

MUZIKOLOŠKI
Z B O R N I K

MUSICOLOGICAL
A N N U A L

LX/1

Z V E Z E K / V O L U M E

L J U B L J A N A 2 0 2 4

Glavni in odgovorni urednik • Editor-in-Chief

Aleš Nagode (Univerza v Ljubljani)

Asistentka uredništva • Assistant Editor

Špela Lah (Univerza v Ljubljani)

Uredniški odbor • Editorial Board

Matjaž Barbo (Univerza v Ljubljani), Svanibor Pettan (Univerza v Ljubljani), Gregor Pompe (Univerza v Ljubljani), Leon Stefanija (Univerza v Ljubljani), Nejc Sukljan (Univerza v Ljubljani), Katarina Šter (ZRC SAZU), Jernej Weiss (Univerza v Ljubljani)

Andrej Rijavec (Ljubljana), častni urednik • honorary editor

Mednarodni uredniški svet • International Advisory Board

Michael Beckermann (Columbia University, USA), Robert S. Hatten (Indiana University, USA), David Hiley (University of Regensburg, Germany), Thomas Hochradner (Mozarteum Salzburg, Austria), Helmut Loos (University of Leipzig, Germany), Jim Samson (Royal Holloway University of London, UK), Lubomír Spurný (Masaryk University Brno, Czech Republic), Jeff Todd Titon (Brown University, USA), Katarina Tomašević (Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Serbia), Michael Walter (University of Graz, Austria)

Uredništvo • Editorial address

Oddelek za muzikologijo

Filozofska fakulteta

Aškerčeva 2, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija

e-mail: muzikoloski.zbornik@ff.uni-lj.si

<https://journals.uni-lj.si/MuzikoloskiZbornik>

Cena posamezne številke • Single issue price

10 €

Letna naročnina • Annual subscription

20 €

Založila • Published by

Založba Univerze v Ljubljani

Za založbo • For the publisher

Gregor Majdič, rektor Univerze v Ljubljani

Izdaja • Issued by

Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, Oddelek za muzikologijo Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani

Za izdajatelja • For the issuer

Mojca Schlamberger Brezar, dekanja Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani

Tisk • Printed by

Birografika Bori d. o. o., Ljubljana

Naklada 150 izvodov • Printed in 150 copies

Izdajo zbornika je omogočila Javna agencija za znanstvenoraziskovalno in inovacijsko dejavnost Republike Slovenije. / *With the support of the Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency.*



To delo je ponujeno pod licenco Creative Commons Priznanje avtorstva - Deljenje pod enakimi pogoji 4.0 Mednarodna licenca (izjema so fotografije). / *This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (except photographs).*

Vsebina/Contents

Helena Filipčič Gardina

Pregled življenjske poti in glasbenega delovanja Vladimirja Lovca (1922–1992)	5
Life and Musical Activities of Vladimir Lovce (1922–1992)	

Gregor Pompe

»Hodim nekam svoja pota.«	
Slogovna vprašanja ob simfoničnem opusu Vladimirja Lovca	23
“I Go My Own Way”: Stylistic Questions About Vladimir Lovce’s Symphonic Opus	

Tjaša Ribizel Popič

Vladimir Lovce v vlogi glasbenega kritika	43
Vladimir Lovce as a Music Critic	

Sa Ra Park

Domenico Scarlatti’s Musical Style: His Keyboard Sonata K. 288	55
Glasbeni slog Domenica Scarlattija: njegova Sonata K. 288	

Rytis Urniežius

Edvard Grieg’s Norwegian Dances op. 35: Two Orchestral Versions, Two Destinies	83
<i>Norveški plesi</i> op. 35 Edvarda Griega: dve orkestrski različici, dve usodi	

Mohd Fairuz Zamani

Is It Chaotic? An Examination of the Harmonic Materials in Razak Abdul Aziz’s <i>Etude No. 5</i> for Solo Piano	115
Je kaotično? Pregled harmonskega gradiva v <i>Etudi št. 5</i> za klavir solo Razaka Abdula Aziza	

Klara Žnideršič, Peter Šavli, Matija Marolt, Matevž Pesek

Trubadur: nadgradnja platforme za e-učenje glasbene teorije	153
Troubadour: Upgrading the Music Theory E-Learning Platform	

Wang Yi

Revolutionizing Music Production with ChatGPT Applications: Accessibility, Creativity, and Impact on the Industry in China	175
Preobrat v ustvarjanju glasbe z uporabo ChatGPT aplikacij: dostopnost, ustvarjalnost in vpliv na dejavnost na Kitajskem	



DOI: 10.4312/mz.60.1.83-114

UDK: 785.11Grieg E.

Edvard Grieg's *Norwegian Dances* op. 35: Two Orchestral Versions, Two Destinies

Rytis Urniežius

Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theatre

ABSTRACT

Edvard Grieg never orchestrated his *Norwegian Dances* Op. 35 composition himself, but several orchestral versions created by other musicians exist. The orchestration by Hans Sitt soon became popular and is frequently performed up to these days. Robert Henriques created another version of the composition approximately eight years earlier than Sitt. Although Grieg approved Henriques's version in his letters, Sitt's version was ultimately published. The article aims to compare two orchestral versions of *Norwegian Dances*, their orchestration technique, style, and probable influences.

Keywords: Edvard Grieg, *Norwegian Dances* Op. 35, orchestration

IZVLEČEK

Edvard Grieg ni nikoli orkestriral svojih *Norveških plesov*, op. 35, obstaja pa več orkestrskih različic, ki so delo drugih glasbenikov. Zelo popularna je postala orkestracija Hansa Sitta, ki se še danes pogosto izvaja. Približno osem let pred Sittom je svojo različico orkestracije izdelal tudi Robert Henriques. Čeprav je Grieg v svojih pismih pohvalil Henriquesovo verzijo, je bila na koncu izdana Sittova. Članek primerja obe orkestralni verziji *Norveških plesov*, tehniko in slog njune orkestracije ter verjetne vzore zanju.

Ključne besede: Edvard Grieg, *Norveški plesi* op. 35, orkestracija

Introduction: A Short History of Two Orchestrations

Edvard Grieg created his *Norwegian Dances* Op. 35 for piano four hands in 1880 (1881?)¹. Soon afterwards the composition was published by C. F. Peters publishing house in Leipzig. Grieg found the themes (a march and three hal-lings) for *Norwegian Dances* in the collection of folk melodies *Older and Newer Norwegian Mountain Melodies* [*Ældre og nyere norske fjeldmelodier*] compiled by Ludvig M. Lindeman (1812–1887).² Grieg never orchestrated this composition himself. Instead, at least two orchestral versions³ of this work by other musicians were accomplished during Grieg's lifetime. Danish composer and cellist Robert Henriques (1858–1914) created the first version, and Bohemian violinist Hans Sitt (1850–1922) the second one. Ultimately, Sitt's score was published and became the most frequently performed orchestral version of *Norwegian Dances*.

The concise chronology of creating orchestral versions of *Norwegian Dances* is as follows:

- In 1880 (1881?), Grieg created a four-movement cycle *Norwegian Dances* for piano four hands.
- In 1881, the composition was published by C. F. Peters.
- In 1882, Robert Henriques orchestrated *Norwegian Dances*.
- In 1883, on 2 January, Grieg sent a letter to Henriques containing comments and suggestions to improve the score.
- In 1886, on 15 January, the premier of *Peer Gynt* in Copenhagen included *Norwegian Dances* 1, 2 and 3 orchestrated by Henriques.
- In 1887, Grieg created the version of *Norwegian Dances* for piano two hands.
- In 1890,⁴ Hans Sitt completed his orchestral version of *Norwegian Dances*.

1 Both years (1880 and 1881) can be found indicated in different sources as years of the composing of *Norwegian Dances*.

2 In his letter to Gerhard Schjelderup (11 May 1904), Grieg mentioned that *Norwegian Dances* contain no folk melodies but his original themes (Finn Benestad and William H. Halverson, eds., *Edvard Grieg: Letters to Colleagues and Friends* (Columbus, Ohio: Peer Gynt Press, 2000), 609). Likely, Grieg here was mistaken. Yet the indication "[in op. 35]" in the text is given in brackets, thus not by Grieg himself but by the editors, so Grieg did not necessarily mean Op. 35, but possibly some other collection. In another letter to Schjelderup (26 October 1905), Grieg speaks of *Norwegian Dances* already as the work where "folk song merges with one's own individuality" (Ibid., 612).

3 In a letter to Carl Warmuth Jr. (10 January 1884), Grieg talked about performing the orchestrated *Norwegian Dances* at the concert in Amsterdam. The conductor Johan Gottfried Hendrik Mann was also the author of the orchestration. According to Grieg, the composition had tremendous success (Benestad and Halverson, *Edvard Grieg: Letters*, 669–670). Also, Frans van der Stucken orchestrated *Dances* Nos. 2 and 3 (see: Bergen Offentlige Bibliotek website, <https://mitt.bergenbibliotek.no/cgi-bin/websok-grieg?tnr=201706>). Apparently, *Norwegian Dances* were orchestrated more than twice, yet only Sitt's version stood the test of time.

4 In some sources (program notes, etc.), the date 1891 and sometimes earlier years are indicated. However, the date 1890 appears more credible.

- In 1891, *C. F. Peters* publishing house issued an orchestral score of *Norwegian Dances* created by Hans Sitt.

In a letter to Frederick Delius (16 April 1888), Grieg highly estimated the “colossal erudition” of Sitt, yet he characterised his orchestration as “at times somewhat crude”.⁵ When *Peters* told about the intention to publish the orchestral version of *Norwegian Dances*, Grieg suggested asking a French musician to do this job. He indicated Edouard Lalo as one of the candidates. Yet *Peters* “did not comply with Grieg’s wishes”⁶: an already existing version created by Sitt was published in 1891. Grieg did not prefer any of the two existing scores: he perceived the advantages and shortcomings of each version, yet his conception was somehow different, expecting that the third version (the “French” one) could be the best.

In an article published in 1953, Danish author Sven Lunn attempted to look more closely at the relations between Grieg and Henriques. Among other items, he discussed the orchestration of *Norwegian Dances*. According to Lunn:

*Henriques immediately saw that they [Norwegian Dances – R.U.] provided opportunities for an orchestral arrangement, addressed [...] Grieg and obtained his permission to orchestrate them. Probably, he worked during summer months: at least No. 2 of these four Dances is dated “Petershøj July 3, 1882”, and No. 3 “Petershøj July 25, 1882”. No. 1 and No. 4 are without date.*⁷

The assumption that Henriques “immediately saw” the opportunities hidden in the composition matches with characteristics accepted by numerous authors⁸ who consider *Norwegian Dances* a work that “cries for being orchestrated” due to the inherent qualities of its character and texture. Benestad and Schjelderup-Ebbe also stated that “*Norwegian Dances* have a character that seems to call for the sound of an orchestra, and it is strange that Grieg himself didn’t make some attempt to orchestrate them at the same time he wrote the four-hands version”.⁹

5 Benestad and Halverson, *Edvard Grieg: Letters*, 213.

6 Finn Benestad and Dag Schjelderup-Ebbe, *Edvard Grieg: The Man and the Artist* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1988), 248.

7 Sven Lunn, “Grieg og Robert Henriques,” *Nordisk musikkultur* 2, no. 1 (1953): 6.

8 For example: Olga Levashova, *Edvard Grieg* (Moskva: Muzyka, 1975), 260. The author of this monograph assumes that Grieg’s initial version for piano four hands could be regarded as a sketch for the intended symphonic score.

9 Benestad and Schjelderup-Ebbe, *Edvard Grieg: The Man*, 247. Apart from indicating that *Norwegian Dances* “call for the sound of an orchestra”, Benestad and Schjelderup-Ebbe wrote that they produce “almost symphonic effect” (ibid., 248). The word “almost” might indicate the widely spread point of view on Grieg as a creator of small and chamber compositions that prevent musicologists from acknowledging a “real” symphonism of Grieg’s creations. All four movements are composed in Grieg’s favourite compound ternary form ABA, where both sections A are identical. Only the fourth *Dance* has a developed coda. The main manifestation of symphonism could be

A possible explanation of such “strange” behaviour could be found in Grieg’s letter to Henriques (21 December 1885): “I [...] must practice the piano, because I have promised Svendsen that I will participate in his next philharmonic concert and don’t have time to orchestrate the *Dances* myself.”¹⁰ Presumably, Grieg had no plans to orchestrate *Dances*, at least in the nearest future, just because they “cried for being orchestrated”, as he did with some other of his compositions (e.g., *Holberg Suite*, 1884/85, also songs and piano pieces arranged for string orchestra).¹¹

Grieg’s generally high opinion about Henriques’s skills as an orchestrator was confirmed in his letter to Breitkopf & Hartel (31 August 1882). There Grieg wrote about Menuet of his Piano Sonata orchestrated by Henriques that was “so sonorously and capably done that it is in any case worth publishing”.¹² Grieg’s opinion about the score of *Norwegian Dances* was also positive. In his letter to Henriques (2 January 1883), Grieg cautiously praised the work, saying that he must hear it played before the final assessment. Also, he saw no possibility of publishing the score, at least in *Peters Publishing House*, which was overwhelmed with arrangements.

Four years later, an opportunity to apply the orchestrated version emerged: the producers of the premier of *Peer Gynt* in Copenhagen (15 January 1886) planned to extend the *Dance* scene and needed more music. Grieg suggested the orchestral version of *Norwegian Dances* and wrote to Henriques (21 December 1885) asking him to send the score. Grieg remembered that, several years before, he approved Henriques’s orchestration.¹³ The next day after the

found in disclosing of innate beauty and peculiarities of the character of the themes presented in extended expositions. The texture based on the simple homophonic accompaniment and dancing rhythms implies the possibility of efficient orchestral embodiment. On the other hand, slower and more melodious middle sections fit for the subtle textures and the ingenious modification of timbre.

10 Benestad and Halverson, *Edvard Grieg: Letters*, 395.

11 The assumption that Grieg did not orchestrate his work because of so-called “Svendsen complex”, i.e. admiration of Johan Svendsen’s (1840–1911) compositions on folk tunes and especially his orchestration (“If I had Svendsen’s brilliant technique...”, as Grieg stated in a letter to Henriques from 24 April 1887, see: Benestad and Halverson, *Edvard Grieg: Letters*, 397) is doubtful. There is no doubt that he admired Svendsen’s compositions and musical activities in general, see: Edvard Grieg, “Johan Svendsen’s Concert,” *Edvard Grieg: Diaries, Articles, Speeches*, ed. Finn Benestad and William H. Halverson (Columbus: Peer Gynt Press, 2001), 280–283. Yet, up to that time, Grieg had completed many successful orchestral works and established his orchestral style. In general, the importance of this presumable inferiority complex is probably overemphasized (on this point see: Erlend Hovland, “The Decline of Music History: A Case Study of the Grieg Research,” *Studia Musicologica Norvegica* 43, no. 1 (2017): 31–57.

12 Benestad and Halverson, *Edvard Grieg: Letters*, 165. Grieg’s Piano sonata attracted attention as a potentially orchestral work not once: Percy Grainger planned to create an orchestral version of this work and present it as “Grieg-Grainger symphony”. However, the plan was not implemented (Malcolm Gillies and David Pear, “Great Expectations: Grieg and Grainger,” *The Musical Times* 148, no. 1900 (2007): 15).

13 Benestad and Halverson, *Edvard Grieg: Letters*, 395.

premiere (the first three *Dances* were performed¹⁴) Grieg wrote to Henriques telling him that orchestrated pieces “at some places really sounded quite good”.¹⁵ Yet Grieg noticed: “I would have liked a more rhythmic emphasis in the orchestration, but who could have guessed that these *Dances* would be used in *Peer Gynt*?”¹⁶

That was not the last time Grieg considered incorporating the music from *Norwegian Dances* into *Peer Gynt*. In a letter to the director of the Christiania Theatre Bjørn Bjørnson (7 February 1892), Grieg suggested including *Dance* No. 4 into the staging of *Peer Gynt*. It is doubtful whether he had in mind Henriques's or Sitt's version. The comment in a footnote in a collection of Grieg's letters (2000) indicates Henrique's score, yet at that time Sitt's version had already been published (1891) and, therefore, also available.¹⁷ However, in 1892 Grieg discarded a suggestion to include *Dance* No. 2 into his *Peer Gynt* orchestral suite No. 2 because the *Dance* was based on the folk tune, while “in *Peer Gynt* everything must be original”.¹⁸

Sven Lunn noted that Henriques's version is full of inventive ideas, however, a little clumsy. Meanwhile, Sitt's version is less ingenious but more professionally scored, revealing the craftsmanship of the orchestrator. Besides, Lunn observes that the two versions have many similarities. The reasons for these similarities could be different: either the character of Grieg's work allows little variants of its orchestral embodiment, or Sitt was familiar with Henriques's score before he started his work on *Dances*. Lunn concludes that in the latter case, Sitt modified Henriques's initial conception, striving to adapt the score to the requirements of the contemporary orchestration standards that would presumably help to gain popularity performing it in concerts. However, according to Lunn, the result was less characteristic, less Norwegian, and less “griegish” than in Henriques's version. Yet Lunn does not explain what features of Henriques's score made it more Norwegian and closer to Grieg's style.¹⁹

The history of two versions and the appearance of one of them in the press still leaves questions and could become the subject of separate research. Yet the

14 Benestad and Schjelderup-Ebbe, *Edvard Grieg: The Man*, 248.

15 Benestad and Halverson, *Edvard Grieg: Letters*, 396.

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid., 110.

18 Edvard Grieg, Letter to C. F. Peters publishing house [Max Abraham?], 12 February 1892. Bergen Offentlige Bibliotek website, <http://www.bergen.folkebibl.no/cgi-bin/websok-grieg?mode=p&nr=383467&dok=0&pf=kort&side=2>, accessed January 27, 2022. It is not clear if Grieg reconsidered the concept of *Peer Gynt* after the performances in Copenhagen and Christiania, where *Dances* were used, or if he drew a dividing line between the aesthetic demands of incidental music and concert music. It is also possible that Grieg included *Dances* in Copenhagen premier merely because of the lack of time for creating new pieces.

19 Lunn, “Grieg og Robert Henriques,” 8.

current article does not aim to disentangle the historical circumstances that led to the ultimate result: sending Henriques's score into oblivion and publishing Sitt's score, which became very popular and frequently performed up to this day. In this article, the two versions of the orchestration are compared to answer several questions:

- 1) should we treat Sitt's orchestration as more professional and masterly created;
- 2) which of the scores is closer to Grieg's orchestration manner, "Grieg's spirit", and would it be appropriate to renew Henriques's version and suggest it for the concert stage;
- 3) what are the main similarities between the two scores and is there a possibility that Sitt used Henriques's score while composing his own?

Grieg on Henriques's Orchestration: 2 January 1883 Letter

Grieg wrote his comments on Henriques's orchestration of the *Norwegian Dances* in his letter sent on 2 January 1883.²⁰ He praised the work as a whole and wrote that only a few small things needed to be changed. Grieg indicated sixteen questionable places in Henriques's score and suggested improvements. These comments include several noteworthy observations that could help understand Grieg's viewpoint on orchestration details. The most noteworthy items of Grieg's letter are surveyed in this chapter.

The first comment suggests the low strings *pizzicato* at the beginning of *Dance* No. 1 to make the chromatic succession in measures 8–10 sound more prominent. Later, in his ninth comment, Grieg wrote that he has nothing to say about *Dance* No. 2, yet in a *post scriptum*, he suggested *pizzicato* for cellos in rehearsal mark B and five measures after rehearsal mark C. These comments show that Grieg was inclined to enlighten the texture by indicating *pizzicato* for the low strings, simultaneously making their line more conspicuous.

The second comment reveals that Grieg knew well-established patterns of instrumental expression widely used at that time, and at least some of them were acceptable to him. Besides other suggestions, Grieg asked in *Dance* No. 1 to proceed with the bassoon solo melody after rehearsal mark C, characterising the sound of the bassoon as "humorous".

Several comments (3, 5, and 7 concerning *Dance* No. 1 and 11, 12, 14, and 15 concerning *Dance* No. 4) confirm Grieg's precaution against abusing the

20 Letter to Robert Henriques, 2 January 1883. Edvard Grieg, Bergen Offentlige Bibliotek website, accessed January 31, 2022. The author of this article would like to express his gratitude to Jorunn Eckhoff Færden (Edvard Grieg Archives, Bergen Public Library) for the substantial help in the current research by providing the essential materials, including the copy of Grieg's letter to Henriques from 2 January 1883, and also a copy of the score of *Norwegian Dances* created by Henriques.

heavy brass: trombones and especially trumpets. For instance, in the fifth comment, Grieg suggested excluding the trombone *piano* at rehearsal mark F of *Dance* No. 1, preferring a bassoon instead. Likely, trombone could be suitable in that episode, yet Grieg's subtle taste suggested that it would not conform to his orchestration style.

For *Dance* No. 4, Grieg expressed several significant objections. He began a series of comments with a warning "alle Achtung!" This warning again deals with the usage of trombones and trumpets. Firstly (the eleventh comment), he once again asked to replace trombones with bassoons (and to save bass trombone for *fortissimo*) at the first *più vivo*.

Then, inevitably, trumpets attracted Grieg's attention. Grieg warns Henriques, that if the melody is assigned to the trumpet, it should be meticulously calculated otherwise the result would be unsatisfactory. He demanded to eliminate trumpets 17 measures after rehearsal mark D (the twelfth comment)²¹: they are dangerous "even if they play bellow *pppp*, but no one does – even a decent *piano* is a rarity" ["selv om de bælser *pppp*, men det gjør desuden ingen, selv et anstændigt *piano* hører til Sjeldenhederne"]. Grieg suggested clarinets as a substitution. The moderation of using trumpets in melody as well as in other layers of texture is manifested in most of Grieg's orchestral creations.²²

However, in some appropriate instances, Grieg appreciated the quality of brass sound. 13 measures after the rehearsal mark F (his fourteenth comment) Grieg demanded a strong accent and suggested the horn instead of the bassoon. Moreover, 15 measures after the rehearsal mark G he suggested *including* the trumpet to achieve an emphatically tragic effect: Grieg does not restrict the activity of a heavy brass instrument but, on the contrary, encourages its application.

2 January 1883 letter to Henriques reveals some of Grieg's attitudes on orchestration. It shows the composer's sensibility for subtle timbre characteristics and precaution in applying orchestral means (especially the heavy brass). Henrique might easily correct the places Grieg suggested to improve without affecting the entirety of the scoring style (therefore, it is not Grieg's criticism that determined the oblivion of Henriques's score). However, when Grieg intended to use *Dances* Nos. 1, 2 and 3 in the 1886 Copenhagen premiere of *Peer*

21 Most likely Grieg's twelfth comment about 17 measures after rehearsal mark D contains a mistake: that place is the beginning of the rehearsal mark E, the trumpets staves there are empty and the general dynamic mark is *f*, but not *p* in any degree. Perhaps, Grieg had in mind the rehearsal mark B (measure 71): its character corresponds to the description in Grieg's letter.

22 On the other hand, Grieg did not always succeed in avoiding the doubtful application of trumpets, for example, in the final episode of *In the Halls of the Mountain King* and the beginning of *Symphonic Dance* No. 1. In those episodes, the melody is given to the second trumpet while the first trumpet performs one of the harmonic voices above this melody. As a result, the first trumpet in a higher position masks the melody.

Gynt, there were no amendments in the score sent by Henriques.²³ Most likely, the latter did not work on this orchestration until sending them after Grieg's request.

The comparison of Henriques's and Sitt's scores could help to discuss the earlier raised questions concerning the differences and similarities between the two versions of *Norwegian Dances* orchestration, their proximity to or estrangement from "Grieg's spirit", probable borrowings by Sitt from Henriques's score and the expedience to renew Henriques's version and suggesting it for the concert stage. The comparison of these two scores will take place in the rest section of the current article.

General Features of Two Scores

There are differences in measure numbers between Sitt's and Henriques's scores preserved in the Royal Library in Copenhagen. In the middle section of *Dance* No. 1, Henriques shortened the repeated passage by putting the repeat mark one measure earlier than in the original piano score (Sitt remained faithful to the original). Therefore, the measure numbers beginning with the second half of Henriques's score do not correspond with Sitt's score: it lags by one measure. Subsequently, Henriques's score is one measure shorter. Also, Sitt added two introductory measures in *Dance* No. 2, and Henriques did not. Therefore, his score is two measures shorter. It causes inconveniences in comparing the two versions; moreover, the rehearsal marks in both scores are different. Both measure numberings in the scores of *Dances* Nos. 1 and 2 will be indicated for orientation further when necessary. The number of measures in *Dances* Nos. 3 and 4 coincides in both scores. In the further text, Sitt's score will be indicated by the abbreviation **SS**, and Henriques's score will be indicated by the abbreviation **HS**.

Both Sitt and Henriques created their scores from the piano four hands score. The latter contains elements absent in the reduced version for piano two hands; these elements are present in both orchestral scores. However, Sitt begins *Dance* No. 4 in D minor and then shifts to B minor from measure 25: similar to the version for piano two hands (that was composed later, in 1887). Thus, when Henriques created his orchestration, Grieg's version for piano two hands still had not been composed, and the version for piano four hands begins directly in B minor key, therefore HS begins in B minor key as well.

23 The author of this article used a copy of the score of *Norwegian Dances* created by Henriques that is preserved in the Royal Library in Copenhagen.

Should Sitt's Score Be Regarded as More Professional and Masterly Created than Henriques's?

The instrumentations of both scores differ only slightly. Both sets of instruments are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: The instrumentation of the *Norwegian Dances* by Sitt and Henriques

Orchestral sections	Sitt's score (SS)	Henriques's score (HS)
Woodwinds	2 flutes	flute
	piccolo	2 nd flute or piccolo
	2 oboes	2 oboes
	2 clarinets in B (A in No. 2)	2 clarinets in A
	2 bassoons	2 bassoons
Horns	<i>Dance No. 1:</i>	<i>Dance No. 1:</i>
	2 horns in F	2 horns in D
	2 horns in D	2 horns in F
	<i>Dance No. 2:</i>	<i>Dance No. 2:</i>
	2 horns in F	2 horns in E
	2 horns in E	
	<i>Dance No. 3:</i>	<i>Dance No. 3:</i>
	4 horns in F	4 horns in E
	<i>Dance No. 4:</i>	<i>Dance No. 4:</i>
	2 horns in F	2 horns in D
	2 horns in D	2 horns in F
Heavy brass	2 trumpets in F	2 trumpets in D (E in No. 2)
	3 trombones	3 trombones (only bass trombone in No. 2)
	tuba (in Nos. 1, 4)	tuba (in Nos. 1, 4)
Percussion	kettledrums	kettledrums
		snare drum (in No. 1)
	triangle (in Nos. 1, 3, 4)	triangle (in Nos. 1, 3, 4)
		bass drum (in Nos. 1, 3, 4)
	cymbals (in No. 4)	cymbals (in Nos. 1, 3, 4)
Plucked strings	harp (in No. 2)	
Bowed strings	string section	string section

Obviously, there are more **percussion instruments** in HS than in SS. The analysis of both scores revealed that Henriques sometimes abuses them a little.²⁴ Therefore, Grieg's remark that he would prefer "more rhythmic emphasis" in HS seems strange.²⁵ This remark could be explained only in the context of using HS in *Peer Gynt* dancing scenes.

Already the first two measures show the differences between two versions, firstly in the context of Grieg's warnings against the overuse of **heavy brass**. Henriques does not include trombones, while Sitt avoids trumpets. Considering Grieg's cautious attitude towards overuse of trumpets, Sitt's version should be closer to Grieg's expectations. Interval of a third in trumpets in HS would sound rather poignantly. Besides, the upper, most prominent sound of trumpets is fifth, while original concept demands the root of the A major chord in the upper position. The range of the first chord in SS is impressively extended due to the first sixteenth of piccolo, that is absent in HS (Example 1).

In several places, Henriques uses trombones excessively by giving them melodies that do not correspond to the character of the instruments. Grieg warned against these abuses in his letter comments Nos. 5 and 11. Sitt uses trombones sparingly, applying them as instruments for accompaniment or prominent melodies in *forte* episodes.

In every orchestral score, a proper **equilibrium between different layers of texture** should be created. Thus, the task of the orchestrator lies in creating a proper orchestral texture embodied with the help of the application of instruments. The **choice of timbres** of instruments and their distribution in different layers of the texture is another task integrated with the previous one. In general, the balance of different layers of texture is better in SS. The precondition for such balance is purposeful and well-calculated doublings of instruments. Doublings chosen by Henriques in some places seem not so reasoned. The choice of timbres and their distribution in the texture is variable in both scores. Mostly, Sitt's solution seems more grounded, yet HS also contains passages of colourful and inventive application of instruments. Henriques uses more pure solo timbres, yet his texture is often too particoloured and thin.

24 At the beginning of the manuscript, there is a sign X in blue pencil next to the stave containing parts of the snare drum and triangle. Most likely it was made by Grieg: he disapproved of the usage of these instruments.

25 Bjarte Engeset presumes that such reproach has a foundation in Grieg's innate character: "Grieg's personal temperament seems to have something in common with the freedom seeking and radical Beethoven in the inclination towards energy and accentuation." See: Bjarte Engeset, "Edvard Grieg's Orchestral Style: Conductor's Point of View," keynote presentation at the Grieg Conference in Copenhagen (August 13, 2011), 44, <https://griegsociety.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Paper-Bjarte-Engeset-2011.pdf>.

SS
HS

Allegro marcato. ♩=132

Allegro marcato. ♩=132

Example 1: *Norwegian Dance No. 1*, mm. 1–2. Condensed C score.

It seems that Henriques does not always estimate the necessity of highlighting and reinforcing the melodic layer: in some places, the relief and the background are not sufficiently balanced in favour of one of them. In Example 2, the organ point of fifths in SS counterweights the melody of the first violins, while in HS all violins dominate against the solo cello²⁶ and two very low horns.

26 On the other hand, it can be presumed that the indication “Solo” could mean just the importance of a particular part because the unison of both the first and the second violins is supplied with the same indication.

SS

Presto e con brio. $\text{♩} = 116$

Bassoon

Violin 1 *sul G. p*

Viola *p marcato*

Violoncello *p*

Double Bass *divisi p*

HS

Presto e con brio. $\text{♩} = 116$

Bassoon *p*

Horn in D *pp*

Violin 1, 2 *Solo p marcato pizz.*

Viola *p*

Violoncello *Solo p*

Example 2: *Norwegian Dance* No. 4, mm. 35–43. Empty staves are omitted.

In HS, two different layers of texture sometimes negatively intervene with one another: in Example 3, high pedal notes of woodwinds are in the same tessitura as the melody performed by other woodwind instruments.

HS

Flute 1 *p*

Flute 2 *[p]*

Oboe *[p]* *a2 p*

Clarinet in A *[p]*

Example 3: *Norwegian Dance* No. 4, mm. 27–32. High woodwinds parts in HS.

Pure timbres of solo brass instruments (firstly horn and later trumpet) in SS, mm. 87–102 of *Dance No. 4* impart fresh, energetic character to the melody. In HS, the same melodic passages are attributed to the first violins doubled firstly by horn solo and later by clarinet. Such colouring adds little to the predominant timbre of violins (Example 4).

SS

[Presto e con brio $\text{♩} = 116$]

I

Bassoon *p* Solo

Horn in F *p*

Violin I *p*

Viola *p*

Viola *p* divisi

Violoncello *p*

Double Bass, Trombone 3 *p*

====

Bassoon *p* Solo

Trumpet in F *p*

Violin I *p*

Violin 2 *p*

Viola *p*

Viola *p*

Violoncello *p*

Double Bass, Trombone 3 *p*

HS

[Presto e con brio $\text{♩}=116$]

Bassoon

Horn in F

Trumpet in D

Violin 1

Violin 2

Viola
Violoncello

Double Bass,
Trombone 3

Clarinet in A

Bassoon

Violin 1

Violin 2

Viola
Violoncello

Double Bass,
Trombone 3

Solo

p

pp

p subito

p subito

p subito

p subito

p subito

Example 4: *Norwegian Dance* No. 4, mm. 87–100. Condensed score.

Violas are often used separately from other strings in both scores but especially in SS – not only in accompaniments but also in doubling melodies and counterpoints, yet seldom as the principal implementers of significant themes. This emphasis on violas partly could be explained by the fact that Sitt was a violist himself and played viola in the Brodsky Quartet for many years (why violas

are also extensively employed in HS is hard to explain because Henriques was a cellist). However, in Grieg's scores, a similar doubling also appears, although mostly in short episodes. Notably, violas are frequently combined with clarinets. For example, in *Symphonic Dance No. 2* (mm. 100–107), violas double clarinet and then oboe solo in octave. Both arrangers are inclined to double cellos and double basses with bassoons (another way of doubling favoured by Grieg), yet Sitt applies this means more frequently.

In mm. 49–59 of the *Dance No. 1* Henriques gives the subsidiary layer of texture for the first violins *pizzicato* supported by flute – oboes chord. This combination is subtle but likely a little feeble. Meanwhile, Sitt assigns the movement in eighths to piccolo and oboes in octave and placing flutes in the middle creates a compact unit of a distant “military” character. A contrasting dark timbre of the main melody is achieved by doubling violins *sul G* with low clarinets (Example 5).

SS

Allegro marcato. $\text{♩} = 132$

Flute *pp*

Piccolo *pp*

Oboe *pp*

Clarinet in Bb *pp*

Bassoon *pp*

Horn in D *pppp*

Trumpet in F *pp*

Violin 1 *pp* *sul G.*

Violin 2 *pp* *pizz.*

Viola *pp*

Bassoon 1, Violoncello, Double Bass *pppp molto staccato*

HS

Allegro marcato. ♩=132

Flute *pp*

Oboe *pp*

Horn in F *pp*

Violin 1 *pp* pizz.

Violin 2 *pp* pizz.

Viola *pp* Solo

Bassoon 1, Violoncello, Double Bass *pp*

Example 5: *Norwegian Dance* No. 1, mm. 49–53. Condensed score
(bass drum part is eliminated from HS).

The **voice leading** in SS is generally more consequent and logical. Texture elements appear in proper time and do not disappear without reason, as sometimes can be seen in HS. Sitt most often retains the prominent line of cellos and double basses with all leaps, avoiding illogical and inconvenient breaks. For example, the pursuit of proper voice leading determined the unison but not the octave of cellos and double basses at the beginning of *Dance* No. 1 (mm. 8–16). Meanwhile, Henriques did not succeed in avoiding an awkward major seventh leap from E to E-flat in m. 15 (Example 6).

SS

[Allegro marcato. ♩=132]

Violoncello *[p]*

Double Bass *[p]*

cresc. molto

f

HS

[Allegro marcato. ♩=132]

Violoncello *[p]*

Double Bass *[p]*

cresc. molto

f

Example 6: cellos-basses parts in the *Norwegian Dance* No. 1, mm. 11–16.²⁷

27 Grieg added an indication *arco* in pencil at the second measure of this example; up to that place, since measure 3, his indication (also in pencil) *pizz.* remains valid.

Henriques merges cellos and double basses into unison more often. Sitt, in most cases, applies them in octaves, thus keeping a conspicuous bass line. Octaves of cellos and basses in SS are also more effective than Henriques's choice of violas and cellos octaves in the first 19 measures of *Dance No. 4*.

Presumably, Sitt had a more profound **knowledge of instruments' peculiarities and possibilities** than Henriques. Sitt is free in writing *divisi*, multiple stops and harmonics for strings, thus making the texture colourful, lush and voluminous. He chooses the proper registers of wind instruments. In HS, the choice of instruments seems not always the best possible. In Example 7, a clarinet melody that includes sounds of the "bridge" register would not be sufficiently expressive and distinctive in the background of related timbres of second clarinet, bassoons and a horn. Sitt gave the melody to Grieg's favourite oboe and accompaniment to contrastive yet supportive of the graceful melody *pizzicato* of all strings (Example 7).

SS

[Allegretto tranquillo e grazioso. ♩=76]

Solo

Oboe

Bassoon

Horn in F

Violin 1, 2, Viola

Violoncello, Double Bass

HS

[Allegretto tranquillo e grazioso. ♩=76]

Solo

Clarinet in A

Bassoon

Horn in E

Viola

Example 7: *Norwegian Dance No. 2*, mm. 3–6 SS, 1–4 HS. Condensed score.

It also can be stated that Sitt was more attentive to **articulation and performing techniques** (*sul G*, *tasto*, *pizzicato*, the use of harmonics, etc.) that he meticulously indicated in the score. Henriques's articulation is less variable. In *Dance No. 2* since mm. 15 SS (mm. 13 HS), Sitt proceeds with strings accompaniment *pizzicato*. Henriques chooses *arco*, which makes the accompaniment dark and heavyweight because of the low registers of the instruments. This accompaniment does not correspond to the graceful character of the melody. Sitt's attention to articulation, strings bowing, and fingering (indication to play on D string downwards from B to E) is also noteworthy (Example 8).

SS

a tempo [Allegretto tranquillo e grazioso. ♩=76]

HS

a tempo [Allegretto tranquillo e grazioso. ♩=76]

Example 8: *Norwegian Dance No. 2*, mm. 15–18 SS, 13–16 HS. Condensed score, harp staves in SS are omitted.

Evidently, Sitt was a more experienced orchestrator than Henriques. Yet some of his solutions appear as miscalculations. For example, in measure 118 of *Dance No. 4*, Sitt added a rapid ascending D-flat scale passage not found in both Grieg's piano versions and HS. This passage is inconvenient for most instruments (even violins), and clarinets need to cope with this scale moving along the "bridge" register. Moreover, a loud brass chord masks the movement of woodwinds and violins. While watching videos and listening to the recordings, it can be observed, that the performers sometimes even do not make strenuous attempts to perform this passage precisely (Example 9).

[Presto e con brio ♩=116]

The score is for measure 118 of *Norwegian Dance No. 4*, marked *Presto e con brio* with a tempo of ♩=116. The key signature is one sharp (F#) and the time signature is 2/4. The instruments listed are Piccolo, Flute, Clarinet, Oboe, Trumpet, Horn, Trombone, Tuba, Bassoon, Violin 1, 2, Viola, and Violoncello/Double Bass. The Piccolo, Flute, Clarinet, and Violin 1, 2 parts feature a rapid ascending D-flat scale passage. The brass section (Oboe, Trumpet, Horn, Trombone, Tuba, Bassoon) plays a loud chord (sf) that masks the woodwinds and violins. The Viola and Violoncello/Double Bass also play a loud chord (sf). The score is a condensed C score.

Example 9: *Norwegian Dance No. 4*, m. 118 SS. Condensed C score.

Which of the Scores is Closer to Grieg's Orchestration?

Sven Lunn assumes that Henriques's orchestration is closer to Grieg's orchestration manner, as he wrote, to "Grieg's spirit". This opinion is subjective, and a nearer insight into both scores makes this assumption doubtful. Besides, the content of the concept "Grieg's spirit" is too vague and not a suitable point of departure for the analysis; therefore, more tangible concepts of *orchestration style*, *manner* or *technique* are more precise and hence put into the focus of this research. Further, several examples taken from both arrangements are presented in the context of the peculiarities of Grieg's orchestration.

The style of orchestration could be examined in two aspects: 1) an application of means of the orchestral embodiment of musical material in local, short episodes and 2) a distribution of the orchestration means in the entirety of the composition – the dramaturgy of textures and timbres. Although local decisions attract immediate attention and appear more evident, the dramaturgy of timbres reveals the constructive way of thinking of the orchestrator and deeper relationships that also determine the orchestral style of the composition. The subject of the research demands attention to both aspects.

It was already noted, that Henriques sometimes merges cellos and double basses into unison, while Sitt applies them mostly in octaves. Grieg also favoured the latter way of producing the conspicuous bass line. The sombre sound of violins *sul G* appear in many of Grieg's compositions (the first theme of the *Symphonic Dance* No. 4) and SS (*Dance* No. 4, mm. 103–117, 207–229).

There is a very sharp contrast between the first and the second sections of *Dance* No. 2. Sitt applies full *tutti* at the beginning of the middle section. Layers of texture are well balanced, and each of them sounds prominently. Numerous examples of such contrastive episodes using the full orchestra also appear in Grieg's scores. Henriques needlessly excluded several significant instruments (heavy brass and violins), thus weakening the overall impression of contrast between the first and the middle sections of the second movement (Example 10).

SS

Allegro. ♩=112

Flute
Oboe
Clarinet
Trumpet
Horn
Trombone
Violin 1, 2
Viola
Violoncello
Double Bass
Bassoon

HS

Allegro. ♩=112

Flute
Oboe
Clarinet
Horn
Bassoon
Viola
Violoncello
Double Bass

Example 10: *Norwegian Dance* No. 2, mm. 27–30 SS, 25–28 HS. Condensed C score, harp in SS is omitted.

The last measure of *Dance* No. 2 in HS contains a chord that seems better orchestrated than in SS and close to Grieg's manner. Sitt included all brass instruments and strings in low registers, producing heavy and even gloomy timbre. The first flute plays high A, which is hard to perform *ppp*. Likely, the combination of instruments in this measure could be treated as Sitt's miscalculation. Meanwhile, Henriques gives high notes to string harmonics, avoids heavy brass and puts flutes and clarinets in a moderate register (Example 11). This distribution of instruments reminds of the last chord of the *Symphonic Dance* No. 2. Sven Lunn likely had in mind such specific subtle details writing about the closeness of HS to Grieg's style.

SS
HS

Flute

Oboe

Clarinet in A

Bassoon

Horn in F

Horn in E

Trumpet in F

Trombone

Timpani

Violin 1

Violin 2

Viola

Violoncello

Double Bass

Flute

Clarinet in A

Bassoon

Horn in E

Violin 1

Violin 2

Viola

Violoncello

Double Bass

Example 11: The last chord of the *Norwegian Dance No. 2*. Empty staves are omitted.

Generally, all comments for improving the score that Grieg sent in his letter to Henriques indicate the places that do not correspond to Grieg's style. For example, in the *Dance No. 1* melody in trombones parts beginning with m. 142 HS (143 SS) would be strikingly atypical for Grieg. Also, in this episode, the instruments used by Sitt for downward octave movements in the same episode, reveal his inventiveness once again: the first violins perform the octave leap while the lower notes of the chords are given to the flutes. Thus, violins slightly dominate, yet a proper *pp* will be available. In HS, the high note of the first flute will be too prominent, and the position of the high oboe between two flutes is not favourable for the balance of the chord (Example 12).

SS

[Allegro marcato. ♩=132]

Flute *pp*

Oboe *pp*

Clarinet in B \flat *pp cantabile*

Bassoon *pp cantabile*

Horn in F *pp*

Timpani *ppp*

Violin 1 *pp*

Violin 2 *pp*

Viola *pp*

Violoncello *arco ppp*

Double Bass *arco ppp*

HS

[Allegro marcato. ♩=132]

Flute *pp bene legato*

Oboe *pp dolce*

Clarinet in A *pp dolce*

Trombone 1, 3 *pp dolce*

Violin 1, 2 *pp pizz. arco*

Violoncello *pp*

Double Bass *pp*

Melody for oboe solo could be considered as Grieg's "leit-timbre" (middle section of *Symphonic Dance* No. 1, outer sections of *Symphonic Dance* No. 2 and many more). Numerous oboe solos can be found in both arrangements of the *Norwegian Dances*. For example, the oboe is a carrier of the main melody in the middle section of *Dance* No. 4 in both scores. Yet Sitt's version is closer to Grieg's way of scoring: the accompaniment for the solo oboe is given to strings, thus reminding the middle section of the *Symphonic Dance* No. 1. Henriques here used clarinet, bassoon and two horns, thus reducing the contrast and probably diminishing the exclusive individuality of the solo oboe (Example 13).

SS

[Tempo meno mosso e tranquillamente. ♩=84]

I solo

Oboe *p dolce*

Violin 1 *sempre p*

Violin 2 *sempre p*

Viola *sempre p*

Violoncello *sempre p*

HS

[Tempo meno mosso e tranquillamente. $\text{♩} = 84$]
I solo

Oboe *p dolce*

Clarinet in A *[p sempre]*

Bassoon *[p sempre]*

Horn in D *[p sempre]*

Violin 2 *[p sempre]*

Viola *[p sempre]*

Example 13: *Norwegian Dance* No. 4, mm. 143–148. Empty staves are omitted.

Contrasts, juxtapositions, imitations, and dialogs between woodwind instruments and between woodwinds and strings are frequent in Grieg's scores (overture *In Autumn*, *Symphonic Dances*, *Lyrical Suite*, etc.). Sitt is more inventive and closer to Grieg's manner while distributing melody among solo woodwinds. Grieg's dramaturgy of timbres is specific and can be observed in all his orchestral works: "the development of music material which affects the overall orchestral design of Grieg's compositions is often based on the *dialogic (polylogic) non-conflict type of the musical dramaturgy*."²⁸ It is based on monologues, dialogues or polylogues of solo woodwinds (of course, the oboe is the most beloved one) that are often "summarized" by more general, impersonal timbre: first violins, first and second violins (usually in octave) or, more seldom, the mixed timbre of several woodwinds. Usually, one of the participants of the polylogue serves as an axis, the principal timbre (e.g., oboe in the *Symphonic Dance* No. 3, clarinet in *Gangar* from *Lyrical Suite*). Meanwhile, the HS in some places contains illogically scattered parts of soloists.

On the other hand, in some cases, Henriques successfully imitates Grieg's polylogues. The *piano* episode at the end of *Dance* No. 2 features an inventive solution found by Henriques (mm. 41–44 in HS). The first violins

28 Rytis Urniežius, "Two Orchestral Embodiments of Three Pieces from Op. 54 by Edvard Grieg," *Musical Annual* 56, no. 1 (2020): 130.

HS

[Presto e con brio. ♩=116]

Flute *pp* *I solo*

Oboe *pp* *I solo*

Clarinet in A *pp* *I solo*

Bassoon *p cantabile*

Horn in D *p*

Violin I, 2 *pp subito*

Viola solo *pp subito*

Violoncello solo *subito p cantabile*

Contrabass *p subito*

Example 15: *Norwegian Dance* No. 4, mm. 103–110, HS. Condensed score.

The special issue is the melodic solos of horn and trumpet, appearing in both scores. Almost in every case, these solos are expressive and of an individual character: brisk and joyful in fast sections of *Dances* Nos. 1 and 4, nostalgic and sorrowful in the middle section of No. 4. Likely, Grieg would not mind against such application of brass soloist (see the suggestion of including trumpet in Grieg's letter, comment No. 14).

The middle section of *Dance* No. 3 is perhaps the most evident example of the priority of Sitts scoring concerning timbre dramaturgy. The overall structure is well-balanced; the melody is constructed as a dialogue between the timbre of the first violins and a mixture of three woodwinds. In HS, all periods are scored differently; the distribution of instruments is scattered, particoloured and uneven; flute II doubles violins II and, for unknown reasons, enters in the second measure of the melody (m. 42); flute I enters in the climax measure although the slight *crescendo* here does not demand any significant enforcement. In the last climax, the first violins enter at the middle of the phrase. Most likely, this is the most unsuccessful solution to distribute the timbres in HS. Evidently, the section does not correspond to the way Grieg would orchestrate this episode (Table 2).

Table 2: *Norwegian Dance* No. 3, the scheme of the distribution of timbres in SS and HS

SS

Measures	33–40 (8 m.)	41–48 (8 m.)	49–56 (8 m.)	57–68 (12 m.)
Melody	violins I	flute I; oboe I, clarinet I	violins I	flute I; oboe I, clarinet I
Accompaniment	strings without double basses	all strings	strings without double basses	flute II, clarinet II; bassoons (in mm. 61–65); all strings

HS

Measures	33–40 (8 m.)	41–48 (8 m.)	49–56 (8 m.)	57–68 (12 m.)
Melody	viola solo	flute I (mm. 45–48); flute II (with vn II, mm. 42–48); violins I, II in 8-va	clarinet I	flutes; oboe I; clarinet I; violins I (join in m. 62)
Accompaniment	violins and cellos	clarinet I; bassoons; strings except violins	oboe I; bassoon I; horn I	bassoon II; horns; trombones; strings without violins I

Could Sitt Profit Henriques's Score while Composing his Own?

Similarities between two scores might be noted, yet most likely, the fact of plagiarism is at least dubitable. Probably coincidences occur when the music material is more or less unequivocal – implying namely this but hardly another way of orchestral solution. Thus, it is impossible to give a clear answer to this question. Yet, the influence of HS on SS is possible. Most places indicated in Grieg's letter to Henriques are scored differently in SS: probably Grieg consulted Sitt. If it happened, the similarities to Henriques's version could also appear after these consultations: perhaps Grieg, familiar with HS, experienced its influence and, in turn, passed some particular details of Henriques's orchestration (or even showed the score) to Sitt.

In any case, this is hardly the case of direct plagiarism. Still, some of the places are rather "suspicious". For example, the similarity of the *crescendo-fortissimo* episode from measure 22 of *Dance* No. 1 is obvious: even the entrance of the

piccolo is at the same place. Often the choice of solo instruments is similar in both scores, e.g., the dialogue between solo horn and oboe in the introduction of *Dance No. 4* (on the other hand, the accompanying layer is scored differently). Since m. 66 of the *Dance No. 1* Sitt uses similar octaves of trombones as Henriques does (Grieg objected to them in comment No. 3 of his letter). That also implies that Sitt perhaps took a sight at HS. However, these octaves are in the original version for piano four hands. Therefore, their inclusion in scores is reasonable, while the choice of the trombones in both scores could be accidental.

Conclusion

In his article, Sven Lunn presents his opinion concerning Henriques orchestration:

*So, what is about Henriques's version? Yes and no. Maybe rather no. It is full of great ideas, but it is pretty clumsy. Sitt's version, on the other hand, could be characterized by a certain knowledge of how to arrange it for orchestra properly. But it is not always as characteristic as Henriques's version. In a few words, one can say that Henriques has the intentions, Sitt, on the other hand, the craft. But still, there is an astonishing similarity between the two scores. Page after page, one can observe such a strong resemblance that one gradually gets the impression that this is not entirely coincidental. It might be coincidental. Perhaps the nature of the material is such that the work can be done only like that of Henriques's and Sitt's. And yet, I cannot believe it is possible. It seems to me as if Hans Sitt's version was inspired by Henriques's as if Sitt has cut Henriques's version to meet the general requirements of the international concert audience, but at the same time has deprived it of some of its characteristic features.*²⁹

Apparently, Sven Lunn was right in evaluating Sitt's orchestration as more professional and expressively conveying musical ideas to the listener. Sitt accumulated many achievements in orchestration art of the nineteenth century, although the score of the *Norwegian Dances* shows his adherence to moderate (apparently close to Leipzig conservatoire school tradition) orchestrating manner. However, it is difficult to agree that Sitt's version was only a "cut" of

29 "Hvordan er så Henriques' version? Ja – og nej. Måske snarere nej. Den er fuld af gode ideer, men er temmelig ubehjælpssom. Sitts version derimod er præget af en sikker viden om, hvorledes en sats skal lægges for orkester. Men den er ikke altid så karakterfuld som Henriques'. I få ord kan man sige, at Henriques har intentionerne, Sitt derimod rutinen. – Men alligevel er der en ganske forbavsende overensstemmelse imellem de to partiturer. Side efter side kan man konstatere en så stærk lighed, at man efterhånden får det indtryk, at denne ikke er ganske tilfældig. Den kan være tilfældig. Muligvis er stoffet af en sådan art, at opgaven kun kan løses på en måde, der minder om Henriques' og Sitts. Og dog kan jeg ikke tro, det er muligt. For mig står det, som om Gand Sitts version er inspireret af Henriques', som om Sitt har skåret Henriques' version til, således at den opfyldte det almindelige, internationale koncertsalskrav, men har derved samtidig berøvet den noget af dens karakter." Lunn, "Grieg og Robert Henriques," 8. The author even suggests that Danish musician could re-work Henriques's score and return the spirit of Grieg. The support for the compatriot and attempt to revive (or renew) his work seems understandable.

Henriques's version with eliminated specific characters and that its only advantage is an accommodation to the requirements of the contemporary audience.

Generally, the sound of Sitt's orchestra seems fuller, and the contrasts are more emphatic. It can be stated that Sitt had an innate sensation of the power of the orchestra. Sitt is inclined to spare instruments for proper effects or to create a gradual *crescendo*. He applied more ingeniously *divisi* of the strings, harmonics, multiple stops, etc. His strings encompass wide range, and his sonorous *tutti* contain little empty staves. SS, on the one hand, is more colourful, contrastive, and effective than HS; on the other hand, it does not contain superficial effects and is mostly not overloaded with excessive quantity of instruments or any eccentric techniques. In comparison, HS is of more chamber character. Sometimes seems, that Henriques was a little cautious or not quite sure about the possibilities of orchestral forces.

Although Grieg referred to Sitt's orchestration of his *Norwegian Dances* as "crude", his version mostly corresponds with Grieg's view on orchestration in both local solutions and dramaturgical distribution of musical ideas in dialogues, polylogues, generalizations and establishing the core axis of timbres. After all, the popularity of Sitt's orchestration in the world concert halls is firmly established. There is hardly any necessity to replace the widespread version with another, especially of doubtful advantages, even if corrections in the score would be made. And, of course, any correction in Sitt's score is hardly possible. It can be concluded that current research did not prove any misdoing (plagiarism) in the case of two scores, and the version, which popularity is already firmly established, deserves its position.

Bibliography

- Benestad, Finn, and Dag Schjelderup-Ebbe. *Edvard Grieg: The Man and the Artist*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1988.
- Benestad, Finn, and William H. Halverson, eds. *Edvard Grieg: Letters to Colleagues and Friends*. Columbus, Ohio: Peer Gynt Press, 2000.
- Engeset, Bjarte. "Edvard Grieg's Orchestral Style: Conductor's Point of View." Keynote presentation at the Grieg Conference in Copenhagen, August 13, 2011. <https://grieg-society.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Paper-Bjarte-Engeset-2011.pdf>.
- Gillies, Malcolm, and David Pear. "Great Expectations: Grieg and Grainger." *The Musical Times* 148, no. 1900 (2007): 7–26.
- Grieg, Edvard. "Johan Svendsen's Concert." In *Edvard Grieg: Diaries, Articles, Speeches*, edited by Finn Benestad and William H. Halverson, 280–283. Columbus: Peer Gynt Press, 2001.
- Hovland, Erlend. "The Decline of Music History: A Case Study of the Grieg Research." *Studia Musicologica Norvegica* 43, no. 1 (2017): 31–57.
- Levashova, Olga. *Edvard Grieg*. Moskva: Muzyka, 1975. [Левашова, Ольга. Эдвард Григ. Москва: Музыка, 1975.]
- Lunn, Sven. "Grieg og Robert Henriques." *Nordisk musikkultur* 2, no. 1 (1953): 6–9.
- Urnėžius, Rytis. "Two Orchestral Embodiments of Three Pieces from Op. 54 by Edvard Grieg." *Musicological Annual* 56, no. 1 (2020): 101–132.

POVZETEK

***Norveški plesi* op. 35 Edvarda Griega: dve orkestrski različici, dve usodi**

Štiristavčni ciklus *Norveških plesov* op. 35, ki temelji na ljudskih melodijah, je ena od najbolj popularnih in najpogostejše izvajanih skladb Edvarda Griega. Izvorno je skladatelj delo zasnoval za klavir štiroročno. Nekaj let kasneje ga je priredil za klavir dvoročno. Zaradi svojih značilnosti (tekstura, značaj tem, enostavna in dobro uravnotežena oblika) je delo zelo primerno za orkestralno priredbo. Grieg ga sam ni nikoli orkestriral, je pa nekaj avtorjem pripravilo orkestrske verzije celotnega cikla ali posameznih stavkov. Vsaj dve orkestrski verziji *Norveških plesov* sta nastali v času Griegovega življenja. Avtor prve je bil danski skladatelj in čelist Robert Henriques. Različica, ki jo je izdelal češki violinist Hans Sitt je nastala nekoliko kasneje. Oba sta orkestrirala vse štiri stavke cikla. Henriquesova različica je bila pripravljena najprej. Grieg je zelo cenil Henriquesovo spretnost pri orkestriranju in je zelo pohvalil njegovo partituro *Norveških plesov*. Vendar je na koncu v tisku izšla Sittova različica. S tem je Henriquesova priredba zaradi spleta zgodovinskih okoliščin padla v pozabo, Sittova verzija pa je ostala zelo priljubljena in pogosto izvajana vse do danes.

Članek primerja obe različici orkestracije *Norveških plesov*. Avtor poskuša oceniti orkestracijske obrtniške sposobnosti obeh prirejevalcev in primerjati značilnosti njunih orkestracij z značilnostmi Griegovega pristopa k orkestraciji. Razpravlja tudi o možnem vplivu Henriquesove orkestracije na nekoliko mlajšo Sittovo.

Raziskava je razkrila, da je Sittova orkestracija izredno večša in poslušalcu jasno posreduje glasbene ideje dela. Sitt je poznal mnoge orkestracijske dosežke 19. stoletja in mu je bil dobro znan tudi Griegov način orkestriranja. V splošnem je zvok Sittovega orkestra bolj poln, kontrasti pa veliko bolj izraziti v primerjavi s Henriquesovo verzijo. Lahko trdimo, da je Sitt izreden občutek za izrazno moč orkestra. Zato si njegova priredba zasluži trdno zagotovljeno priljubljenost v svetovnih koncertnih dvoranh. Henriquesova partitura sicer vsebuje mnogo dragocenih prvin, a ne dosega obrtniške dovršenosti Sittove orkestracije. Raziskava ni odkrila nedvoumnih primerov Sittovega prevzemanja Henriquesovih rešitev. Zato lahko sklenemo, da si Sittova verzija, katere priljubljenost je dodobra utrjena, zasluži to mesto v glasbenem življenju.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

RYTIS URNIEŽIUS (rytis.urniezius@sa.vu.lt) studied wind band conducting at the Klaipėda Faculties of Lithuanian Conservatoire (now Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theatre). In 1993, he gained a doctoral degree in Musicology at this institution. He was a Lecturer at the Music Academy of the Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas and is currently a Professor at the Vilnius University Šiauliai Academy, Institute of Education. Since 2022, Professor at the Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theatre Klaipėda Faculty. He was the founder and editor-in-chief of the peer-reviewed scholarly journal *The Spaces of Creation* (2004–2016). Urniežius is also a member of the International Society of Research and Promotion of Wind Music (IGEB). His research interests are focused on wind band music, instrumentation, orchestration, and music history.

O AVTORJU

RYTIS URNIEŽIUS (rytis.urniezius@sa.vu.lt) je na fakulteti Litvanskega konservatorija v Klaipėdi (sedaj Litvanska akademija za glasbo in gledališče) študiral dirigiranje. Leta 1993 je prav tam doktoriral iz muzikologije. Med letoma 2012 in 2018 je poučeval na Akademiji za glasbo Univerze Vytautasa Magnusa v Kaunasu, trenutno pa je profesor na Pedagoškem inštitutu Akademije v Šiauliaiju, Univerza v Vilni. Je ustanovitelj znanstvene revije *The Spaces of Creation* Univerze v Vilni, bil pa je tudi njen glavni urednik (2004–2016). Je tudi član Mednarodnega društva za raziskovanje in promocijo godbeništva (IGEB). Njegova interesna področja zajemajo glasbo za pihalne orkestre, inštrumentacijo, orkestracijo in zgodovino glasbe.