950. This edition was based on the Altmann Eulenburg score printed in 1935. In the piano reduction of this edition the writing is quite thick at times and the clarity of detail is sometimes lost. The cello part has also been tampered with by the addition of some of the flashy Gevaert passages and there is no indication in the music as to where this occurs. Stutschewsky uses the Gevaert cadenzas.

The Peters edition of the concerto was edited by Julius Klengel. This one is also based on the André but with minor changes made by Klengel. The cadenzas, as far as can be discerned, are by Klengel. All other editions, except the Schott, which will be discussed next, are derived either from the André 1804 print or the Gevaert 1890 version.

The edition of the D Major concerto published by B. Schott's Söhne in 1954 was edited by Maurice Gendron. On the title page one reads "Nach der Original-Ausgabe Eingerichtet" which translates roughly to "Edited after the Original Edition". Whether Gendron used the André or the autograph in the preparation of this edition I was not able to discover. Nevertheless, this edition is probably the most accurate of all. As far as the actual notes are concerned the cello part contains only two deviations from the autograph. These could have been misprints. There are also some minor errors (also misprint possibilities) in the piano reduction. This publication cannot be considered a critical edition. Gendron has freely added dynamic markings, bowings and phrasings that are not in the autograph; again, there is no indication as to what is original and what is Gendron. But even with these shortcomings, the edition is the best of those currently
available. The cadenzas included were composed by Gendron. This was the edition I used in my preparation for the performance of this concerto.

As pointed out earlier, there is a definite need for more accurate editions of cello repertoire. A critical edition of the Haydn D Major Cello Concerto is certainly called for. This concerto is one of the staples of every cellist's repertoire and the most accurate possible edition of this work should be available for his study.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

In Chapter Two the controversy surrounding the authenticity of the Haydn D Major Cello Concerto was discussed in detail. The conclusion was drawn that Haydn did compose the concerto but possibly not its actual themes. After extensive study of the C Major Cello Concerto by Anton Kraft, the Sonata op. 2 No. 2, also by Kraft, the C Major Cello Concerto by Joseph Haydn and especially the virtuoso solo passages for solo cello in the early symphonies of Haydn (Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 31), I have come to the conclusion that Haydn did compose in its entirety the D Major concerto. There is a very good probability that Haydn collaborated with Kraft on the concerto in technical respects, but the music in the concerto is Haydn's.

At this point there should be no question as to whether one should perform the original or the Gevaert version. The Gevaert only cuts out two minutes of the performance time but extracts some very important structural passages. The Gevaert also adds instruments to the orchestra that Haydn did not intend. The original version should be performed.

At present there is no critical edition of this concerto available for cello and piano. The most accurate edition (Gendron, Schott 1952) is marred by minor mistakes and liberal editing of dynamics.
The only authentic orchestral score is the one published by Eulenburg and edited by Hans-Hubert Schönzeler in 1962 (Eulenburg No. 769). This score was prepared with the use of the autograph manuscript.

The conscientious performer, who wishes to be faithful to the composer's intentions, will make his reading of the D Major concerto conform, as closely as he can, to what Haydn actually wrote.
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