

Ernst-Günter Heinemann

### **Some observations on preparing Henle Urtext editions of Grieg's music**

In 1948 Günter Henle began to build a library of source-critical editions of piano and chamber music by “classic” composers for his newly-founded company. It was his declared aim to present works in the versions in which their composers had released them for printing. Various stages of musical development, early sketches and versions were to be commented upon in the preface and in the notes section of the new editions, but were not to be reproduced in the musical text. In this way Henle’s concept differed from the style of modern “complete editions”, which give great weight to describing the genesis of a work (describing here means that the musical text of preliminary stages is edited and printed).

By “classic” Henle meant works of all style periods that had insinuated themselves into domestic music-making and concert performance on account of their outstanding quality. Thus “classic” composers in this sense meant Grieg and Debussy as much as Bach and Beethoven. All projects were planned as “back list” titles, meaning that, once a work had been accepted for publication, it should remain in print. It is obvious that, on business grounds, only those titles that can show an assured level of distribution are of interest for this publishing agenda. Maintaining titles that have to be partly or completely revised at the time of reprinting is costly. Henle’s original idea of *Urtext* editions— as fixed and unchanging documents that could be republished unaltered—soon demonstrated itself to be illusory.

Editions, after all, depend on the subjective, historically-dependent viewpoint of their editors. One and the same work produced by different editors may contain significant variations (Bach’s Cello Suites do not permit a definitive edition because of the unsatisfactory nature of the sources; it is not surprising that, up to now, some one hundred different editions have appeared). Every edition is dependent on the survival of a better or worse source tradition. Furthermore, the source tradition is not an immutable “given”, but is always in flux. For example: in October 2005, the long-lost autograph of the 4-hand piano arrangement of Beethoven’s *Grosse Fuge*, op. 134, was discovered. The

corresponding *Urtext* edition, part of Henle's publishing program since 1966, clearly has to undergo a fundamental revision that will surely lead to new findings. The engraver's model for Grieg's *Ballade* op. 24 is lost. If it were to be rediscovered, the Henle edition would have to be revised, likely.

Henle routinely corrects any errors of detail or printing when an edition is reprinted. In some cases an edition may be revised, due to the emergence of new sources. Furthermore, changes in musicological research and presentation styles may make it necessary to systematically revise a whole group of works. A revision of Chopin's piano works—which have for many years been part of Henle's main repertoire—is currently in preparation. Chopin's *Préludes*<sup>1</sup> have just appeared in a completely new Henle *Urtext* edition, while revision of Beethoven's piano sonatas and Schumann's piano works is already far advanced. Many of these works already exist in new, fundamentally revised editions. Advances in research for these editions can be seen on the one hand in their comprehensive new prefaces and critical reports, and on the other in the revision or complete re-engraving of the existing musical text. The *Urtext* concept enables such continuous improvement to the editions.

Around twenty years after the foundation of the publishing house, that was around 1970, the principal piano and chamber-music works of composers from Bach to Brahms had appeared from Henle. Now was the time to extend the publishing program, always under the principle that future projects would have to stand alongside already established ones. It was in 1972 that a work by Edvard Grieg first appeared from Henle: volume 1 of the anthology *Leichte Klaviermusik des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts* contained the piano piece "Vöglein", no. 4 from book 3 of the *Lyric Pieces*, op. 43. A plan was laid around 1980 to present selected important works of Grieg. A Grieg expert was enlisted in the person of Einar Steen-Nökleberg,<sup>2</sup> which led to links with people and institutions in Norway. Musicologists and editors at Henle, first of all Ernst Herttrich and later myself were to work with them on the production of the editions.<sup>3</sup> This concept had already proved itself, and is used for other Henle editions too. For example, Murray Perahia and Norbert Gertsch are collaborating on a new edition of Beethoven's piano sonatas, and Mária Eckhardt is working with Henle editors on Liszt's piano music.<sup>4</sup>

It was to be expected that the experience that editors at Henle had had in dealing with source problems in works of already published composers would help in the compilation of the Grieg edition. At the present time, twelve books or volumes have appeared, including ten piano works, the third Violin Sonata, the Cello Sonata and two pieces for cello and piano (namely the *Allegretto* from the Violin Sonata op. 45 in Grieg's arrangement for cello and piano—a Henle first edition—and the *Intermezzo* of 1866 from a projected Suite for cello and piano). A small observation in regard to this *Intermezzo*: the findings of the new Henle edition are entirely different from the Peters edition. The autograph of the piece is covered with corrections, some of which are very difficult to read. Peters edited the basic notation, but decided not to integrate the corrections. Henle deciphered the corrections. It is clear that these additions, while extremely difficult to read, fit convincingly into the work. They after all present Grieg's last thoughts on this piece.<sup>5</sup>

To return to the piano works: as concerns the *Lyric Pieces*, books 1, 2, 3, 5 and 8 each have appeared separately. Henle now plans a collected volume that will contain all of the *Lyric Pieces*. In addition to this complete volume, the already-mentioned and already-published individual books will continue to be available.

What fundamental problems does Grieg present to the editor? Initial indications are favorable. From the early days his works appeared frequently—and, from 1888, exclusively—from Peters Verlag in Leipzig, which by the close of the nineteenth century was a high-powered company producing reliable editions in aesthetically pleasing prints. It is also an advantage that Peters is the sole publisher for the majority of Grieg's works. Beethoven, Chopin, Liszt and Mendelssohn, for example, published their works in such a way that first editions of their works would be simultaneously published in several countries by different publishers. These parallel editions, which were practical from a copyright standpoint, confronted composers with great organizational problems, and are often a source of confusion for our modern critical editions. The definitive musical text, in the sense of a “final version”, can frequently only be ascertained with difficulty. Composers had to supply all these publishers with engraver's models. As such, the autograph generally served for the main publisher, with a second autograph, or a copy corrected by the composer, serving a further publisher, and it was not unusual for an

perhaps uncorrected proof of the engraving from the main publisher to serve as engraver's model for the publisher of the parallel edition.

Various other models exist in respect to how printing was organized. Chopin, for example, often had his autographs written out by copyists such as Julian Fontana. Inevitably this led to small editorial additions and copyist's errors, which were not all discovered even when the composer made a final review. Chopin often did not undertake such editorial work. Moreover, the proofreading of the musical text of parallel editions is not always satisfactory. Chopin frequently corrected only the French first edition, and left correction of the German or English editions to the publisher.

Mendelssohn, who was inclined towards revision at every stage of a work, frequently continued to meddle in the proofs of parallel editions, so that the editions, although appearing at approximately the same time, may reveal different stages of revision. Of course, here too efforts were made to produce a consistent final version; but circumstances meant that this goal was not always achieved. In such cases it is clear that several sources must fulfill the function of the usual (single) "main source" for a new edition. It is practically impossible to describe such situations without a source stemma.

In contrast, the modern editor of Grieg's piano and chamber music generally only has to deal with a single first edition. Moreover, Grieg was well organized in his approach to preparation for printing, making easily decipherable autograph engraver's models available to his publisher. Such a situation is not at all usual for works accepted for publication. Beethoven, for example, often confronted the engraver with the insoluble problem of deciphering a hastily written autograph, or with confusingly corrected copies. Grieg's autographs, on the other hand, are not only legibly written, but as a rule already resemble a text ready for printing. It is rare to find drastic revisions by the composer at the engraving stage. When correcting proofs he was primarily checking that the engraving was a correct reproduction of his autograph.

[**Music example 1:** Cello Sonata; comparison of engraver's copy<sup>6</sup> and first edition<sup>7</sup> of the Cello Sonata, first page of music (copy from 1890). The red marks reproduce the reading in the autograph. As can be seen, there is just one single difference, which may be explained as follows. In the engraver's copy, the first page of music ends at measure 11. The engraver may consequently have overlooked the fact that the slur continues

lightly over the end of the measure. The composer did not notice this change at the proof correction stage.]

The theory that Grieg had already concluded the composition process in the autograph that served as engraver's model is supported by the fact that his works were usually reprinted unaltered. Grieg, as is generally acknowledged, was already a successful composer within his lifetime, and his works were regularly reprinted. Thus—as Erdahl shows in his dissertation *Edvard Grieg's sonatas for stringed instrument and piano*<sup>8</sup>—between 1883 and 1907 Peters in Leipzig issued the Cello Sonata op. 36 in no fewer than 13,900 copies in many unaltered printings. This is an impressive result when compared with modern print runs. Although two corrected copies of the Cello Sonata survive—the dedicatory copy for Nina Grieg, containing a few corrections added in Grieg's hand, and the dedicatory copy for Grieg's brother John, also containing corrections—Grieg clearly did not request a revised reprint.<sup>9</sup>

In 1902 Peters published—not least to satisfy Grieg's wishes—the *Lyric Pieces* in a one volume complete edition. On 13 December 1901 Grieg had written to Hinrichsen, regretting that the single books of *Lyric Pieces* had not been reviewed in the German press. “The 10 books of *Lyric Pieces* represent parts of an intimate life history. That these single books have not been reviewed in the German press is only to be expected. I spoke several times to Dr Abraham about it. But how would it be, if the 10 books could be evaluated, once and for all, as a single work, and if you, to this end, brought out the 10 books in one volume?”<sup>10</sup> A year earlier Grieg had unequivocally indicated to his publisher that the 10<sup>th</sup> book, op. 71, would be the last of the series. Thus on 10 August 1901 Grieg wrote to Hinrichsen: “The pieces are entitled *Lyric Pieces, 10<sup>th</sup> and final book*. And that is how it must stay. It is not a fixed idea. This model must no longer be repeated.”<sup>11</sup> On 26 May 1902 Grieg wrote to publisher's representative Hinrichsen about the project for a collected volume: “when the time comes for you to prepare a complete volume of the *Lyric Pieces*, I would like to request a corrected proof. There are unfortunately some nasty mistakes that have never been corrected.”<sup>12</sup>

Grieg was completely aware of the problem of errors, and also made efforts to correct them; the discussion here, however, is not one of revisions in the sense of reworkings and further development. By the way: of course Grieg also revised, may be in

other fields: see the preface by Einar Steen-Nökleberg and Ernst-Günter Heinemann to Henle's two-piano edition of the Piano Concerto (Munich, 2003) concerning changes that necessitated a revised reprint or newly-engraved edition at the lifetime of the composer.

It was characteristic of Grieg that he normally wrote out two complete copies of his piano and chamber music. In some cases the chronology cannot be determined on first sight, so close are the autograph texts to each other. In the case of book 10 of the *Lyric Pieces*, the first setting down in writing dates from June 1901, and the second, sent by Grieg to Peters as an engraver's copy, from 15 August 1901. In all seven pieces in the book the first autograph copy already transmits the final text, even where crossings out and overwriting give it the character of a compositional autograph. Some of the pieces written out by Grieg in June already have a calligraphic quality. The later engraver's model looks like a copy made by the composer, at least as regards the primary parameters of pitch and duration (in contrast to the secondary ones of expression marks, articulation, phrasing, etc.). There may be some divergences in the finer details. But in no way does the later copy always offer a more developed or better text. Sometimes, fine details from the first autograph are missing from the later one. So the editor of a critical edition must decide whether this is due to an oversight, or whether the composer deliberately rejected the particular detail. As an example (in this case, no. 1 of op. 71, *Once upon a time*) for the comparison of textual peculiarities from the first autograph, second autograph (engraver's model) and first edition, the close relationship between all three documents, which is typical of Grieg, is revealed.

**Music example 2:** two-colored comparison, inserted into the first edition<sup>13</sup>. Differences in the first autograph<sup>14</sup> are in green ink, and those of the engraver's model, second autograph<sup>15</sup>, are in red. The differences are slight. In measure 4 the engraver has possibly inserted the quarter note e in the tenor part for reasons of musical grammar; or perhaps—which seems more likely—Grieg has intervened at proof stage. More interesting is measure 12. The *pp* appears in both autographs. Was it forgotten by the engraver, or was it Grieg's opinion that the marking *diminuendo molto* would be sufficient to render a *pp* superfluous? The question must remain open. At any rate, Peters did not change this in the collected volume 1902. Therefore it cannot fall into the category of the “nasty mistakes” referred to by Grieg.

But compare the following **example 3**, as to op. 71, No. 3, Puck, m. 16 concerning exclusively the accidentals and leaving aside the other deviations on this page. The naturals, given in A1, are missing in A2, obviously forgotten by Grieg while writing the copy A2. They are missing, also, in the first edition and they are missing in the complete edition of 1902. Peters corrected this place in the renewed edition of 2006.<sup>16</sup>

In the examples given, Grieg shows himself focused and performance-oriented. This makes his freedom with the scores and parts in the duo sonatas all the more surprising. The eighteenth century knew a distribution model of two individual parts (one the piano part alone, the other the part for the solo instrument). During the nineteenth century the method used today (of a piano part with the solo instrument part notated above it in smaller type; and the part for the solo instrument) was gradually adopted. In an ideal situation, the part printed above the piano part would agree with the separate solo part. Unfortunately, in practice such complete agreement almost never occurs, and the two parts often differ, particularly in their phrasing and dynamic markings. In the first edition of Debussy's Violin Sonata, the long slurs in the violin part given in the piano score have been broken up in the solo part into several short slurs. A way had to be found in the Henle edition to resolve the challenge of producing a consistent text for the violin in both parts of the edition while maintaining responsibility towards an *Urtext* edition. Henle ventured a compromise. Two separate solo parts were printed (the first containing the violin part from the piano score, the second corresponding to the solo part of the first edition); however, only the violin notation with the long slurs appears in the Henle piano score. This is in accordance with the evidence in the autograph: Debussy's habit was only to write an autograph score. The genesis of the separate violin part remains obscure, especially as concerns Debussy's involvement with it. Its peculiarities might also—for example—be traced back to the violinist at the premiere: Debussy intended the first performance to be with the violinist Arthur Hartmann, whose gift for improvisation he admired. The work was finally heard for the first time on 5 May 1917 at the Salle Gaveau in Paris, with violinist Gaston Poulet, and the composer at the piano.<sup>17</sup>

A different situation again presents itself with Grieg, where the divergence of notation between the parts is already evident at the autograph stage (examples are the Cello Sonata and the third Violin Sonata). Grieg first concerned himself with writing out

a score as a basis for the engraving. He completed a solo part as an engraver's model at a later stage. While writing out the part he frequently made revisions that are not insignificant, for example to dynamics, which were not then copied back into the autograph score. Peters faithfully followed the two autographs in their engraving, and thus there is inconsistency between the two parts.

**[Music example 4:** collation of the two versions of the cello part. The red additions to the score of the first edition show how the solo part diverges from the score. A comparison of measures 155f and 163f immediately reveals the problem. The solo part brings disorder to the system. Why is *tranquillo* missing from the solo part in measure 151? Why does the score have *mf* while the solo part has *mp*? Here Grieg presents us with a dilemma. The autograph part is certainly the “final version” of the text. But this version does not really fit with the piano part, as is most clearly indicated by new placements of the dynamics.]

Henle was obliged to resolve this issue in its new edition. Initial discussions as to how to proceed were also pursued during editorial work on the third Violin Sonata, which appeared in 2003.<sup>18</sup> Two principal models were tried out at the engraving stage. The first attempted to reach a harmonization between the two violin parts, always following the maxim that, in Henle editions, score and solo part should always exactly agree (except in regard to fingerings and bowing marks). Here, however, harmonization means mixing together two notated texts into a new one, which of course cannot be “authentic”. Only the composer would have been entitled to make such a revision. It was finally decided, again adhering to the maxim of an identical text for the violin part of the piano score and for the solo violin part, principally to insert the text of the autograph solo part—the “final version”—into the score. This required an about-face in the editorial position, and led to numerous corrections to the new Henle edition, already engraved but not yet published. Unfortunately this second solution forces also to alter the original text: for in Grieg's original score dynamic markings of violin and piano are perfectly harmonized. Changing the violin part raises points of dispute that must be remedied within the score. Moreover, the second editorial solution means that Grieg's notational idiosyncrasies in the violin part in the score would be abandoned: to be absolutely clear, the composer's original notation would have to be sacrificed. (Only in isolated cases is the notation of the violin



part in the piano score given priority over that of the solo part.) At all events, the editor was obliged, in using this second model, to make interventions that are the prerogative of the composer. But in practice, revision here means improvement. Obviously, the most important readings of the solo part notation are noted in the commentary to the Urtext edition.

The future. We should add to this report on the state of Henle's Grieg editions that publication of further standard works of Grieg is definitely desirable. These include, among others, the first and second Violin Sonata and the String Quartets, which are often heard in concerts and which are often recorded. The *Norwegian Dances* op. 35 would be a fine addition to the four-hand piano repertoire. The list goes on, and surely in the future there will be new reasons to enrich Henle's publications catalog. Program ideas can also come about completely by chance: Henle originally, as already noted, planned only single selected books of the *Lyric Pieces*. It was sufficient to have the brief observation of pianist Leif Ove Andsnes, during a visit to Henle in Munich, that he had to have the complete volume when he wished to choose one of the pieces for a concert program. This argument made immediate sense: a new project was born, very quickly and without further debate. (My thanks go to Siren Steen, Bergen Public Library, and Öyvind Norheim, Oslo National Library, for willingly disposing sources and granting permission for printing the examples, and to John Wagstaff, Urbana (Illinois) who took care of the english translation).

---

<sup>1</sup> Frédéric Chopin, *Préludes*, ed. Norbert Müllemann. Munich: Henle, 2007

<sup>2</sup> Einar Steen-Nökleberg (Oslo), Professor of Piano in Oslo and Hannover, is editor (along with Ernst Hertrich or Ernst-Günter Heinemann) and fingering specialist for Henle's Grieg editions. Only the third Violin Sonata op. 45 was edited by Egon Voss, with the fingering indications again supplied by Einar Steen-Nökleberg.

<sup>3</sup> Henle's co-editors working with Einar Steen-Nökleberg are: Ernst-Günter Heinemann for the Piano Concerto, op. 16 (two-piano version); *Lyric Pieces*, books 1-3, 5, and 8; Piano Sonata, op. 7; and works for Cello and Piano; and Ernst Hertrich for the *Ballade*, op. 24, the *Holberg Suite*, op. 40, and *Norwegian Dances (Slatter)*, op. 72.

<sup>4</sup> For Beethoven's piano sonatas: Murray Perahia (London), editor and fingering specialist, with editor Norbert Gertsch (Henle); for Liszt's piano works: Mária Eckhardt (Budapest) with Wiltrud Haug-Freienstein and Ernst-Günter Heinemann (both of Henle Verlag) and Ernst Hertrich (formerly at Henle).

<sup>5</sup> Edvard Grieg, *Works for Cello and Piano*, ed. Ernst-Günter Heinemann. Munich: Henle, 2005, p. 58f.

<sup>6</sup> The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York

<sup>7</sup> The National Library of Norway, Oslo, shelfmark N.M.832:2

<sup>8</sup> Rolf Christian Erdahl, *Edvard Grieg's Sonatas for Stringed Instrument and Piano: Performance Implications of the Primary Source Materials* (dissertation, Baltimore, 1994), p. 114f.

---

<sup>9</sup> Dedication copy of the first edition, first issue, for Nina Grieg for her birthday, with revisions to the musical text in Grieg's hand (Bergen Public Library, Grieg Collection, shelfmark 246564); dedication copy of the first edition, first issue, for Grieg's brother John, with corrections added (*ibid.*, same shelfmark).

<sup>10</sup> Edvard Grieg, *Briefwechsel mit dem Musikverlag C. F. Peters 1863-1907*, ed. Finn Benestad and Hella Broch. Frankfurt: Peters, 1997, p. 474.

<sup>11</sup> Grieg, *Briefwechsel*, p. 470.

<sup>12</sup> Grieg, *Briefwechsel*, p. 480.

<sup>13</sup> The National Library of Norway, Oslo (first edition, first impression, copy "Cecilie Holm")

<sup>14</sup> Bergen Public Library, Grieg collection, shelfmark 0201966

<sup>15</sup> Bergen Public Library, Grieg collection, shelfmark 0201987

<sup>16</sup> Edvard Grieg, *Lyric Pieces (Piano Works I)*, ed. Dag Schjelderup-Ebbe, Preface Joachim Dorfmueller. Frankfurt: Peters, 2006

<sup>17</sup> Claude Debussy, *Sonata for Violin and Piano*, ed. Ernst-Günter Heinemann. Munich: Henle, 1997.

<sup>18</sup> Edvard Grieg, *Sonata no. 3 in C minor for Violin and Piano, op. 45*, ed. Egon Voss. Munich: Henle, 2003.