THE CARL NIELSEN EDITION

By Niels Krabbe

I. Introduction

*Carl Nielsen Udgaven* (The Carl Nielsen Edition) – abbreviated hereafter CNU – sees itself as both a practical and a scholarly edition of all the composer’s completed works and is thus aimed at both scholars and musicians. It was established in 1994 and concluded its work in March 2009 with its 35th and final volume, *Addenda et Juvenilia*. The total operating costs, covered throughout the period by two thirds from the public sector and one third from the *Carl Nielsen og Anne Marie Carl-Nielsens Legat*, amount to c. Dkr 35 million, while the production costs (music processing, printing and binding), which are covered almost exclusively by private funding, amounted to c. Dkr 8 million. It has thus been one of the biggest ever music publication projects in Denmark.

In 1994 the edition was organized and housed at The Royal Library in Copenhagen at the direct request of the then Minister of Culture Jytte Hilden, who at the same time pledged public sector operating support for the project – in the early years in the form of a three-year allocation to be renewed regularly on application, and in the later years with a permanent allocation up to and including March 2009. At first CNU was staffed by four full-time employees as well as a foreign corresponding editor. After a few years the staffing was expanded with a fifth editor, while at the same time the editors were given the possibility of undertaking research during part of their working time. This was done partly to encourage staff to stay, partly to give them the opportunity of gaining academic credits; at the same time the management of the edition was reorganized and placed under the aegis of the Music Department of The Royal Library, thus giving the Department and CNU a shared management, beginning on 1 August 1997.

The specific background for the Minister of Culture’s initiative to establish CNU was a press article in summer 1993, which was highly critical of the musical material used for a performance of Nielsen’s opera *Maskarade* in Innsbruck under the baton

---

1 Unlike many similar projects, all the editors throughout the period (apart from the corresponding editor) have been gathered in the same place. This has provided the best possible conditions for ongoing internal discussions of overall guidelines and editorial details as well as ensuring a certain uniformity through all the volumes.
of the Danish conductor Niels Muus. In a series of prominent articles in one of Denmark’s biggest newspapers, *Jyllands-Posten*, the Danish administration of the legacy of Carl Nielsen was severely criticized, first and foremost because obstacles had allegedly been put in the way of the dissemination of Nielsen’s music outside the borders of Denmark by entirely inadequate musical material. In the case of *Maskarade* the conductor and musicians complained that the material consisted of Carl Nielsen’s own handwritten copies, which had been in use for almost a century in a succession of performances, and which were full of corrections, deletions and cuts. The debate involved, besides *Jyllands-Posten*’s powerful and charismatic cultural reporter, the Danish music publisher Edition Wilhelm Hansen (which owned the rights to *Maskarade*) and the Danish Music Information Centre, and the tone was so harsh and implacable that the then Minister of Culture intervened on her own initiative and directed the Director General of the Royal Library to establish the organizational structure and professional expertise to launch a collected edition of Nielsen’s works. The request was accompanied by a pledge to grant operating costs to such an edition for the first few years with the possibility of further extensions. A good year after these newspaper polemics – that is, on 1 August 1994 – the edition had been installed in new premises in the middle of Copenhagen with an academic staff who could then immediately begin drawing up the production plan, editing principles, source registration and so on.

This history of the establishment of the edition in 1993/94 is interesting in the light of cultural policy. Normally it is scholars or research institutions who ask the public sector for funding to start up major research projects; in this case it was the Danish State (represented by the Minister of Culture) that charged the research milieu with the task, with related pledges of funding – although with arguments that were not directly related to the research world itself, but rather addressed the possibility of a major cultural drive abroad (the marketing of Denmark’s most important composer). For better or worse, this prehistory has influenced the work ever since: it has given the project unique funding conditions, but at the same time it has meant that there has constantly been a focus on the edition’s practical usefulness and its ob-

---

2 Similar criticism was raised the next year in connection with a performance of *Maskarade* in Kassel under the baton of the American conductor Ira Levin (*Jyllands-Posten* 25.5.1994, which said of the musical material supplied: ‘It is a scandal and a mess’!)

3 It has subsequently turned out that it was only the score (a photocopy of the fair copy with corrections in The Royal Library in Copenhagen) that justified this description; the parts, copied in the late 1970s, were unproblematic; the newspaper’s critical description of the material seems by all indications a little exaggerated, but it led as we have seen to the establishment of CNU!

4 Prior to the Minister’s initiative another two steps had been taken with a view to establishing a collected Carl Nielsen Edition: about five years before this, the present writer was contacted by the *Danish Composers’ Society* about such a project, and a few years later the Carl Nielsen scholar Torben Schousboe tried – also unsuccessfully – to take the lead with a Nielsen edition.
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... The relationship between musicological stringency and practical usefulness is relevant to any modern, so-called ‘scholarly’ music edition, and I will come back to this point below.

It was thus a performance of *Maskarade* that got the edition started; but it was the same opera that got the edition off to a bad start. In 1996 *Maskarade* was to be given a concert performance in the Tivoli Concert Hall by the Danish Radio Symphony Orchestra conducted by Ulf Schirmer. Not least as a result of the above-mentioned press polemics a few years before, and of the large state appropriations for the work on the edition, *CNU* felt pressured to deliver new, revised musical material for this performance – at a time when it had not yet published a single work, had just gradually started on the preliminary work on two of the symphonies, had hardly clarified the edition’s overall publication strategy, and had not even finished the editorial guidelines. Nevertheless, the editors – on a not yet fully worked-out philological basis – hastily had to draw up revised performance material for Carl Nielsen’s largest and most complicated (in terms of sources) work for the concert in Tivoli. They succeeded under great time pressure, but with the result that later, after gaining much experience from other works and clarifying many issues related to the philological foundation of the edition, they had to begin the editing of *Maskarade* anew with a view to final publication in 1999 – after issuing the first two volumes, the Second and Fifth Symphonies, in 1998.

Thus, for better or for worse, *Maskarade* was to play a quite crucial role in the early years of *CNU*’s history.

II. The Situation on Carl Nielsen’s Death in 1931

Nielsen had a great many of his works printed as they were composed: this was true of the symphonies (with the exception of the Sixth), some – but far from all – of the minor orchestral works, the concertos (with the exception of the Flute Concerto), the chamber music, the piano music and many of the songs. His main publisher until the...
middle of the 1920s was Wilhelm Hansens Musikforlag in Copenhagen, which was the predominant music publisher in Scandinavia at the time. Before 1925 very few of the works were printed by other publishers (in fact only the Third Symphony, printed by Kahnt in Leipzig in 1913, and the String Quartet in F major Opus 44, the Piano Suite Opus 45 and Prelude and Theme with Variations, printed by Peters in Leipzig in 1923 and 1925 respectively). But in 1925-26 there was a rupture between Nielsen and Wilhelm Hansen: the composer felt poorly treated and spoke out in no uncertain terms on the matter in a couple of interviews in connection with his sixtieth birthday in June 1925. For the last six years of his life Nielsen published his works (including the Fifth Symphony) through Borups Musikforlag in Copenhagen.

Although Nielsen thus had much of his music published while he was alive, and although the great majority of his works were written with a view to specific performances, and not for his desk drawer, several of the works – including a number of major works – were not printed during the composer’s lifetime; these have now been published for the first time in CNU. Because of the nature of the works this applies first and foremost to the operas, the incidental music for the theatre, the cantatas and some of the many songs – genres which quantitatively take up more than a third of the total CNU (see the following list):

Works published for the first time in CNU

- *Maskarade* (CNU I/1-3)
- *Saul og David* (CNU I/4-5)
- Incidental music for twenty plays (CNU I/6 and I/9)
- *Sir Oluf he Rides* – (CNU I/7)
- *Aladdin* (CNU I/8)
- Music for twelve occasional cantatas (CNU III/2-III/3)
- *Andante Tranquillo e Scherzo* (CNU II/7)
- *Symphonic Rhapsody* (CNU II/7)
- c. 40 songs (CNU III/4)

It goes without saying that the availability of these many works in printed, revised form now paints a more nuanced picture of Nielsen’s overall production for the circle of scholars and musicians who do not have direct access to the primary – and hitherto only – sources for the works.

---

8 For much of his life Nielsen also maintained an extremely close and friendly personal relationship with Wilhelm Hansen’s director, Alfred Wilhelm Hansen.

III. Publications in the Period 1931-1998

During the period from Nielsen’s death in 1931 until the first volume of CNU in 1998 there have of course been numerous editions of the composer’s works. Two categories from this period are of interest in the present context: first editions of works that were not available in print during Nielsen’s lifetime; and new editions on a critical and scholarly basis.

The first category – works that were first printed after the composer’s death and thus without his participation – comprises the following main works:10

- *Commotio* (Society for the Publication of Danish Music, 1932)11
- *Sixth Symphony* (Society for the Publication of Danish Music, 1938)
- *Concerto for Flute and Orchestra* (Society for the Publication of Danish Music, 1952)
- *Springtime on Funen* (Wilhelm Hansen, 1945)

The second category – editions based on an evaluation of the source situation and a source-critical approach documented in the edition itself – is extremely scantily represented. In the case of the piano music, there are two different collected editions with critical commentaries, Mina Miller’s from 1982 and Arne Skjold Rasmussen’s from 1987.12 If the piano music more than any other genre seemed to call for a critical edition, this was due to the widespread view that over time successive pianists had made a number of ‘improvements’ and ‘corrections’ in Nielsen’s music, so that the various printed first editions appeared with a number of deviations from Nielsen’s original sources (drafts and fair copies).13 A myth had gradually arisen about Nielsen’s piano style, based on a combination of traditions about his inadequacies as a pianist and his allegedly unidiomatic way of writing. Both of these led to a wish to restore the music to a form closer to the composer’s original intentions, one that was based partly on a study of the manuscript sources and partly on vague ideas about Nielsen’s aesthetic views and general stylistic reflections on the distinctiveness of his music. However, there is nothing in the sources to suggest that Nielsen disapproved of the various changes in the contemporary printed editions, and these – despite the corrections mentioned – thus still represent his *Fassung letzter Hand.*

---

10 Minor works from this category include several of the smaller orchestral works from *Carl Nielsen Works*, II/7 and II/8, the chamber music works *Serenata in vano* and *Canto serioso*, all published by Skandinavisk og Borups Musikforlag in the 1940s, and *Quintet for Strings*, published by Edition Dania in 1937.
11 In collaboration with Skandinavisk og Borups Musikforlag and Fr. Kistner & C.F.W Siegel.
13 See David Fanning’s introduction in *Carl Nielsen Works*, II/12.
Mina Miller’s edition emerged as a result of a mixture of philological, stylistic and more diffuse personal evaluations, as is evident from her general preface:

The methods by which this critical edition was prepared were based on the premise that such an edition must be faithful to the composer’s ideas not only in the accuracy of its musical notation, but also in the consistency of its approach to historical, philosophical and technical considerations in the work’s interpretation. The convergence of these elements in the interpretation of Nielsen’s piano music is magnified in importance by the fact that his unconventional and frequently unidiomatic style often leads to ambiguities which can be resolved only with reference to the composer’s aesthetic ideas and his conception of the performer’s role.14

Arne Skjold Rasmussen’s edition is not furnished with a true critical commentary, but in a general preface to all the volumes he deals with these matters both in general and in a number of details. Rasmussen’s basic attitude to the transmission of the piano works is, ‘[…] that CN’s first thoughts about his works were usually the best’, and that certain aspects of the ‘phrasing, nuances and accentuation’ must ‘be left to the editor’s experience, tradition, knowledge of CN and his other works’.15

As far as these issues are concerned, CNU, in keeping with its general editorial guidelines, has in all essentials kept the first printed versions as main source and thus differs in a number of respects from Miller’s and Rasmussen’s editions. However, this does not alter the fact that these editions highlighted a number of important circumstances related to the rather uneven transmission of the piano music and thus forced CNU to reflect thoroughly on this whole issue.

One of the famous – some would say notorious – revised new editions of one of Nielsen’s principal works is Emil Telmányi’s and Erik Tuxen’s study score of the Fifth Symphony from 1950 (full score and parts from 1952), where it is stated laconically, but without further clarification, in a short preface:

This edition has been revised based on the autographs [sic.]. The score has been arranged in a more perspicuous manner and provided with small corrections which have proved useful during performances held.16

---

14 General Preface, dated May 1981, in Mina Miller, op. cit.
15 Arne Skjold Rasmussen, op. cit. (Preface, 2).
16 Pocket score, Skandinavisk Musikforlag København, dated ‘August 1950’.
It was first and foremost in the instrumentation that Tuxen and Telmányi made changes, ostensibly to ensure a wider audience for the work via radio and gramophone, 'both of which demand a thinning-out of the instrumentation', as Erik Tuxen is said to have stated in connection with Nielsen’s possibility of becoming 'world famous'.

Tuxen’s edition has been used in numerous performances and recordings since its appearance and even after the symphony became available in CNU’s revision (vol. II/5, 1998) there are still conductors who prefer Tuxen’s retouching and changes to the revised new edition.

The transmission of Three Motets Opus 55 (one of the composer’s very latest works) has also caused problems in this respect – so much so, in fact, that the work has had difficulty gaining a foothold on the international musical scene despite its Latin rather than Danish text. It is well documented by the sources that the Danish church musician and conductor Mogens Wöldike (1897-1988) had a considerable influence on this work. But it cannot be established with certainty whether the many dynamic and caesura-like instructions in the first printed edition of 1931 which were inserted by Wöldike, were actually approved by the composer, or whether they were transferred without Nielsen’s knowledge to the first printed version from the now lost choral parts used in the first performance a year before. Clarification of this issue is of course crucial to whether the instructions in question should be included in CNU. The difficulty is that for a modern performance they seem alien to the style and have allegedly been the cause of the poor dissemination of the motets. Despite this, and against the background of a detailed account of the genesis and reception of the work in the years 1929-1931, CNU has chosen to stick to the principles that changes made by people in the composer’s closest circle in his own lifetime are considered part of the main source, even if such a choice might conflict with an adequate performance today. Here, then, we have one of several examples of how practical and scholarly considerations do not always go hand in hand.

During the years before the establishment of CNU, source-based revisions of a number of works were carried out with a view to specific performances or recordings, not least by Torben Schousboe, who for a while was the scholar most familiar

---

19 According to information given to the present writer by among others choir conductor Bo Holten.
20 The motets were given their first performance by Wöldike in April 1930 and were printed in the spring of 1931, a few months before Nielsen’s death. See Carl Nielsen Works, III/6, 480-504; because of the circumstances mentioned above vol. III/7, 163-172, reproduces a facsimile of the whole autograph fair copy of the motets.
with the status and condition of Nielsen’s source material. However, these revisions had a certain ad hoc character, and they were not available in print; in addition, the philological basis for the revisions was not immediately evident from the work. Nevertheless Schousboe’s work in the 1970s and 1980s was of very great importance to the dissemination of Nielsen’s music; one of many examples that can be mentioned here is Schousboe’s revisions of the opera Maskarade\(^{21}\) and of the incidental music for Adam Oehlenschläger’s play Aladdin\(^{22}\) as well as the preparation of the performance material for the collected a cappella choral music with the related, very extensive introduction to the works in connection with the gramophone recording of this music in 1984.\(^{23}\)


Throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, as has been suggested above, there were a number of initiatives towards the formation of a proper organization which would support the production of a collected edition of Nielsen’s works: partly from the Danish Composers’ Society, partly from the Nielsen scholar Torben Schousboe.\(^{24}\) For various reasons (economic, organizational and more personal) these measures had no outcome, and it was only in connection with the newspaper articles about the performance of Maskarade in Innsbruck that a realistic and ambitious plan was laid in 1993 for a national project with the aim of publishing all of the composer’s works in a practical-scholarly edition on a considered philological basis.\(^{25}\)

In contrast to the situation in many other countries, there was no great tradition of publishing music on a philological basis in Denmark in 1993. The national Denkmäler series, Dania Sonans, the first volume of which had appeared in 1933,\(^{26}\) was published very irregularly, and with varying emphasis on the philological aspect; nor was there any general plan for a focus in its repertoire. Beyond this one could men-

---

\(^{21}\) With a view to a gramophone recording in 1977 (Danish Music Anthology) by the Danish Radio Symphony Orchestra under the Danish conductor John Frandsen.

\(^{22}\) With a view to a CD recording in 1992 (Chandos) with the Danish Radio Symphony Orchestra conducted by Gennady Rozhdestvensky.

\(^{23}\) Text booklet for Carl Nielsen, Samlade værker for kor a capella, Danish Music Anthology, Dacapo 1984.

\(^{24}\) The latter had worked out a comprehensive plan for an edition, which at a certain stage was presented to officials in the Ministry of Culture in the beginning of the 1990s.

\(^{25}\) As initiative-taker and later controlling body an editorial board was established with representatives appointed by the universities, The Royal Library and the Danish Musicological Society.

\(^{26}\) Dania Sonans. Kilder til Musikens Historie i Danmark. Tomus I. Værker af Mogens Pedersen, critical edition by Knud Jeppesen, Copenhagen 1933. Since the first volume in 1933, a further 13 volumes have appeared in Dania Sonans. At the time of writing it is not clear whether the series will be continued; at present the project has been suspended indefinitely.
tion the series of volumes with music from the age of King Christian IV.\textsuperscript{27} Finally, the collected edition of Niels W. Gade’s music had been established a few years before, and the first two volumes of the edition had already been published in 1995.\textsuperscript{28}

Despite these initiatives, the newly started CNU – because of the aforementioned absence of a true tradition of such things in Denmark, but also because of the special source situation of Nielsen’s works – more or less had to start from scratch with the establishment of a proper scholarly foundation and the drawing-up of technical editorial guidelines in a comprehensive internal document.\textsuperscript{29}

**Scope and content of the individual volumes**

Each of the volumes in CNU is based on the same template:

- A general preface to the whole edition
- An introduction to the work or works in the volume with a description of the genesis of each work and its first performance, its reception in Nielsen’s lifetime\textsuperscript{30} and a brief overview of the source situation and the editorial strategy.
- Facsimiles of selected sources
- The music
- A critical commentary consisting of a description of the sources, a filiation of sources and a List of Emendations and Alternative Readings.

CNU comprises all music by Carl Nielsen which has come down to us as finished works – whether they consist of many hundreds of score pages or less than ten bars; the criterion has been that the work has a clear beginning and ends with a double bar! Sketches or unfinished works have not been included;\textsuperscript{31} Nielsen’s reworkings of his own or others’ works have also been omitted, unless there are two or more ‘equally

\textsuperscript{27} *Music in Denmark at the Time of Christian IV*, 6 vols., Engstrøm & Sødring, Copenhagen 1988.

\textsuperscript{28} Niels W. Gade, Werke, vol. I/4, 1995 (Symphony No. 4, ed. Niels Bo Foltmann) and vol.II/1, 1995 (chamber music, ed. Finn Egeland Hansen).

\textsuperscript{29} *Retningslinjer for Carl Nielsen Udgaven* (Guidelines for the Carl Nielsen Edition), basic text dated 1999 and later regularly adjusted after editorial discussions. To a not insignificant extent these guidelines in 1999 could draw on the experience of the Gade edition for the drawing-up of a similar – if less extensive – document.

\textsuperscript{30} It has been an invariable principle that only matters relating to reception and transmission up until Nielsen’s death in 1931 are included in CNU. Nothing relating to the fate of the works after 1931 has been mentioned.

\textsuperscript{31} In the view of CNU, publication of the sketches only makes sense if the publication is accompanied by a complete facsimile or a ‘diplomatic’ rendering of the individual sketch, accompanied by a full account of its relationship with the final composition; this kind of work does not belong in a complete edition but in a special publication.
valid’ versions of a work, as is the case for example with many of the songs, with *Canto Serioso* and with *Cantata for the Centenary of the Polytechnic Institute*. The edition, which consists of more than thirty volumes, is divided into three main series: *Theatre Music* (9 volumes), *Instrumental Music* (12 volumes) and *Vocal Music* (7 volumes). Within each of these series, the works are ordered by genre – as far as possible chronologically within each genre. In order not to obscure the picture of Nielsen’s artistic profile and to maintain a certain homogeneity in each volume, all works composed before Nielsen’s official debut as a composer (the *Suite for String Orchestra* Opus 1) are relegated to the concluding volume of *Juvenilia et Addenda*. In that connection there arises the familiar – sometimes even moral – issue of whether it is fair to publish works that were either disclaimed by the composer himself or in general are of a quality incompatible with the more canonical part of the oeuvre. At CNU we have found no reason to omit such works. In the first place these works can contribute towards an elucidation of the composer’s artistic development, and secondly any omission would accentuate the demand for a more general qualitative assessment of the music, which is totally alien to a music-philological project like CNU. Finally – as is also the case with the publication of artists’ letters – one must recall that an artist is always free to destroy works (or letters) he does not want preserved for posterity; that was what Sibelius, among many others, did. Against the background of these remarks, *Juvenilia et Addenda* thus consists of two main groups of works. First, there are works that can definitely be dated before opus 1 (*Suite for String Orchestra*); that is, mainly compositions from Nielsen’s early youth as a military bandsman in Odense and from the Academy years in Copenhagen, 1883-86. The D minor quartet, which according to tradition was Nielsen’s visiting-card for his first meeting with the then principal of the Academy of Music in Copenhagen, Niels W. Gade, is of particular interest. Besides this work, the group further comprises a number of isolated quartet movements, a piano trio, two romances for violin and piano and various other minor works for piano and chamber ensemble. Secondly, the volume contains a group of minor works that cannot be definitely dated and therefore cannot directly be included under the designation *Juvenilia*, but which share the feature that in the sources they appear as finished compositions by Nielsen.

---

32 On the other hand a number of four-hand piano versions of various orchestral works – approved by Nielsen – have not been included in the edition.

33 14 volumes, counting the double publication of the two operas (Danish/German and Danish/English).

34 Nielsen considered the performance in September 1888 of the string suite as his official debut as a composer. In fact a year earlier, in September 1887, his *Andante Tranquillo e Scherzo* had been performed in a concert in Tivoli; this work has therefore been included in the volumes of minor orchestral works, not in *Juvenilia et Addenda*.

35 This matter is dealt with in detail by Lisbeth Ahlgren Jensen in the present volume of *Carl Nielsen Studies*. 
The language is a particular problem when it comes to an international edition of a Danish composer. All texts placed before the music are in both Danish and English, whereas the critical commentary after the music is exclusively in English. The verbal comments in the course of the music (including work titles) also appear both in the original language and in English.

The actual texts of the many vocal works (series I and III) have presented more of an acute problem. Nielsen wrote the great majority of his music to Danish texts. In fact there are only the following exceptions:

- Italian Pastoral Aria from the play Amor and the Poet (Italian)
- Hymnus amoris (Latin)
- Three Motets (Latin)
- Two songs to Swedish texts

All the works are of course published with the text in the original language; certain works further have the vocal text in a singable English (or German) translation with a view to the dissemination of the music internationally as well as a rendering of the content of the works for non-Danish-speaking scholars. This applies on the one hand to the two operas (singable libretto in Danish, English and German with the music), and on the other to the many songs (singable text in Danish with the music and in English after the music in an appendix). By contrast the 22 plays and the 14 cantatas are printed solely with the original Danish text, whereas the content of the text is paraphrased in the English introduction to the works.

At a time when it is becoming increasingly common to perform music in the original language (even when this is not one of the widely known languages), one can discuss the rationale of publishing vocal music with translated, singable texts. For one thing, to the trained ear of someone with a knowledge of the original text, the translated text will almost always sound ‘wrong’ in relation to the music; and for another the adapted, translated text will often be of dubious value as a lyrical text, because it
has had to make allowances for the musical metre. CNU – as indicated above – has chosen a pragmatic solution and published texts in translation for the works that could conceivably gain wider currency thanks to the possibility of performing them with English (or in the case of the operas with German) texts. Viewed from the scholarly, analytical perspective, a word-for-word translation – which would thus not be singable – is of course preferable; however such a translation has been outside CNU’s remit.

It is well known that there are two ‘schools’ of modern music philology, each of which swears to its own principle when it comes to written music: one school wants revisions and additions to be directly evident from the music page (special typography, notes at the bottom of the page, comments in brackets etc.), while the other school believes that such things should only appear in the accompanying critical commentary, and that the music page should appear without editorial remarks of any kind. CNU belongs to the latter ‘school’. The editors have chosen, against the background of their knowledge of the music and its transmission, as well as a reading and an interpretation of the sources, one and only one version of the musical text. The critical commentary documents the choices and indicates alternative possibilities. The core issue here is the equation of editing with interpretation.41 This attitude is often misunderstood and perceived as if CNU wishes to be prescriptive about the practical performance of the music. This is not the case. A scholarly edition cannot dictate a particular performance or a particular interpretation; such things are the right and duty of the musician. But the editor can offer a well-argued proposal for what should form the basis for an artistic performance, a basis which to the greatest possible extent reproduces the ‘correct’ reading of the sources. It is to this – not to the retouchings or ‘improvements’ of later times – that the musician or analyst can and must apply his or her interpretation.

The sources

Apparently Nielsen did not draw up sketches for his works to the same extent as many other composers. Only for a small selection of pieces, such as the String Quartet Op. 5, Sinfonia Espansiva, Aladdin and Commotio, is there more extensive sketch material. For other works there are a few, very scattered sketches and for a large number of works there are none at all. In CNU, as mentioned before, these sketches are not reproduced. According to tradition (based on the preserved material and on accounts of Nielsen’s mode of composition), Nielsen would often compose at the piano, where he notat-

---

41 Cf. also James Grier, The Critical Editing of Music, Cambridge 1996, which states programmatically on the first page: This book attempts to redress the balance, to make editing the focus of critical debate, and to challenge editors to recognize the degree to which critical interpretation and editing are inseparable, as the expression textual criticism shows.
ed the work in pencil draft – usually by and large in its final form. The subsequent work with the fair copy was then done by Nielsen himself, or by one of his pupils or friends. It is well known that the composer considered the work of fair-copying, like proofreading, extremely trivial, and tried at all costs to get through it as painlessly as possible. This attitude is one of the reasons for the many discrepancies one finds between the draft and the fair copy, discrepancies which the editor must interpret either as errors or as the composer’s corrections in connection with the copying. Or to put it differently, the editor must assess whether these are examples of inattention or compositional activity from Nielsen.

The performance material too poses a problem for any editor, not least when the composer, like Nielsen, often conducted the works himself and thus made his own additions and corrections in the material. Such material was determined by the specific performance situation, the abilities of the musicians, the acoustics of the concert hall, execution and notation conventions and many other factors. Its authority compared with the main source is therefore extremely limited, and in many cases quite non-existent. Of course this does not alter the fact that the part material from performances where Nielsen was in one way or another involved has been collated with the main source and in certain cases has functioned as a corrective.

This is where the frequently discussed work-concept comes into the frame. Although one can easily lose oneself in philosophical discussions of the concept, it is not unimportant for an editor to be clear about where the work is – and thus to take a stand on what it is that is to be published. Does the work exist as it was manifested in a particular known performance (for example the first performance)? Is it rather the written music as it appears in one particular source? Is it a combination of a main source plus corrections made on the basis of other sources? Or does the work exist, not necessarily as it has been fixed in the written sources, but as the editor, from his study of the matter, supposes the composer to have conceived it – that is, what one could call the composer’s intended meaning? Such questions are presumably raised in any scholarly edition, and the choice among the various possibilities can in fact vary from work to work. But at CNU the basic attitude is clearly that the work is published on the basis of the source which according to the filiation appears as the main source, emended partly on the basis of parallel passages in the main source, partly on the basis of close consideration in the light of secondary sources from the hierarchic source structure behind the work. What the composer perhaps should have written, or what might possibly sound better, is irrelevant to the edition.

42 Peter Hauge, ‘Carl Nielsen and Intentionality’, Carl Nielsen Studies I (2003), 49ff., refers in this connection to concepts from the world of textual criticism: final authorial intention and the socio-historic aspects of a work, where one can say as a parallel that the performance material represents the latter category while the revised main source represents the former.
Fassung letzter Hand

Like so many other scholarly editions, CNU too works with the ideal concept *Fassung letzter Hand*, defined as the latest version of a work that the composer sanctioned. In cases where the work was printed during Nielsen’s lifetime, the printed edition – when possible with the composer’s added corrections – will be the main source; where the work was *not* available in print before 1931 the main source will normally be the fair copy. But whether the first printed edition or a fair copy is interpreted as ‘the composer’s last will’, it will clearly be necessary in many cases to edit the music against the background of analogies on the source’s own terms, to correct it with reference to other authentic sources, or even to accept earlier versions of a passage because of errors and inaccuracies in the fair copy. In this connection it should be mentioned that Nielsen hardly ever returned to a work composed earlier in order to revise it; when a work was finished, the composer moved on.

In a single striking case the edition has had to depart from the principle of reproducing Nielsen’s ‘last will’. This is not surprisingly the opera *Maskarade*, which Nielsen changed regularly both before the premiere and later in the various revivals. In this case, the edition reproduces Carl Nielsen’s original version, as it was before he made the many changes before and after the premiere, although all changes are of course noted in the critical commentary. This is what we could call a – never-performed – *Urfassung*, rather than a *Fassung letzter Hand*.43 The justification for this decision, which in a way breaks with one of the fundamental principles of the edition, lies partly in the opera genre itself, where the work concept is especially difficult to handle, and partly, as a consequence, in a number of external circumstances related to the various performances. Publication of a *Fassung letzter Hand* of a work like *Maskarade* would involve a notion that behind the work there was some striving towards the definitive version, sanctioned by the composer – a notion that is quite without justification in the actual performance and reception circumstances. The very fact that a number of changes, both before the premiere and in connection with later performances, were forced on the composer by the theatre because of financial considerations underlines this.44

A special problem related to constructions like *Fassung letzter Hand*, intended meaning and the work concept stems from the fact that several passages in Nielsen’s music were orchestrated by other people than himself. In such cases, what we have from the composer’s hand is simply a piano arrangement with scattered references to the instrumen-

---

43 See Preface to Carl Nielsen Works, I/1-3 and Critical Commentary.
44 See Peter Hauge, op. cit., 42-81, which also gives an account of the complex relationship between Nielsen’s draft for the whole opera and the fair copy, where only Act One is in Nielsen’s hand, while Acts Two and Three were fair-copied by Nielsen’s close friend, the pianist Henrik Knudsen.
tation, or an actual short score, which lacks a final form; and sometimes the letters provide further guidance on a number of details. Such passages or works are regarded in CNU as fully valid Nielsen works as long as every single outside contribution has been made under the guidance of the composer and subsequently approved by him.

Of works with long or short passages with instrumentation by others (but with the full approval of the composer) we can mention the Flute Concerto (Emil Telmányi), *Aladdin* (Nancy Dalberg), *Sir Oluf he Rides* – (Julius Röntgen), many of the hymns (Paul Hellmuth), *Hymn to Art* (Joachim Andersen), *The Mother* (Emil Reesen) and the Fourth Symphony (Knud Jeppesen). In a single case (*Cantata for the Opening Ceremony of the Aarhus Agricultural Exhibition 1909*) whole movements were drawn up by Emilius Bangert, quite without instructions from Nielsen, so that the work in its entirety appears as the work of two composers. Only a strictly purist approach to the assessment of the musical work’s relation to its composer would mean that such works could not be published in a collected edition of Nielsen’s oeuvre, and CNU has therefore had no scruples about including these works too in the authentic Nielsen canon.

The following will concentrate on a single example of a work where the whole instrumentation was left to someone else. The choral work *Springtime on Funen* was orchestrated and fair-copied throughout by Nielsen’s composition pupil Nancy Dalberg on the basis of instructions from the composer (which, incidentally, she did not always follow). The arrangement was due partly to the usual time pressures from Nielsen’s side, partly to health reasons; in addition, at this time (late summer, 1921) he was in the middle of work on his Fifth Symphony, which in every respect must be regarded as an opposite pole to *Springtime on Funen*. Thus there is no source in Nielsen’s own hand for the score of *Springtime on Funen*, only a draft for the piano score. Dalberg’s score does, however, contain a number of additions in Nielsen’s hand, and it was used for all performances in the composer’s lifetime.

V. The Legacy of CNU

From the outset CNU was launched as a practical and scholarly edition, and because of the large amount of public-sector funding it has been followed with considerable attention by the surrounding musical world.

---

45 The collaboration on the collection *Salmer og Aandelige Sange* between Nielsen and his pupil Paul Hellmuth sometimes had the slightly odd result that each wrote his own harmonization of Nielsen’s melody, then bar by bar they chose which of the two harmonizations was to be used in the final work. This is true for example of what is perhaps the most famous of the hymns, ‘Min Jesus, lad mit Hjerte faa’, which was later used as a theme in the variation movement of the Wind Quintet.

46 In order to preserve the overall sequence of the work, both Nielsen’s and Bangert’s movements are included.

The *practical* aim has meant – besides the considerations of the clarity of the musical text (without typographical indications of revisions and variants) discussed above – that for all relevant works performance material can be ordered in the form of parts and – for a few of the works – piano scores. The edition has been used in many performances and CD recordings in Denmark and abroad as the individual works have become available, and a number of CD projects have actually cited the use of the revised material as an element in the marketing of the CD. *CNU* has also led to the performance of works that have never been played in public since their first performance in Nielsen’s lifetime; the two most spectacular of these new performances are the music for two of the theatre plays, *Aladdin* by Adam Oehlenschläger and *Sir Oluf he Rides* – by Holger Drachmann, two of Nielsen’s largest scores.

But there have also been problems with the practical musical world, especially when it comes to the frequently played works such as the six symphonies, *Helios*, the overture to *Maskarade* and other works that have been part of the standard repertoire of Danish orchestras since Nielsen’s death. As indicated above, in the course of time various musicians have made changes in Nielsen’s instrumentation. In fact a particular performance tradition has been passed on from one generation of musicians to the next, and because of Nielsen’s status in Denmark it has been viewed as inviolable. It has therefore sometimes been regarded by Danish musicians as a problem – for some even as sacrilege – when *CNU* has had to break with this tradition for philological reasons, and has published a version of the music which differs from the tradition in a number of respects. In this area the well-known mutual scepticism between the musician and the musicologist has sometimes flared up; in a few cases so much so that orchestras have quite simply refused to play from the revised parts and have demanded the old music back on their desks. Worth pointing out, however, is the fact that the edition has also prompted the performance and recording of new cycles – such as Douglas Bostock’s with the Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra.

The *scholarly* significance of the edition is more difficult to assess. The investigation of the genesis and contemporary reception of the individual works has produced much new knowledge of Nielsen’s method and conditions of working, and the

---

48 So far piano scores have been produced for the two operas and the three concertos.

49 The latter was performed in November 2008 under the baton of Michael Schønwandt as an introduction to the celebration of the completion of the edition. The dances and the march from *Aladdin* are among the most frequently performed music by Carl Nielsen, but when the collected theatre music with its long passages of melodrama was performed from the new revised edition in 2009 it had only been performed once ever since the first performance of the play at the Royal Theatre in Copenhagen in 1919.

50 This is true not least of one of Denmark’s two most important orchestras, the Danish Radio Symphony Orchestra, which since its foundation has viewed the dissemination of Nielsen’s music as one of its prime tasks.
systematic description of the sources and the establishment of the hierarchy for each work have created the foundation for a reliable musical text. And finally the very fact that a number of hitherto unprinted works can now be studied and compared with the well-known canonical works has given rise to new analytical approaches to Nielsen’s music.

With the conclusion of CNU in 2009, just under 150 years after his birth in 1865, Nielsen’s entire output has for the first time become available in print. Now the whole oeuvre can be played and studied, and the broad lines of his compositional activity can be drawn. In view of Nielsen’s position as unconditionally the greatest Danish composer and his placing in the European musical history of the twentieth century, and by virtue of the many economic resources behind the project, CNU must be characterized as a unique milestone not only in Danish musical culture, but in Danish culture as a whole. The edition has had unparalleled economic conditions – both from the public and private sector – and it has enjoyed unique public attention. It has set a standard for music publishing activity in Denmark and has worked up a music-philological expertise that will benefit other similar national projects.

Since the beginning of the 1990s, two further major publication projects relating to the sources for Nielsen’s life and work have been launched. Besides CNU these are a collected edition of Nielsen’s writings (lectures, articles and programme notes),51 which appeared in 1999, and an annotated edition of letters to and from Nielsen, begun in 2001 and planned in ten volumes for conclusion around 2012.52

If we compare Nielsen scholarship with research on other ‘classics’ of the twentieth century, we still lack one more resource – an annotated thematic-bibliographical catalogue of his oeuvre. Such a catalogue should form the culmination of the wave of projects that has made the source material accessible over the last few decades, and CNU in particular, with its in-depth work introductions and its exhaustive source lists, could make important contributions to the a catalogue.53

The three publications of writings, letters and music and the planned thematic catalogue have given and will give research brand new possibilities, and jointly and severally these four works related to all kinds of Nielsen sources will paint a new and more complete portrait of the composer and his music and open up new paths for future scholarly approaches.

53 The Danish Centre for Music Publication, which was launched as a five-year project from 1 August 2009, sees itself as a continuation of The Carl Nielsen Edition. One of the Centre’s tasks in the near future is to start the work on a thematic-bibliographic catalogue of Nielsen’s works (CNW); see further details at http://www.kb.dk/da/kb/nb/mta/dcm
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Specifically about CNU and the publication of Carl Nielsen’s works

Translated by James Manley
A B S T R A C T

The Carl Nielsen Edition (CNU) was established in 1993 on the initiative of the then Minister of Culture in response to press polemics concerning the poor state of performance material for the opera *Maskarade*. The project was concluded with the publication of the last volume in March 2009. Prior to the CNU the dissemination of Nielsen’s music had been compromised by the generally bad state of the written music, either in the form of bad editions or no editions at all.

The edition of all Nielsen’s completed works in 35 volumes has been prepared on a scholarly, philological basis and presented in a way that aspires to the highest possible standard. The edition now presents all Nielsen’s music for the first time, making possible a new and broader approach to the composer by scholars and musicians.