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INTRODUCTION

Carl Nielsen’s Quintet for Flute, Oboe, Clarinet, French Horn, and Bassoon from 1922 is presumably the one chamber music work of his, having reached the widest occurrence both within Denmark’s borders and internationally outside, at concerts and via recordings. Numerous wind quintets have cast their attention on this composition, largely because the possibilities in the last movement for each of the five instruments to express their individual character. During Nielsen’s lifetime it obtained several performances at home and abroad, and in numerous wind quintets have cast their attention on this composition, largely because the possibilities in the last movement for each of the five instruments to express their individual character. During Nielsen’s lifetime it obtained several performances at home and abroad, and at his funeral at The Western Cemetery in Copenhagen wind players from The Royal Orchestra performed the hymn of the third movement, Andante Festivo. The original psalm, Min Jesus, lad mit Hjerte faa (My Jesus, let my heart obtain) had just been sung at the preceding service in the Cathedral.

The musical text for the Wind Quintet has, however, always caused musicians trouble, mainly because the first printing from 1923 includes several inaccuracies and contradictions when compared to the printed parts and the surviving manuscript sources from Nielsen’s own hand. Over the years, a number of attempts have been made to resolve these inaccuracies, but it was not until the publication of the work in the Carl Nielsen Edition, vol. II/11 in 2003 that an authentic score became available, worked out on a music-philological basis and in due respect for all existing sources. The critical approach of this edition takes into consideration the different emanations and variations, and describes the presumed mutual relations between these sources. Be that as it may, many musicians and researchers have expressed a wish to get access to the primary sources. Not primarily in order thoroughly to verify the Carl Nielsen Edition, but rather to get insight into the composer’s workshop and so to speak look him over the shoulders to seek inspiration for an adequate musical performance of the work.

In particular, the international chamber music competition that took place in Copenhagen in the Carl Nielsen Year of 2015 with the Wind Quintet as an obligatory work in the Wind Quintet section of the competition, disclosed a strongly expressed wish from musicians and jury for an annotated facsimile edition of the source material. This publication is herewith presented to fulfill that wish.1

Previously a number of initiatives have been carried out in order to clarify the many inaccuracies in the presentation of the Wind Quintet. Three of them will be discussed here, but it should be noted that none of them have had access to all sources during their work. In The Carl Nielsen Companion, published between 1998 and 2009. It also confirms the well-known challenge encompassing all performance of Nielsen’s music, as expressed for example – rather pointedly – in the words of American Nielsen musicologist Mina Miller, also quoted in Spence’s article:

Discrepancies involving dynamics, articulations, phrasing, and interpretative markings, as well as frequent cases of apparently misprinted notes can be found in nearly all of Nielsen’s compositions, including major orchestral, chamber, dramatic, and vocal works.2

This is precisely what CNU, in its 33 volumes, set out to remedy, and which the present edition of the sources of the Wind Quintet is intended to illustrate.

As the third example of a deep interest in the source conditions around the Wind Quintet the English cd with the closing score from 1923 and Nielsen’s fair copy and suggestions for which reading a musician ought to follow in the given case. As philology is not Parks’ main concern in the article the overview does not pretend to be complete, but it points to some of the problems of which a musician should be aware.3

A more exhaustive treatment of the subject has been made by horn professor Marcia Spence of the University of Missouri, in an article in the periodical The Horn Call from 2010. Based on her doctoral thesis on the subject from 1995 she offers various reflections, general as well as more specific ones, on the correct reading of the sources.4 Despite an extensive knowledge of exactly this source material Marcia Spence unfortunately does not include CNU’s edition of the work which at that time had been available for more than seven years. Spence begins her article by telling how she as a young horn student at University of North Texas was faced with a poster showing a bar from the Wind Quintet in two versions where two notes differed: Nielsen’s version from one of his manuscripts and Wilhelm Hansen’s printed parts from 1923. This revelation led professor Spence later into a closer scrutiny of the material, and the article from 2010 informs that in the Wind Quintet alone there are around 200 discrepancies between the printed parts and the autograph sources. Some of these are more closely documented in the article in The Horn Call.4

Marcia Spence’s work clearly illustrates the need and the background for the Carl Nielsen Edition, published between 1998 and 2009. It also confirms the well-known challenge encompassing all performance of Nielsen’s music, as expressed for example – rather pointedly – in the words of American Nielsen musicologist Mina Miller, also quoted in Spence’s article:

Discrepancies involving dynamics, articulations, phrasing, and interpretative markings, as well as frequent cases of apparently misprinted notes can be found in nearly all of Nielsen’s compositions, including major orchestral, chamber, dramatic, and vocal works.2

This is precisely what CNU, in its 33 volumes, set out to remedy, and which the present edition of the sources of the Wind Quintet is intended to illustrate.

As the third example of a deep interest in the source conditions around the Wind Quintet the English cd with the title

1 The competition, arranged in cooperation by The Royal Danish Academy of Music, The Royal Library, and Danish Broadcasting Corporation, took place 12 October until 18 October 2015 and is expected to be repeated at reasonable intervals.


4 Again it must be stressed that these examples are all corrected and commented on in CNU.

5 Mina Miller, ‘Some Thoughts upon Editing the Music of Carl Nielsen’ (Current Musicology 3 (1982) p. 64), here quoted from Marcia Spence, op. cit. (2010), p. 64.)
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Carl Nielsen Music for Wind and Piano from 2009 by New London Chamber Ensemble is included.6 In this case, the occupation with the sources has clearly yielded a practical result as impeccably documented on the cd. During the recording of the Wind Quintet the leader of the ensemble, the oboist Melanie Ragge, became aware of some of the challenges in the available score which impacted the interpretation of the music. She therefore asked for facsimile copies of parts of the source material from The Royal Library and found in it details of such a nature that the ensemble had certain passages recorded in alternative versions in order to interpret Nielsen’s autographic notation. The following three passages are involved: the beginning of the second movement where the bassoon’s articulation has been changed in relation to the overall recording of the work (see p. 56); the hymn theme from the variation movement where an altered phrasing is attempted referring to a detail in the fair copy of flute and clarinet parts (see pp. 85 and 111); and the final quotation of the hymn in the third movement, this time with cor anglais instead of oboe, once again building on a detail in the manuscript. In the accompanying booklet Melanie Ragge skillfully explains these conditions.7 Background details to these considerations are described later in the discussion of individual sources.

The three examples presented above clearly illustrate the many problems involved with an ‘authentic’ performance of Nielsen’s Wind Quintet. Together with a long list of other issues, they emphasize the need for this critical edition of the collected source material to the work, as a supplement to the philological Endfassung in vol. II/11 of the Carl Nielsen Edition; all references to bar numbers, revisions, source descriptions etc. in the following text, naturally apply to this edition.

THE WORK

The Wind Quintet was composed in the spring of 1922 and dedicated to five specific wind players, four of them from The Royal Orchestra.8 The tale of how Nielsen had the idea for the work has often been told, probably mostly correctly – although after 35 years delay – by one of the five musicians, oboist Svend Felumb, the youngest of the five. In an article entitled “The Old Wind Players” and Carl Nielsen9 he describes in detail how Nielsen, one day towards the end of 1921, phoned his great friend, pianist Christian Christiansen, and heard that in the background somebody were rehearsing a work by Mozart. Nielsen became so taken with the ensemble of four wind players that he promised to write a wind quintet for the musicians present, not forgetting the flute who was apparently not there at the time. Above all, it was the diversity of and the interaction between the five instruments, and thus their ensemble playing which inspired him, particularly as it was expressed in the finale that very work by Mozart.10 Felumb could even add to the story that Nielsen subsequently wrote a cadenza for the concerto. However, this has never come to light.

The genesis of the quintet can be followed in Nielsen’s letters through the spring of 1922. On one of the first days of March he tells his wife from Gothenburg that he had just started a wind quintet, and on 16 April he writes to her that ‘indeed in a couple of days it will be completely finished as I enjoy it [i.e. the work] so much.’ Eight days later on, the 24th of April, comes the triumphant message, ‘My quintet is almost complete (two more hours).’ Only six days later it had its first performance at a private gathering at the residence of Nielsen’s friends in Gothenburg, Herman and Lisa Mannheimer. This is confirmed in Lisa Mannheimer’s endorsement in Swedish on the first page of the draft: ‘First performed 30 April 1922, Sunday on my birthday’ (see Source No. 2, p. 7).11 More than five months further on, 9 October 1922, the official first performance took place at a concert of the New Music association at the Odd Fellows’ Palace in Copenhagen, performed by the five musicians to whom the quintet was dedicated. Next day the newspapers of Copenhagen had copious – and generally enthusiastic – reviews, for Politiken’s part even accompanied by a caricature from one of the rehearsals attended by the composer (see p. xiv below).

As an example, this excerpt is quoted from Hugo Seligmann’s12 review in Politiken:

[...] The evening’s event was Carl Nielsen’s new wind quintet. From first to last a work of great substance with the unmistakable air of classicism; with its flawless clarity of form and the genuine in spirit. From beginning to end it bears Carl Nielsen’s own stamp: his spontaneous and candid feeling and his entirely personal imagination. As examples of passages where the genius is especially eminent we can mention the subordinate theme in the first movement with its delightfully transparent figures above the beautiful and cantabile phrase, and the introduction to the last movement (an adagio) with its powerful and fabulous upsurge.

6 Meridian, CDE 84580. On the cd cover the text ‘…with performers’ notes’ on the new Carl Nielsen Edition of the Wind Quintet and additional tracks from the autograph manuscript’ is added.

7 The discussion of these conditions in the cd booklet was later printed in Horn Call: Journal of the International Horn Society, 40/2, Feb. 2010, pp. 88-90, as ‘New Perspectives from old Manuscripts’.

8 Svend Felumb (oboe), Paul Hagemann (flute), Knud Lassen (bassoon), Aage Os numb (clarinet), and Hans Sorensen (french horn).


10 In the Nielsen literature there is not total agreement on the Mozart work in question. From Felumb’s detailed description of the incident one can assume, though, that it must have been Sinfonia concertante in E flat major, KV 297b, a piece which is strongly controversial in modern times, in the version with clarinet instead of flute. This assumption is built upon Felumb’s mentioning the key of E flat major and that ‘…it was a ‘Koncertantes Sinfonia’ in which the finale has an incomparable range of variations’.

11 For some reason, Lisa Mannheimer one month after this performance, had asked to receive the pencil draft. This can be seen in Nielsen’s letter to her 23 May 1922 (CNB 7/231 and David Fanning (ed.) Carl Nielsen Selected Letters and Diaries, Copenhagen 2017, No. 488).

12 In 1919, Hugo Seligmann (1877-1947) had succeeded the charismatic Charles Kjærluf as a music critic at Politiken. Seligmann had been a student of Nielsen’s, and already in 1931, shortly after the composer’s death, he was the first to write a small book on Nielsen.

13 A number of reviews in other newspapers are quoted in CNU II/11, pp. xxxviii ff.
its grandiose passion and its virile exertion, finally the string of variations, each and everyone an outstanding work of art. [...]14

A good month prior to this Rudolph Simonsen15 in a private letter to the composer had submitted an exact and devoted characteristic of the work:

First of all I have to thank you for the delight this magnificent work did cause me, and to congratulate you from the bottom of my heart on this your latest triumph! It is from beginning to end Carl Nielsen, though it brings something unexpected, too. That side of your personality does not occur so very often. The mastery of your handling those most beloved themes is incredible. [...] How splendid the first piece! And how ravishing the contrast between minuet and trio! How few the means, how great the effects! It is quite sublime, like a distant thundercloud on a bright day of spring, the way the prelude works with the cor anglais; thereby the two movements in A major are separated. Maybe the variations is the pinnacle. I’m so fond of them! And also the ones in unison. The one for bassoon alone is excellent ‘unison counter-point!’ [...] The theme at the end in 4/4 works with substantial breadth and might. [...] Were we not blessed with you, contemporary music would seem impoverished. [...]16

After the successful first performance a couple of months would go by before a printing contract for the work was agreed with Wilhelm Hansen, the music publisher in Copenhagen. The publisher’s correspondance with Carl Nielsen shows us with Wilhelm Hansen, the music publisher in Copenhagen, would go by before a printing contract for the work was agreed with Wilhelm Hansen, the music publisher in Copenhagen. The publisher’s correspondance with Carl Nielsen shows us with Wilhelm Hansen, the music publisher in Copenhagen, would go by before a printing contract for the work was agreed with Wilhelm Hansen, the music publisher in Copenhagen.

By recommended mail today we send you the proofs of the quintet, score and parts. We ask you to see through the proofs as soon as possible. Especially the parts, otherwise the autography sheets will dry up. We ask you to mail the proofs directly to the German printing house Oscar Brandstetter, Dresdenerstrasse 11-13, Leipzig.17

This shows us that Nielsen himself read the proofs of the printed editions of score and parts. This is interesting, taking into account how many errors and inconsistencies can be found in these two printings. Unfortunately, no proof sheets from Nielsen’s hand have been preserved, and we only know the final result which – as mentioned above – ever since has been the cause of confusion and problems for numerous musicians.18 Nielsen received a lump sum of 500 DKK from the publisher as a fee for the printed edition.19

Finally, the few remarks on the Wind Quintet both direct and reported which have been passed on from Nielsen himself should be mentioned. In an undated letter to programme director of the Danish Broadcasting Corporation from 1925, Emil Holm, presumably written in connection with a concert, Nielsen wrote the following short programme note:

The Wind Quintet is one of the composer’s latest works. He has tried there to characterize the different instruments. Now chatting all at once, now one at a time. The work consists of three movements, a) Allegro. b) Minuet, and c) Prelude – Theme with Variations.20 The theme of these variations is the tune for one of C.N.’s sacred songs. Here it forms the basis of a series of variations, one moment cheerful and baroque, the next mournful and solemn, ending with the theme itself in all simplicity and perfectly quiet in its expression.21

The remainder of the statements deal with the variations in the third movement. On the horn solo in Var. IX Nielsen writes in the draft (Source No. 2, see p. 42): ‘Without a significant submission to Nature’s scenery it’s no use,’ and according to several similar reports in a different connection he would develop this characteristic even further. Felumb remembers his words like this:

(by explanation above is built on a kind piece of information by Mikael Kristiansen, Edition Wilhelm Hansen). The printing house in Leipzig, Oscar Brandstetter, mentioned in the letter, was a large and well-reputed enterprise during the Weimar period. Obviously, the Danish music publisher contracted it from time to time.

18 An inquiry at Edition Wilhelm Hansen about these proof sheets has been to no avail. It must be presumed that they have been lost in the demise of the aforementioned publisher in Leipzig, which probably occurred in the Nazi takeover in 1933.

19 Cf. Carl Nielsen’s letter to the Tax Department 29 April 1923 (CNB 7/488 and Carl Nielsen Selected Letters and Diaries, op. cit. No. 516). According to the consumption index from Statistics Denmark this would be equal to about 15,000 DKK in 2016. By way of comparison it is known that Arnold Schönberg received 18,000 DKK for his opus 23 and opus 24, published by Wilhelm Hansen (cf. Finn Gravesen, Hansen, Copenhagen 2007, p. 130).

20 Today, it is not unusual for the Wind Quintet to be performed as if it had four movements, i. e. with the Prelude and the variations as two independent movements; such a thing is of course a total misinterpretation of the work’s dynamics.

21 NKS 2821, 2’, quoted from John Fellow (ed.), Carl Nielsen in Samtid, Copenhagen 1999, No. 204. Mention of the work in Nielsen’s numerous letters only pertains to a number of external conditions around its creation and presentation. As is most often the case in Nielsen’s reference to his works, here he refrains from mentioning its musical substance and structure.

14 Pohlizen, 10 October, 1922, p. 8.
15 Rudolph Simonsen, composer (1889-1947), Nielsen’s successor as head of the Academy of Music.
16 Letter from Rudolph Simonsen to Nielsen, September 1st 1922 (CNB 7/329).
17 Letter from Wilhelm Hansen to Nielsen, 31 March 1923 (CNB 7/478). When the letter emphasizes the need for Nielsen’s fast proofreading of the parts, it is due to something purely technical in the printing sequence. While the score is engraved directly on to the printing plates the parts are lithographed using a special technique, according to which the music is transferred to the stone by way of a so-called autography sheet on which the music has been drawn. A special kind of ink will keep the paper original until it has been proofread, after which it can be transferred to the stone. This is what is alluded to in the letter because there is a certain limit as to how long the music type can remain sufficiently moist
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The Wind Quintet opus 43 (the Prelude before the variations in particular) is among what in Nielsen’s production has made the strongest and most abiding impression on me. Here the free and unbound meet the severest regularity — the hard and insensitive with the highest degree of expressiveness. The virile primordial force of the audaciously sweeping melodious arabesques, all the polyphonic independence, and the harmonious emancipation inside a maintained tonality is of such a primitive greatness that one may dare (hopefully without being misunderstood) drawing a parallel to Michelangelo’s ‘Creation of Man’.27

Finally, one more point around the work should be mentioned. Maybe — and only just maybe — there could be a vague connection between Nielsen’s Wind Quintet from 1922 and Schönberg’s Wind Quintet, opus 26, begun in April 1923 and completed in August 1924 — which was more or less when Nielsen’s quintet was printed and was almost directly after Schönberg’s visit to Copenhagen in January 1923 for a presentation of a couple of his works in Danish Philharmonic Society.28 What would really make such a possible connection interesting is the key position that Schönberg’s work has taken in developing his dodecaphonic style. Two small biographical details may give slight indications of such a connection. While drafting his jubilee book on the music publisher Wilhelm Hansen, the author Finn Gravesen found in the very extensive archives of the house, kept in The Royal Library, a note in the managing director’s own hand. Apparently, this piece of paper had served as a kind of aide memoir after the talk he had had with Schönberg in the composer’s room at Hotel d’Angleterre in Copenhagen. The note indicates that for most part they had discussed the possibility of making an agreement about the publisher’s rights to print Schönberg’s two latest works, Five Piano Pieces opus 23 and Serenade opus 24. Beyond notations on these future editions the note is ending with the words ‘Symf.’ and ‘Carl Nielsen’. The possibility therefore exists that these two gentlemen in the hotel room, talking of Carl Nielsen, may also have touched on his latest work, the Wind Quintet.29

The second detail stems from the flutist Paul Hagemann who, like some of the other musicians joining the first performance of Nielsen’s quintet, had also participated in the Schönberg concert in January 1923. Hagemann was in contact with Schönberg before and after these events, and he himself claimed that he was the one inducing Schönberg to jump into the wind quintet genre after the visit to Copenhagen.30

22 Horn player Hans Sørensen.
23 Felumb, op. cit., p. 38.
25 Felumb, op. cit., p. 38.
26 1898-1981

Dansk Musiktidsskrift, 1932 (7), p. 54. Weis is probably referring to Michelangelo’s fresco on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, which is normally called ‘The Creation of Adam’.


This visit was brought about by the composer Paul von Klenau and, as a result, Schönberg himself conducted a couple of his works, including the Chamber Symphony, opus 9.


Michael Fjeldsee, Kulturradikalismens musik (The Music of Cultural Leftism), Copenhagen 2013, p. 164, renders as a source for this piece of information the periodical Forsøgsscenen 2, No. 8 (February 1930) together with a correspondence between Hagemann and Schönberg in the Arnold Schönberg Center, Vienna (cf. also Jan Maegaard, op.cit. (1996), pp. 417 ff. where this correspondence is also mentioned).
of these circumstances can prove a connection between the two composers’ contributions to the genre, but they open up for the possibility of that being the case.32

SOURCES
The putative stemma appears from the diagram below:

The individual sources will be analysed below one by one. The principal numbering in bold, building exclusively upon the assumed chronology of their emergence, has been established for the purpose of this presentation. For each source, an official citation is stated as used in CNU and CNW respectively, and a reference to CNS. Relevant details of particular interest on each source are pointed out.

32 In a private letter to Finn Gravesen 26 October 2006 the prominent Danish Schönberg scholar, Jan Maegaard, confirms that either Schönberg during his visit to Copenhagen or later on in Berlin may have been told about Nielsen’s Wind Quintet, but yet Maegaard feels obliged to point out that there is no concrete evidence of such a thing in the preserved source material on Schönberg and his visit to Denmark.

33 The supposition that there may have been material prior to the pencil draft (in that case lost) builds partly upon the fact that there are relatively few corrections in the draft, partly on the incompletely transcribed hymn tune in the third movement.

34 It must be supposed that the basis for the first performance in Gothenburg was the pencil draft (because of Lisa Mannheimer’s note in blue crayon at the first sheet, see p. 7). Therefore it is hardly likely that the written-out parts would have been available already here, one week after the composition being completed; but on the other hand, it cannot be ruled out that another set of parts has been available (see below in the introduction to Source No. 4).

35 ‘My Jesus, let my heart obtain’. The hymn is adopted into the authorized hymn book of the Danish National Church.

36 ‘Hymns and Spiritual Songs. 50 New Melodies for Home, Church, and School’.


39 The text originates from an older Danish hymn from 1764 by Bøen Christian Lund with 31 stanzas, of which Grundtvig chose the final four and reworked them in 1845. This abbreviated version was brought into the Danish Hymn Book in 1899 (according to Jørgen Kjærgaard, Salmehåndbog, Copenhagen 2003, vol. II, p. 239).

40 Initially, Grundtvig’s hymn was sung to a tune by the German composer Johann Crüger (1598-1662).

41 Salmebog for Kirke og Hjem, edited by Valdemar Brückner and Jakob Knudsen, Kolding 1892. Clergyman Valdemar Brückner was the one originally requesting Nielsen to write new tunes for a number of the hymns in this hymn Book.

42 The theme for the variations in the third movement is identical with Carl Nielsen’s tune for the hymn My Jesus, let my heart obtain written as part of a larger collection of hymns for use in the Danish National Church and published as Salmer og aandelige Sange. Halvhundrede nye Melodier for Hjem, Kirke og Skole in 1919 (CNW, Coll. 10). The Background for this work is described by Nielsen himself in somewhat forceful terms: ‘Our church singing in this country has clearly declined and is becoming ever worse. Could I contribute just a small part to restore the general taste, how delighted I would be.’ In an unpublished preface to this collection he spoke even more acerbically on the standard of hymn singing during this period, a repertoire ‘which has often – I cannot deny it – made me shudder. Here the thing that is decisive for one’s impression is not always the song itself, but equally its environment. It does not offend me to hear indecent music coming up from the steps of a beer cellar; but beneath the arches of the church, in one of the country’s schools, or in a good Danish home I expect and demand decency in speech and singing’.28

43 The tune for My Jesus, let my heart obtain is one out of several that Nielsen wrote to texts by the Danish poet, historian and vicar, N.F.S. Grundtvig,29 texts that until then had been sung on pre-existing older – and according to many experts – inferior tunes.40 The notation ‘Brückner 148’ in Source No. 1a and 1b refers to its place in one of the dominating Grundtvig hymn books of the time.41 It must be observed that there is hardly any ecclesiastical manifestation in Nielsen’s subsequent use of the hymn as a theme in the variation movement of the Wind Quintet. It was merely selected because he found the hymn well suited to the purpose of becoming a music theme. You may wonder, though, why this eight year old hymn tune was selected as a theme of his variations, leaving out his many well liked songs for popular use. The tune was

SELECTED SOURCES FOR CARL NIELSEN’S WORKS, VOL. 2
scarcey known by many in 1922, when an old tune from the middle of the 17th century to the text in question was still used in church. Nielsen’s tune was not incorporated in *Den danske Koralbog* until 1954 – but here erroneously to the text *Est du modfalden, kære Ven* (‘Are you discouraged, dearest friend’) to which Nielsen had written a totally different tune!42

In the light of Nielsen’s abovementioned policy statement on his wish to reform church singing it is interesting to note that he obviously didn’t quite feel at ease with the harmonization of such hymn tunes. That can clearly be seen from Source No. 1b (and from the sources of some of the other hymns in the collection). In a number of cases, and in this one too, he would send his tune to one of his students, the organist Paul Hellmuth (1879-1919), asking him to complete the harmonization. As can be seen from the manuscript, only title, clef, time signature, key signatures, and the tune itself are in Nielsen’s hand while the three lower parts are added by Paul Hellmuth. The red circle indicates that the co-operating partner has agreed that this version is the one to be used in the ensuing collection of Nielsen’s hymns. By the way, the added phrases below the notation reveal a little about Nielsen’s and Hellmuth’s ongoing co-operation around this whole project:

(Nielsen): Come and have lunch at 12! Best wishes C.N. (Hellmuth): Dear Mr. C. N. Once more: It is a marvellous melody!!!! I mean ‘Rise, ye Christians’. The other one I have made so simple as possible. It is also good. Thank you for the food, and best wishes, Your PH.

As will be seen, Nielsen made use of Hellmuth’s harmonization, unchanged in his edition of the hymns in 1919 as well as later on as a theme in the Wind Quintet. The only two alterations came in the quintet when changing the opening note from short to long upbeat44 plus that the seventh bass note of the hymn was changed from d to B (whereby the tonic is maintained all through the bar with passing notes in fl., cl., and fg. in parallel tenths); the last-mentioned alteration is characterized in The Carl Nielsen Companion as being ‘exquisite’.45 To which must naturally be added that he prolongs the hymn’s eight bars with a concluding eight-bar afterphrase and adds significant articulation and phrasing. Finally it’s worth noticing that in the concluding repetition of the theme with the character designation *Andante festivo* (bb. 248 ff.) in an impressive way he changes the metre from triple time into quadruple time.

Source No. 1a consists of a folio with sketches for four of the hymns later to enter the collection, printed in 1919. On the recto page *Herren siger: er I trætte* (Are you tired, says the Master, CNW 175), followed by *O hør os, Herre, for din Død* (Oh hear us, Master, for your death!, CNW 189), and on the verso page *Glæden hun er født i Dag* (Happiness is born today, CNW 169) with specific indication of the somewhat tricky harmonization of the cadence in bb. 10-11, plus in unison notation the tune for *Min Jesus, lad mit Hjerte fæs* (My Jesus, let my heart obtain), i. e. the theme afterwards used in the Wind Quintet.

Source No. 1c is part of the complete printer’s copy for *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* published in 1919, consisting of 49 tunes. The pencil addition after the last stanza, *Gammel dansk* (Old Danish) refers to the provenance of the text as mentioned above.

**No. 2**

Score, pencil draft, autograph (CNU II/11, Source E; CNS 43b.)

*Date: March-April 1922.*

As mentioned above Carl Nielsen had finished the draft in the last weeks of April 1922; only the first movement was dated (‘25th March 22’). The greater part of the work was composed in Gothenburg while Nielsen was having a number of commitments as a conductor, staying with his Swedish friends Lisa and Herman Mannheimer. The first performance in their private home on Lisa’s birthday the 30 April may have taken place making use of a set of parts copied from the draft. But – if so – apparently they have been lost. Maybe the portion of the subsequently worked out part material written in Carl Nielsen’s hand (i. e. second movement, cl., cor., and fg. (see Source No. 4, pp. 107, 121, 133-34) comes from this original set of parts. Anyhow, someone was in a hurry to complete the performance material for the birthday, just one week after his writing Anne Marie that the work ‘is almost finished (2 hours to go)’.46 After the performance Carl Nielsen presented the hostess with the score: she at the bottom of the first page inserted this phrase in ink: ‘First performed 30/4 1922 Sunday on my birthday’ (see p. 7). In 1965 the manuscript was donated to The Royal Library by the Mannheimers’ descendants. With the background described above it is hard to imagine the existence of a fair copy in connection with the first performance in Gothenburg.

The score is written in pencil, with a few corrections in black ink as well as with additions in blue pencil (this last only in the second movement). With just a few exceptions it is relatively easy to read and therefore may have been used as an original for the apparently missing set of parts used at the private first performance. In several passages articulation and phrasing are just sketched out or downright implied.

The first pages of the second movement in particular indicate that Nielsen has been composing in several phases, in the first of which he left out empty bars, later on filled in with blue crayon. In the Prelude, introducing the Theme with Variations in the third movement, Nielsen has been meticulous in marking the articulation. Presumably, this is due to the musical character of exactly this part of the work.

---

42 CNW 300.
44 It is worth mentioning that Nielsen does not in the same way change the upbeat for the fifth bar of the theme. On the contrary, here he retains the long upbeat of the hymn whereby three out of four two-bar phrases in the theme begin with a short upbeat while one has a long upbeat.
46 CNB VII/219.
The source shows a special situation regarding the horn variation. Nielsen clearly having evinced it special attention. As mentioned above this variation is written — or presumably rather added — at the last sheet of the draft named ‘Var X’ and supplied with a remark that it shall be added after Var. IX (see p. 42). Thus, the idea for this horn solo must have come to him after finishing the previous variations and the final repetition of the theme. Later he has changed his mind, and instead inserted it as Var. IX, i.e. after the draft’s Var. VIII. Furthermore, precisely this variation, as the only one, was supplied with an explanation in the composer’s hand at the bottom of page 16 on how it should be performed: ‘without a totally naïve abandonment in nature’s scenery it’s of no use’, as also mentioned above.

TABLE 1 (see p. xv), not being a complete list of variants, is a survey of the most conspicuous deviations between the draft and the rest of the sources and the revised version in CNU II/11. It goes without saying that such deviations mostly comprise so-called ‘negative’ variants, meaning details in other sources not mentioned in this source, because it is a draft.

No. 3
Score, fair copy, printing manuscript, autograph (CNU II/11, Source B; CNS 43a).
Date: spring or summer 1922.

Carl Nielsen’s autographic fair copy must have been written immediately after the performance in Gothenburg. It is hardly likely that prior to the performance he had managed to write out parts as well as the score during the week between completion of the work and the presentation. Anyway the fair copy was available 29 June 1922, as Nielsen writes in a letter from Damgård in Jutland for Rudolph Simonsen in Copenhagen:

If you’ve got time and are inclined to see the quintet before you leave, then it lies either on my table or my piano in my leather case at Frederiksholms Kanal, and there you can get it from my wife or from Maren [...].

Obviously Source No. 3 is a printer’s copy intended for the engraver; it is evident partly from the title page of the manuscript and partly from the pencil notes added in the score, showing both the changes of staff and of page in the forthcoming printed edition. The manuscript has been in the ownership of to the two daughters, Irmelin Eggert Møller and Anne Marie Telmányi, until they donated it to The Royal Library in 1953.

It is a thoroughly prepared fair copy in ink with just a few corrections in pencil, some of them in Nielsen’s hand, some in the music engraver’s. Besides the many details mentioned in the TABLE 2 below (see p. xvi), the attention should be drawn to the scoring in the variation movement. Here the source will show how Nielsen at one time has been hesitant as to the role of the cor anglais48 while the Prelude of the third movement in the first writing-through had been for cor anglais (to replace the oboe), the theme originally had been for oboe, but subsequently had been amended to cor anglais in nominating the instrument itself as well as in the notes. Here the original oboe part has been scratched out, and the passage then notated a fifth higher. The opposite maneuver appears in the final repetition of the theme; here Nielsen first notated the part for cor anglais, but subsequently had it moved a fifth down, and to make everything clear he added the transposed oboe part in pencil below the bassoon part.

There is strong indication that the alteration has been done here for purely practical reasons and not until writing out the parts. In the oboe part leading up to the final chorale is explicitly stated ‘muta in corno inglese’ (see Source No. 4, p. 100); the composer may have preferred a ‘warmer’ sound with which the cor anglais would provide the final chorale. In this way he would ensure the consistency of sound between the two instances when the chorale is played, but he had to keep the oboe playing because there is only a three-bar rest for the musician to change instruments.50 It may also be stated that the change from oboe to cor anglais from the second movement to the third (prior to the Prelude) is easier to handle because of the break between the two movements. Still, in his above-mentioned memoirs, oboist Felumb does assert that Nielsen phoned him to ask whether in fact this instrument change would be possible, to which Felumb allegedly answered: ‘I was of course young and brave, so undauntedly I said yes. It has caused me (and my successors, too) many troubles — but it was worth it’.50

Another detail in the manuscript should also be emphasized, namely the small double lines noted at some places in the autograph score as well as in the hand-written parts. At first glance they might be interpreted as an indication of where to breathe, but at a closer look it makes no sense. If anything, they should be seen as an indication of a change of tempo and thus in a certain sense tautological. They occur in three places, I/83 (all parts), I/96 (fl.), and III/9 (fl.), and it is not at all clear why they are used just there. Particularly III/9 looks peculiar as the lines are placed right in the middle of the flute phrase (it could be expected that it would also be placed similarly in b. 8).51 Furthermore it must be mentioned that Nielsen — as usual — is somewhat negligent when it comes to completing slurs which are to be continued after a page turn.

---

47 Letter from Carl Nielsen to Rudolph Simonsen, 29th June, 1922 (CNB 7/255 and Carl Nielsen. Letters and Diaries, op. cit. No. 493). Maren was the housekeeper of the Nielsen family.
48 Nielsen’s attention to the special sound of the cor anglais allegedly was awakened by his listening to a performance of Berlioz’ Symphonie Fantastique (cf. Felumb, op.cit.); probably the third movement (Scène aux Champs., bb. 1-19).
49 On the cd with The New London Chamber Ensemble (see note 6 above) an extra take has been recorded with the final chorale alone, but with cor anglais instead of oboe.
50 Felumb, op.cit.
51 The incident is discussed in the cd cover mentioned in note 6.
TABLE 2 (see p. xvii) shows the most important deviations in the autograph in relation to the version rendered in CNU II/11. Also a number of other details of interest in the manuscript are shown here together with deviations from the parts.

No. 4
Parts, printing manuscript, copy and autograph (CNUII/11 Source D; CNS 43c).
Date: spring or summer 1922.

The five parts are written in gatherings of three bifolios with individual pagination for each part. The five gatherings are kept together by a bifolio where the front page (see p. 77) is the publisher’s identification of the work and not an element of the manuscript itself. The set of parts is presumably worked out on the background of the fair copy of the score, but nevertheless it displays a large amount of deviations from the score. The set of parts has been a basis for the printed parts and therefore holds a number of instructions in pencil for the engraver.

Slight deviations in dynamics and articulation between manuscript parts (Source No. 4) and the printed parts (Source No. 7) occur in the following bars:

- Fl.: I/4, 96, II/18; III/2, 62, 162, 221, 246.
- Ob.: I/63, 93, 122, 135; II/54; III/101, 169.
- Cl.: I/7, 24, 68-69, 120; III/83-86, 124, 233.
- Cor.: I/71-72, 75, 127, 136; II/metre marking, 14-16, 28; III/50, 219, 233, 265.
- Fg.: I/5, 60-61, 64-67, 80, 88; II: articulation all the way through the minuetto; III/56-57, 89, 112, 243.

In spite of these few and insignificant deviations there is no doubt that the printed parts are engraved on the background of the manuscript parts. This can be confirmed from the cue notes which are identical, too.52 Nielsen’s (and possibly others’) proofreading of the printed parts can be seen from the fact that for a number of deviations an error in the manuscript is corrected in the printed part.

As mentioned above, there are significant differences in articulation and dynamic indications between the manuscript parts (Source No. 4) and the fair copy of the score (Source No. 3). At a certain stage Nielsen apparently became aware of these discrepancies, and he made the following handwritten addition in the bassoon part after the double bar in b. 90 of the third movement: ‘Nuancer ind i Stemmerne’ (‘Add dynamics to the parts’, see p. 65).

One notices that most of the set of parts is a copy, though the second movement of cl., cor., and fg. is in Nielsen’s autograph, written on divergent sheets, and enclosed in the other gatherings (see pp. 107, 121, 133-34), whereas the copy section has but a few corrections in pencil and in Nielsen’s hand. Thus, no doubt the composer has handled this part set, but apparently not doing a careful job of proof-reading.54 On the other hand it is unclear why three of the parts in exactly the second movement are available in his own autograph; a possible explanation — though by no means verifiable — might be that these three sheets go back to a disappeared part set from the private performance in Gothenburg. This could be supported by the fact that the metronome figure at the three enclosed sheets has been changed (in Nielsen’s hand) from ‘100 à 104’ into ‘96’ which will show that copying of these parts was not done from the autograph score (where the metronome figure is ‘96’ with no corrections), but from some different source.

As is the case with the fair copy of the score, the oboe part also shows that the alteration of the orchestration of the final chorale from cor anglais to oboe has taken place after copying was done: as one may see on p. 11 of the oboe part (Source No. 4, p. 101), the four uppermost staves (Andante festivo) on half a sheet have been pasted in on top of the original cor anglais part.

In the second movement note also the differing articulation of the bassoon in the minuet section (ten. versus stacc.). The additions in pencil at the bottom of a page (fl. (p. 1), cl. (p. 1, 5, 10, and 12), and fg. (p. 1)) pertain to directions for the engraver on page-turning.

In the oboe part it should be noticed that ‘Muta in corngl.’ is written in ink before the prelude (see p. 95) as well as before the final repetition of the chorale (see p. 100), but only crossed out in the last case.

Finally a grave mistake must be mentioned in the third movement’s passage from the Prelude to the chorale theme in cor ingl. and cor. – a mistake carried on in the printed parts (corrected, though, in the printed score): in bars 24-26 the copier apparently has reversed the two parts so that the two last tones have been moved from cor. to cor. ingl., whereas cor. has rests at the similar place (see music example on p. xii).

TABLE 3 (see p. xix) shows deviations in the manuscript parts (Source No. 4) in relation to the fair copy of the score (Source No. 3).

No. 5
French horn, fragment, fair copy, autograph (CNU II/11 Source F; CNS 270).
Date: Spring or summer 1922.

This manuscript consists of six pages of which p. 1-5 contains Nielsen’s draft for Vocalise-Etude from 1927 (CNW 317) while p. 6 includes the song Danish Weather (Whistling wind and

52 In the final bar of the second movement, observe how Nielsen incorrectly has shown the note one octave lower in brackets and thereafter scratched it out in pencil; maybe in distraction he has had the last tone in the third movement in his mind. There, the deep final tone is in brackets because it cannot be played by the bassoon without the necessary remedy!

53 A small detail further confirms this: in third movement, b. 103 stacc. and accent are missing both in the printed and the hand-written clarinet part. This demonstrates that an unmistakable error has been transferred from the one source to the other (see p. 113 and 190).

54 The three copies of the second movement in Nielsen’s autograph have the da capo of the Menuet fully written out contrary to the two parts by the professional copyist, where the repetition is only indicated by the words ‘Menuet da capo’.
washing wave’ (CNW 325 from the same year). In the present facsimile edition only p. 2 of this gathering is rendered. Here Nielsen in ink has notated the first 16 bars of the Wind Quintet’s second movement (the horn part), written on the blank sheet of music four years before the sheet was used for the two songs. However, the transcript is erroneous as the horn does not pause in all of the 16 bars, but actually plays in bb. 9-11 and 14-16. It may be supposed that Nielsen, having discovered the mistake, has begun once again on a fresh sheet, and at a later opportunity re-used the now discarded sheet while writing down Vocalise-Etude.

It must be noticed that the metronome figure is here indicated as ‘100 à 104’, thus not corrected into the later applied tempo ‘96’ (see comment under Source No. 4). The excerpt from Vocalise on this page (three staves for vocal and piano) includes bars 16-29.

No. 6
Pocket score, print (CNU II/11, Source A).
Date: copyright 1923, presumably published during spring 1923.

As mentioned above, Nielsen read the proofs of the printed score and the printed parts during the early months of 1923. A considerable number of discrepancies between these two sources exist, though it must be assumed that Nielsen had approved them both. Presumably there are two reasons for this situation. First, the somewhat pressed circumstances under which the proofreading took place (as it is shown by the above-mentioned correspondence between composer and publisher (see note 17); second, Nielsen’s well-known dislike of and lack of interest in proof-reading. These differences mostly pertain to articulation and dynamics.

No. 7
Parts, print (CNU II/11 Source C).
Date: copyright 1923, presumably published at the same time as Source No. 6.

The printed parts are based on the hand-written parts as described above (Source No. 4). As the survey in connection with No. 4 has shown, a large number of adjustments of articulation and dynamics were made during the production of the printed parts. On the other hand, as already mentioned, there are numerous discrepancies between the publisher’s printed parts and the score. It makes no sense to render a complete list of these many discrepancies having caused inconvenience for musicians who for more than half a century have only had these two sets of printed sources to play from. They can easily be spotted through a comparison between Sources 6 and 7.

The scope can be illustrated in a single instance: a comparison between the flute part of the first movement in the printed score and the printed part, respectively, shows no less than 28 discrepancies. One may wonder why Nielsen let this pass in his proof-reading, and likewise why the publisher during the 50 years between the first edition in 1923 and CNU in 2003 never felt obliged to resolve this miserable state of affairs in one of Nielsen’s most frequently played works.

No. 8
Arrangement for piano duet by Viktor Brandt Jensen.
Date: 1929-30.

The manuscript arranged for piano duet, of which only a few pages are included in the present edition, was acquired by The Royal Library in 2010. The title page shows that it was worked

55 At least one grave error of pitch could be mentioned, namely bar 180 of the horn solo in the third movement where the score for the second and third notes shows a’ while the part shows b’. Furthermore, the title of the third movement in the printed flute part is ‘Il Menuet’ (see pp. 172 and 209).
out in 1929-1930, that is before Carl Nielsen’s death. Nothing in the records explains who Viktor Brandt Jensen was, in which circumstances the transcription was made, or whether Nielsen was aware of the transcription. The last question might be a cause for wonder, unless the work has been done clandestinely by some Nielsen-admirer. The person concerned is neither known as a composer (besides this one manuscript no other manuscript in The Royal Library’s music collection carries his name), nor does he appear in the considerable circle of letter writers or letter recipients around Carl Nielsen’s person. It is known, however, that the manuscript arrived at the library in 2010 from the pianist Arne Skjold Rasmussen’s estate. He was a big admirer of Nielsen’s music and at the same time he studied with Nielsen’s close friend, the coming head of The Royal Academy of Music, Christian Christiansen, from whom he possibly received the manuscript.

The manuscript comprises 24 numbered pages plus a cover with title page. This is a neatly worked-out fair copy in pencil, except the chorale of the third movement which is written in ink. The arrangement includes the whole work, except for two solo variations left out in the third movement (Var. VII for bassoon solo and Var. IX for horn solo). It is a relatively mechanical transfer of the five-part structure, in such a way that flute and oboe are placed in piano 1 while clarinet is placed in the right hand of piano 2, and horn and bassoon in the left hand of piano 2. Thus, the contribution of the arranger had been reduced to a simple transposition of the relevant parts and one may imagine it to be just a transcription for studying the work for two persons at a piano.

No. 9
Cross stitch embroidery by Olga Sørensen, wife of one of the dedicatees of the quintet, horn player Hans Sørensen (1893-1944), of the third movement, Var. IX (horn solo); framed original in The Royal Library.
Size: 44 x 67 cm, including the wooden frame.
Technique: Cross-stitch on linen, 10-12 threads per cm.

On the back of the frame is written: ‘Embroidered by Mrs. Olga Sørensen. – Gift for Christmas 1950’. Since the embroidery was found in the estate of a certain violinist Erik Mygind in Copenhagen, presumably he was the one to receive the Christmas present in 1950. Subsequently donated to The Royal Library. It is not known whether the embroidery has been done while Carl Nielsen was still alive, or whether it was finished after his death in 1931.

It is not quite clear after which source the embroidery has been made. Apart from ties (that can hardly be sewn with the correct curve) the embroidery is provided with the necessary dynamic and tempo directions, though without following a specific original. One notices the \textit{fff} in the twelfth bar and the missing \textit{ppp} in the second last bar. Also, that the second and third tone in the tenth bar, where the other sources are wavering, erroneously here are ‘b-a’ and not ‘a-g’ as in the draft and the printed score. These details indicate that the embroidery may have been done after the printed part which naturally has also been Hans Sørensen’s part at the performances.

Drawing by P.E. Johannesen in Politiken 10 October 1922 – the day after the first public performance of the Quintet – showing the composer with the five dedicatees of the work during a rehearsal. Nielsen seems to be addressing horn player Sørensen with a somewhat troubled mind.

56 Arne Skjold Rasmussen (1921-1980) recorded all Carl Nielsen’s works for piano on gramophone and published a complete edition of the piano works (Egtved 1987, preface dated October 1980).
57 Confirmed 23 March 2016 by expert employees at Embroidery Shop, Sommerfigler, 3, Vandkunsten, Copenhagen.
### Table 1

Important deviations in the pencil draft (Source No. 2) from the reading of the other sources and the revised version in CNU II/11 (see further specification on p. xi).

- no marking indicates 'missing' information, compared to the final version, or other kinds of comments
- □ - indicates information not in the final version
- ■ - different information in comparison with the final version

#### First movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>fg.</th>
<th>note 2: no ten.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>cor.</td>
<td>no accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>fl., ob., cl.</td>
<td>no accents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>fl., ob.</td>
<td>notes 2-4: no stacc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>cl., fg.</td>
<td>no accents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>fl., ob.</td>
<td>fourth crotchet: no indication of distinctive difference in dynamic level between the two instruments calando in b.12, not in b. 11 as in the fair copy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- □ - stacc.
- □ - 22 ob. note 2: accent
- ■ - 23 fg. **ff** not *f*
- □ - 24 ob., cl. note 1: accent and no stacc. on notes 1-2

26-40 bottom stave below fg. it is not clear whether all the crossout additions below the system belong to the present composition: the added bar below fg. b. 38 is clearly a sketch for fl. bb. 38-39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>fl., ob.</th>
<th>notes 7-10: slurs crossed out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>fl., ob.</td>
<td>note 3: no accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>ob.</td>
<td>note 6: <em>ff</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>cl.</td>
<td>note 2: no accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ob.</td>
<td>notes 8-11: slurs crossed out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>ob., fg.</td>
<td>no tranquillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>cl.</td>
<td>no calando a tempo (quasi roll)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>cl.</td>
<td>the end of the phrase in bb. 36-37 is missing and instead the bar has a semibreve rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>cor.</td>
<td>note 1: no accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>ob., fg.</td>
<td>note 1: no accent; no espressivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>cor.</td>
<td>no <em>pp</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>cl., cor.</td>
<td>last note: no accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>fg.</td>
<td>notes 2-3: no marcato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>all parts</td>
<td>no <em>f</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>cor.</td>
<td>the final note of phrase in b. 51 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-54</td>
<td>ob., cor., fg.</td>
<td>no stacc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>ob.</td>
<td>no stacc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>cl.</td>
<td>no stacc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>cl., cor., fg.</td>
<td>note 1: quaver instead of crotchet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>fl., cl.</th>
<th>no stacc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64-67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>fl., fg.</td>
<td>notes 6 and 8: no accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>fl., cl.</td>
<td>notes 7 and 9: no accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>ob.</td>
<td>note 3: no accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>cor.</td>
<td>no stacc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>cor.</td>
<td>note 1: no stacc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>all parts</td>
<td>note 2: no stacc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>fl.</td>
<td>note 1: no stacc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-96</td>
<td>fl., ob., cl., fg.</td>
<td>no slurs in certain passages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>cor., fg.</td>
<td>notes 7 and 9: no accent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Second movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>fl., ob., cor., fg.</th>
<th>fourth crotchet: three semiquavers and a rest corrected to triplet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>ob.</td>
<td>notes 7-10: no stacc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>ob.</td>
<td>sketches below the fg. part do not belong to the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>fl., cl.</td>
<td>dim. as in the parts but not in the fair copy version (source No. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112-114</td>
<td>ob.</td>
<td>no stacc. and marcato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>cl.</td>
<td>no stacc. and poco marcato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>all parts</td>
<td>calando, not poco rall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>fl.</td>
<td>no marcato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- □ - dim.
- □ - 118 ob. no stacc. and poco marcato
- 120 fg. no marcato
- 127-129 ob. no accents apart from note 5 of b. 127
- 128 ob. the correction in blue crayon (in unison with fl.) is probably not due to a second thought but rather to a slip of the pen (parallel octaves with fl.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ob.</th>
<th>note 2: no accent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>cl.</td>
<td>no stacc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>cl.</td>
<td>no stacc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>cl., fg.</td>
<td>the final minim seems to be added on second thought</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- □ - 32 cor. accent; the note seems to be added on second thought instead of the semibreve e and (**ppp**) of the following bar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>all parts</th>
<th>no a tempo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- □ - 33 fl. accent
- 33-39 fg. no articulation
- 34-43 cl. no articulation
- 40 cor. no stacc.
- 40 fl. sketch below bottom system probably not belonging to the present composition (?)

- □ - 43 fg. sign indicating jump to the coda on p. 5 after the *da capo* of the menuet
- 45 no key signature at the beginning of the trio prima and *seconda volta* compressed into one bar
- 52 all parts | no slur |
- 54 ob. | no slurs |
- 55-56, 57 fg. | no slurs |
- 57-58 fl. | even if the trio motif has already been presented earlier in both ob., cl., and fl. (bb. 45, 47 and 49), this is the first time articulation is added to the motif |

| 60  | fl. | '3 Takter ind’ (‘add 3 bars’) indicating addition of the three bars in the second stave (numbered ‘1’, ‘2’, and ‘3’). It is not clear, whether these three bars are an afterthought on Nielsen’s part while composing, or just a slip of the pen in connection with his work with another sketch, now lost, the latter possibility being the most likely. |
|     | 63 ob. | correction of two crotchets to one minim in black ink |
| 63-68 | fl., ob., cl., cor. | no articulation |
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Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar No.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70-71</td>
<td>cor.</td>
<td><em>poco in contrast to mf</em> and <em>dim.</em> in the other parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>fl.</td>
<td><em>stacc.</em> thus not continuing the accents of the two previous bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>ob., cl., cor., fg.</td>
<td><em>no articulation</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Third movement**

- **1** cor ingl. | *Poco adagio* corrected in pencil to *Adagio*
- **4** fl. | *accent* |
- **6-7** fl. | *no accents* |
- **8** cor., fg. | *no *stacc.* |
- **15** cl., cor., fg. | *second crotchet: no * accents* |
- **16** all parts | *no *ff* |
- **18** cl. | *ambiguous indication of tuplet numbers* |

**20** cor ingl. | *note 6: accent* |

- **25-29** text at the bottom of the page: *Min Jesus lad mit Hjerte faa (first line of the hymn which is used as the theme of the following set of variations; see description of Source No. 1 above)* |
- **26** *Tema med Variationer* (*Theme with variations*): *med Variationer* crossed out in pencil |
- **27-34** fl. | *original tune of the hymn (apart from the upbeat, which in the hymn is the equivalent of a crotchet)* |
- **35-42** cor ingl. | *addition to the original hymn tune, forming the second part of the theme* |
- **51-58** fg. | *no slurs* |
- **61** cor. | *note 2: no *stacc.* |

- **63** fg. | *note 1: accent; notes 3, 4: no *stacc.* |
- **63, 64** cl., cor. | *no *stacc.* |
- **66** ob. | *no *stacc.* |
- **66** cl. | *last note: no *stacc.* |
- **67, 68** fl., ob., cl., fg. | *last note: no *stacc.* |
- **69** fl. | *notes 1, 7, 13: no *accent* |
- **69-70** ob., cl. | *no *stacc.* |
- **75** ob. | *no *espressivo* |
- **76** ob. | *last note: no *accent* |
- **77** ob. | *notes 2, 4, 6: no *accent* |
- **85** fl. | *no *accent; no *pp* |
- **86** ob. | *no *pp* |
- **87** cl. | *no *pp* |
- **88** cor. | *no *pp* |
- **89** fg. | *no *pp* |
- **90** all parts | *no *ppp* |
- **91-103** all parts | *no *stacc., but explicit indication of accents in second part of bb. 94, 98, and 106* |
- **102** all parts | *no *accents* |
- **103** all parts | *no *accent; no *tenuto* |
- **107** cor. | *the cl. motif of a fourth originally notated (and crossed out) in cor.* |

- **107-108** |
- **111** fg. | *accents* |
- **111-113** |
- **115** |
- **117-118** cl., fg. | *the figures (*'5', *'6', *'7', *'9', *'11', *'12')* between the staves are probably added to make sure that the number of bars of the theme (eight plus eight bars) is kept |
- **116** fg. | *accents crossed out* |
- **119-121** fg. | *no *tenuto* |
- **123-125** fl., cl. | *stacc. (as well as *tenuto)* |
- **123-125** fg. | *no *tenuto* |
- **127-128** fl., ob., cl. | *no slurring* |
TABLE 2

Deviations in the fair copy of the score (Source No. 3), from the revised version of the work in CNU II/11 including a number of other details of interest in the manuscript.

TABLE 2

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>fg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>notice the inconsistency of the articulation: (b.1: stacc. and ten. crossed out in pencil; b.2: no articulation). Also notice that stacc. in b.1 of the manuscript part on the inlaid movement in Nielsen’s hand are added in pencil (see p. 56)(^{19}). This fg. passage is ‘wrong’ in all sources between 1922 and 2003 (CNU II/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>note 2: g(^4) corrected in pencil to g(^1); in CNU II/11, p. 195 this information is wrongly related to fl. instead of ob.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>no ril. as in the parts, and consequently no a tempo in b.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>fg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inconsistency in articulation of the same kind as in bb.1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52(^a)</td>
<td>fl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>note 2: no stacc.; slur crossed out in pencil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>fl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notes 5, 6: c(^\flat), b(^\flat) corrected in pencil to d(^\flat)(^\flat), c(^\flat); the fl. motif thus originally had the same intervals as the ob. motif of the following bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-62</td>
<td>fl., ob., cl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuation of articulation from bb. 57-59 missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>cor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mf corrected in ink to mp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>fg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>note 2: c(^?) with a hardly legible correction (or clarification) in pencil. Both the draft (Source No. 2) and the part (Source No. 4) has an unambiguous c(^?). If the pencil correction in the manuscript score is meant to indicate c(^?) the result is not very successful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marcia Spence in her article mentioned above,\(^{19}\) insists that Nielsen’s intended meaning was the c\(^?\) (i.e. the reading of the fair copy of the score), thus creating a contrary motion between the bassoon and the other voices which she prefers to the present parallel motion; however, as it can be seen, all the other sources contradict this view.

Third movement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>fl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accents by analogy with b.5 must be implied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>fg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d(^?) corrected in pencil to c(^?); this also goes for the part ral; also in the part, but not in the printed edition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>fl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>last note: accent added in pencil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>fg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no sempre ff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>cor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff added in pencil also missing in the part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>cl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notice the difference in articulation (slurs) between the score and the parts (see Sources Nos. 3 and 4) in the score the articulation of fl. and cl. is equivalent to the other instruments (8-bar phrase, 4-bar phrase) whereas in the two parts the articulation – contrary to the other parts – is different (one-bar phrases, two-bar-phrases, or four-bar phrases).(^{20}) The same difference between score and part is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-42</td>
<td>fl., cl.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58 In her recording of the work, Melanie Ragge has attached so much importance to the reading of the fg. part that she adds an extra take to the cd containing the alternative reading of the manuscript.

59 Marcia Spence, op. cit., p. 92, Example 2.

60 Melanie Ragge, op.cit. in the cd booklet draws the following conclusion from this: ‘Based on these markings (i.e. the slurings of the parts), we’ve tried to perform the chorales in four-bar phrases creating the image, perhaps, of a church congregation needing breaths a little more frequently than a professional choir! (cd booklet, p. 9).
Table 2

also reflected in the printed material (Sources Nos. 6 and 7); also it should be noticed that in the final quotation of the choral (Andante festivo) there is no difference in the articulation between the instruments.

27-42 cor. ingl. originally for ob. (see p. xi)
+27 cl. p corrected in pencil to mp, part has p, but printed edition has mp, the dynamic of the cl. is thus different from all the other parts
49 cor. notice change of rhythm in pencil; original rhythm: ∙∙ ∙ ∙

67, 68 all parts except cor. and fg. of
b.68 p added in pencil; no dynamic indication in fg. and cor. in b.68
69 cor. notes 1-2: stacc., not slur
70 fl. last note: b flat corrected in pencil to b; the part has b (implied by note 6 of the bar)
74 ob. last note: stacc.; not in the part
82 fl. notice that only the flute has p at the end of the previous phrase; in the parts ob. and cl. have no dynamic indication whereas cor. has pp and fg. p it is not clear what the pencil additions after Var. III refers to. The text says: Nuancer ind i Stemmerne (dynamic nuances to be added in the parts); nor is the meaning of 'bb' (twice) followed by a question mark clear.
98 ob. note 1; b^; not g as in the print; also b^ in the part; the b^ would jar very much against the b^ of the fg.
107-119 fg. difference in the two-note figures (with accents and without); the printed edition follows the manuscript score, not the manuscript part

122 fg. note 1: ten. not in the part, not in the printed edition (ought to have been emended in CNU, because of ten. on all notes of the previous two and a half bars of the fg.)
+139 fg. no dynamic marking; part has mf
144 fg. no dynamic marking; part has p
150 fg. no —— ; the part has ——
151 fg. note 6: b^ corrected to c in pencil; c in the part
152 fg. note 6: b^ corrected to c in pencil; c in the part

159, 167 cl. last note: b^ corrected to b flat in pencil; b flat in the part
258 fg. note 1: no accent; added in pencil in the part, not in the printed edition
259 ob., cl., cor. no p

265 fg. the low AA in brackets is below the normal range of the bassoon, and can only be used on the bassoon if a tube is inserted; the AA in brackets is indicated in all the sources, so Nielsen obviously wanted it!
TABLE 3
Deviations in the manuscript parts (Source No. 4) in relation to the manuscript score (Source No. 3).

- no marking indicates 'missing' information in the parts compared to the fair copy of the score
- □ - indicates information in the parts but not the fair copy of the score
- ■ - different information in the parts in comparison with the fair copy of the score

| FLUTE | First movement | 4 | no accent |
| 7 | no mp |
| 7:42 | different slurring |
| 10 | no poco f |
| 23 | no accent |
| 32 | note 1: no stacc. |
| 33 | note 3: no accent |
| 33-36 | different slurring |
| 38 | no double commas, a tempo |
| 52\textsuperscript{a} | note 3: no accent |
| 61\textsuperscript{a} | no a tempo |
| 52\textsuperscript{a} | no f |
| 52\textsuperscript{a} | marc. |
| 64-67 | no stacc. |
| 69, 71 | notes 7, 9: no accents |
| 81 | no double commas after the fermata |
| 111 | dim. |
| 112 | pp |
| 119-120 | different slurring |
| 123 | double commas |
| 129 | note 2: stacc. |
| 134 | note 1: no stacc. |
| 135 | no dim. |

Second movement

| 27 | fff instead of f |
| 31 | rit. added in different hand |
| 35 | accent |
| 49-50 | accent and stacc. instead of tenuto |
| 52, 52\textsuperscript{a} | no p |
| 57-59 | accent and stacc. instead of accent and tenuto |
| 60 | accent and stacc. |
| 67-70 | different slurring, including corrections in pencil |
| 120 (note 3)-121 | accent instead of tenuto |

Third movement

| 6 | notes 1, 3, 5: accent |
| 19 | no p |
| 27 | mp instead of p |
| 27-42 | different slurring |
| 38 | no p |
| 63 | mp instead of p |

1 Melanie Ragge, op. cit., suggests that the slurring in the flute part in short phrases might indicate a slower tempo of the chorale theme than the one indicated by the long 8-bar phrase of the autograph score. "...creating the image, perhaps of a church congregation needing breaths a little more frequently than a professional choir" (Ragge, op. cit. p. 9).

| 67 | last note: no stacc. |
| 68 | pp instead of p (added in pencil in Nielsen's hand) |
| 92 | notes 1-6: no stacc. |
| 103, 104 | no tenuto and stacc. |
| 123 | no slurs |
| 123-128 | last note (upbeat of the following bar): no tenuto |
| 135-137 | no marcato and double commas |
| 158 | pp instead of p |
| 162 | ppp (added in pencil) instead of p |
| 199 | poco f |
| 205-206 | no double commas and p |
| 206 | note 1: no accent |
| 210 | no p |
| 216 | no dim. |
| 221-228 | different articulation |
| 234 | notes 3-4: no slur |
| 235 | piu mosso |
| 233 | instead of \{\text\textperiodcentered} |
| 246 | no double commas |

OBOE

First movement

| 21 | no p |
| 23 | notes 1, 3: accent |
| 52 | no f |
| 72-75 | different slurring |
| 83 | no double commas |
| 84 | note 1: no stacc. |
| 92 | p instead of mp |
| 116 | notes 7-10: no stacc. |

Second movement

| 32 | pp |
| 51\textsuperscript{a} | note 2: no stacc. |
| 54 | no mf |

Third movement

| 22 | ppp (i.e. one bar earlier than in the score) |
| 25-26 | see comment above (pp. xii-xiii) about the swap of ob. and cor. in these bars |
| 38 | p |
| 74 | note 2: no stacc. |
| 75 | no express |
| 90 | no ppp |
| 103 | note 4: no marcato |
| 134 | no p |
| 135-162 | two slurs instead of one slur |
| 199 | no tuplet numeral |
| 256 | no legato |
| 263 | end of slur on note 1 |
| 263-265 | no slur |

CLARINET

First movement

| 4 | note 1: a instead of g |
| 24 | slur instead of stacc. |
| 25 | note 6: no accent |
| 27-29 | two slurs instead of one slur |
| 36 | note 2, instead of \{\text\textperiodcentered} (slip of the pen) |
| 61\textsuperscript{a} | no pp |
| 57\textsuperscript{a} | slur beginning on note 1, no stacc. on note 1 |
| 58\textsuperscript{a}, 59\textsuperscript{a} | no stacc. |
| 65-67 | no stacc. |
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No Slur</th>
<th>First Movement</th>
<th>Second Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68-69</td>
<td>No Slur</td>
<td>40: No P</td>
<td>50: No A Tempo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Note 1: No P</td>
<td>41: No P</td>
<td>53: F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td><strong>P</strong> Instead of P</td>
<td>42: No A Tempo</td>
<td>54: __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125-128</td>
<td>No Slurs and Ties</td>
<td>44: Accent and Tenuto</td>
<td>64-67: Accents Instead of SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Note 2: No Marcato, No P</td>
<td>45: Accent and Tenuto</td>
<td>75, 76: Note 1: No Stacc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>No __________ and PP</td>
<td>46: No Stacc.</td>
<td>81: Note 1: No Accent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No Slur</th>
<th>First Movement</th>
<th>Second Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Different Slurring</td>
<td>47: Tenuto and Tenuto on all three notes instead of Tenuto on notes 2-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 16</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>48: P</td>
<td>56: No P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 34</td>
<td>Note 2: No Stacc.</td>
<td>49: P</td>
<td>58: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td><strong>P</strong> (the second P added in pencil) instead of P</td>
<td>50: P</td>
<td>60: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Accent and Tenuto on all three notes instead of Tenuto on notes 2-3</td>
<td>51: P</td>
<td>62: No Accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>52: No Accent</td>
<td>64-67: No Accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td><strong>P</strong> Instead of PP</td>
<td>53: No Different Slurring</td>
<td>68: No Accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-62</td>
<td>Accent and Tenuto continued as in b.59</td>
<td>54: No PP</td>
<td>70: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Poco Rall.</td>
<td>55: No Tenuto</td>
<td>71: No P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>No Tenuto</td>
<td>56: No Tenuto</td>
<td>72: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No Slur</th>
<th>First Movement</th>
<th>Second Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Note 4: Accent</td>
<td>57: No Accent</td>
<td>9: <strong>P</strong> Instead of P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Note 4: No Accent</td>
<td>58: No Different Slurring</td>
<td>14: P Instead of PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Note 6: No Accent</td>
<td>59: No Different Slurring</td>
<td>15: Last Note: No PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>P Instead of MP (in the score corrected in pencil from P)</td>
<td>60: No MP</td>
<td>28: No MF and __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Note 3: No Stacc.</td>
<td>61: P</td>
<td>32: P Instead of PPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Note 1: No Stacc.</td>
<td>62: No Stacc.</td>
<td>34: No PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-64</td>
<td>No Stacc.</td>
<td>64-67: No Stacc.</td>
<td>44: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67, 68</td>
<td>Last Note: <strong>PP</strong> Instead of P</td>
<td>65: No Different Slurring</td>
<td>68-71: __________ PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Notes 2, 3: Stacc.</td>
<td>69: No Tenuto</td>
<td>72: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Note 3: C instead of B' (the wrong note is copied to the printed part, but corrected in the printed score)</td>
<td>73: No Tenuto</td>
<td>74: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>No P</td>
<td>75: No Tenuto</td>
<td>76: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>No __________ and PPP</td>
<td>77: No Tenuto</td>
<td>78: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Note 1: No Stacc.</td>
<td>79: No Tenuto</td>
<td>80: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Note 1: Stacc. Instead of Accent</td>
<td>81: No Tenuto</td>
<td>82: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Note 1: No Tenuto</td>
<td>83: No Tenuto</td>
<td>84: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Stacc. Instead of Accent</td>
<td>85: No Tenuto</td>
<td>86: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>No Slurring</td>
<td>87: No Tenuto</td>
<td>88: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>No 4: No Accent</td>
<td>89: No Tenuto</td>
<td>90: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>No Marcato</td>
<td>91: No Tenuto</td>
<td>92: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169-170</td>
<td>No Tie; No P</td>
<td>93: No Tenuto</td>
<td>94: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>95: No Tenuto</td>
<td>96: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192-202</td>
<td>Different Articulation</td>
<td>97: No Tenuto</td>
<td>98: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>No P</td>
<td>99-101: Different Articulation</td>
<td>100: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211-218</td>
<td>Different Slurring</td>
<td>102: No Tenuto</td>
<td>103-105: Different Articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>F instead of FF</td>
<td>104: No Tenuto</td>
<td>106: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td><strong>PP</strong> Instead of P</td>
<td>107: No Tenuto</td>
<td>108: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221, 225</td>
<td>Notes 1, 5: No Tenuto</td>
<td>109: No Tenuto</td>
<td>110: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Notes 2-4: No Accents</td>
<td>111: No Tenuto</td>
<td>112: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Trans.</td>
<td>113: No Tenuto</td>
<td>114: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>P Instead of <strong>PP</strong></td>
<td>115: No Tenuto</td>
<td>116: No Tenuto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CORNO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No Slur</th>
<th>First Movement</th>
<th>Second Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No Double Commas, No A Tempo</td>
<td>117: Dim.</td>
<td>117: Dim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td><strong>MP</strong> Instead of P</td>
<td>119: No Fenice</td>
<td>119: No Fenice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>MF Instead of <strong>MP</strong></td>
<td>120: No Fenice</td>
<td>120: No Fenice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Note 1: No Accent</td>
<td>121: No Fenice</td>
<td>121: No Fenice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Dim.</td>
<td>122: No Fenice</td>
<td>122: No Fenice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Note 3: No Accent</td>
<td>123: No Fenice</td>
<td>123: No Fenice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>No <strong>P</strong></td>
<td>124: No Fenice</td>
<td>124: No Fenice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>No <strong>P</strong></td>
<td>125: No Fenice</td>
<td>125: No Fenice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 3

**BASSOON**

**First movement**
- 1: note 2: no tenuto, only stacc.
- 5, 6: no accents
- 7–9: two slurs instead of one slur
- 10: no semper \( p \)
- 14: \( p \) —— pp
- 19–21: \( m^p \) instead of \( p \)
- 26: no \( f \) and ——
- 48: no \( p \), no accent, no expressivo
- 53: accent
- 57: no marc.
- 60: note 7: no accent
- 61: no accents
- 55: no —— and \( mf \)
- 64–67: no \( f^z \)
- 67: no ——
- 69: no accents
- 80: no accent
- 84: \( mp \) instead of \( p \)
- 86–88: different slurring
- 108: no ——
- 112: rall.
- 123: no \( pp \)
- 135: \( p \), poco rall., ——

**Second movement**
- 2–3: different articulation
- 5: no accents
- 13: no —— and ——
- 33–35: no articulation
- 37: no articulation
- 44: last note: no \( p \)

**Third movement**
- 2: no ——
- 8: correction in pencil both in the score and in the part
- 12: last note: no accent
- 15: last note: no accent
- 27–34: different slurring
- 37: note 1: accent
- 40–42: no articulation, no slurring
- 53: note 2: tenuto
- 55–58: different slurring
- 56: notes 2–5: tenuto
- 57–58: no ——
- 68: last note: \( p \)
- 69: no \( mp \)
- 75: \( mp \) instead of \( p \)
- 89–90: no \( pp \), ——, \( ppp \)
- 97–98: no stacc.
- 103–105: no articulation
- 107: \( p \) instead of \( mp \)
- 107: notes 1, 3, 5, 7, 9: accents
- 112: \( ff \) on note 1 instead of note 3
- 114: no \( p \)
- 115, 116: no accents
- 119: notes 1–5: no accents
- 122: note 1: no tenuto
- 123: note 3: no tenuto
- 130: no \( p \)
- 135: no ——
- 138: no rall.
- 142: \( f \)
- 144: \( p \)
- 150: ——
- 187–192: tenuto instead of slurs
- 197–201: tenuto instead of slurs
- 219: \( f^j \) instead of \( f_e \)
- 220: no \( f^z \)
- 223: no \( f^z \)
- 235: piu mosso
- 240–241: tenuto instead of slurs
- 243: note 2: accents
- 244: \( \langle \dot{f} \rangle \) instead of \( \dot{f} \)
- 258: note 1: accent
- 263, 264: \( \langle \dot{f} \rangle \) instead of tenuto
ABBREVIATIONS

b. bar
bb. bars
cl. clarinet
CNA Carl Nielsen Arkivet (Carl Nielsen Archives, The Royal Library)
CNS Carl Nielsen samlingen (Carl Nielsen Collection, The Royal Library)
cor. corno
cor. ingl. corno inglese
DK-Kk Det Kongelige Bibliotek, København (The Royal Library, Copenhagen Copenhagen; new name from 1 January 2017: The National Library)
fg. fagotto
fl. flauto
ob. oboe
Var. Variation
FACSIMILES

Source 1, Hymn tune 2
Source 2, Score, pencil draft 7
Source 3, Score, printer’s copy 43
Source 4, Parts, printer’s copy 76
Source 5, Horn part, fragment 143
Source 6, Printed score 144
Source 7, Printed parts 167
Source 8, Four hand arrangement 212
Source 9, Embroidery, horn part 216
Source 1a
Hvor har, C. N.

En ev. seg. Det er en pragfald melodi! Lag 3 koretter, aldrig.
Den anden, har jeg gjort 200 enkelt.

Kan du foretage 412, melodi.

(1957-58-1961)

En alvor melodi. Den er ogaa good. Takk for madfruen filin.

C. N.
2. Du bliver Nædens Tid og Snud
mig såd og lynsigt,
i du mig kysser med din Mund
og tager hjem til dig.
3. Mit Hjærte i den Grav, du hæ
til Forsoningen rød,
lad, naar det omver; Hvilte hans
og smile ad sin Død!
4. Før så migarme Synden hjem,
med din Befærdighed,
til dit det ny Jerusalem,
til al.din Hørlighed!
I/bb. 70-84

Source 2
II/bb. 1-29

Source 2
Source 2

III/bb. 11-19
III/ bb. 62-76

Source 2
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31
III/bb. 97-107

Source 2
SELECTED SOURCES FOR CARL NIELSEN’S WORKS, VOL. 2

Source 3

I/bb. 39-53
Source 3

1/bb. 65-76
I/bb. 77-88

Source 3
II/bb. 18-40 Source 3
II/bb. 60-71, 115-122

Source 3
III/bb. 74-90

Source 3
Source 3

III/bb. 91-103
III/bb. 123-143

Source 3
III/bb. 207-225

Source 3
source 3

III / bb. 244-265
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CARL NIELSEN:§Ã¥&EØERKVINTET
OP.43.
Carl Nielsen
Op. 43
Kvintet for Blæser
Luditas & Scandans
Extrait. Sonate - Forme

Carl Nielsen
Op. 43

CN 042c

mcmxcvii 2800
Source 4

fl., I/bb. 37-57
Source 4

fl., III/bb. 59-97
Source 4

ob., I/bb. 39-75
Source 4

ob., I/bb. 132-136, II/bb. 1-59
Source 4

ob., III/bb. 59-103
ob., III/bb. 248-265  
Source 4
cl., I/bb. 65-109
Source 4
Source 4

cl., I/bb. 110-136

[Music notation image]
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Source 4

cl., II/bb. 1-71
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Selected Sources for Carl Nielsen's Works, Vol. 2

Source 4

cl., III/bb. 20-58

No. 2. F. 18
Source 4

cl., III/bb. 119-186
Cor. I/bb. 1-47

Source 4
Source 4

cor., III/bb. 59-106
Source 4

cor., III/bb. 107-193
Source 4  
cor., III/bb. 248-265
Source 4

fig., I/bb. 61–96

No. 2, F. 10
fg., II/bb. 1-71

Source 4
fg., III/bb. 1-20

Source 4
Source 4

fg., III/bb. 81-109

Van IV. Tempo giusto.
Source 4

fg., III/bb. 187-237
Source 4
Selected Sources for Carl Nielsen’s Works, Vol. 2

Source 6
Source 6

1/ bb. 45-54
I/bb. 94-112

Source 6
II/bb. 63-122, III/bb. 1-8
Source 6

III / bb. 53-74
III/bb. 181-218
Source 6
Andantino festivo.

III/bb. 238-265

Source 6
Carl Nielsen

Opus 43

 Kvintet for Fløjte, Oboe, Klarinet, Horn og Fagot

Stemmer

Copyright 1923 by Wilhelm Hansen, Copenhagen

1923-24, 9/14
II. Menuet.
KVINTET
for Fløjte, Obo, Klarinet, Horn og Fagot.

Obo

Engelsk Horn.

I.

Carl Nielsen, Op. 43.
ob., I/bb. 56–96

Source 7
II. Menuet.
ob., II/bb. 25-122

Source 7
ob., III/bb. 225-265

Source 7
II. Menuet.

\[ \text{Notation of the Menuet} \]
Source 7

cl., III/bb. 1-22

Prologium.

A. d. a.

III.

Poco agitato

transitio Tempo f. (Adagio)

Agitato.

dim.
cl., III/bb. 116-207

Source 7
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191
Source 7

fg., I/bb. 94-136, II/bb. 1-36

II. Menuet.
Source 7

fg., II/bb. 37-122
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197
Source 7

fg., III/bb. 1-28

III.

Preludium.

Adagio.

Fagot.

acceler.  cantando  dim.  rall.  a tempo

Tempo I. (Adagio)

Tema con variazioni. Un poco Andantino.
Source 7

fg., III/bb. 91-118
fg., III/bb. 119-186

Source 7
II. Menuet.
Source 7

cor., II/bb. 72-122, III/bb. 1-10
Source 7
cor., III/bb. 43-96
cor., III/bb. 97-207

Source 7
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Carl Nielsen Kvinde for
Fløjte - Oboe - Fløjnet - Horn og Tuba
Op 43.

Arrangeret for:
Fløjte, Oboe, Tuba

Dr. Brandt, Juusen

Manuskript, pen begyndt 1929,
yordt først 1930.
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