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ABSTRACT

The two solo violin works by Carl Nielsen (1865-1931) have been largely overlooked since their composition in the 1920s. These pieces are representative of Nielsen’s mature style, combining elements of classical form (the Theme and Variations) as well as processes more commonly found in the twentieth century (through-composition and non-tonal harmonic language). This paper is designed to bring these long-neglected works to light and make them more approachable for violin students, teachers and performers.

As Denmark’s leading composer, Nielsen was well regarded in his lifetime, although his isolation from mainland Europe created obstacles in his path toward international fame. Rather than following trends in post-romantic music, he remained true to his own musical ideals. This choice often isolated him further during his career, but his unique blend of chromatic harmony, driving rhythms and juxtapositions of character captivates modern listeners.

Although small in scope compared to his symphonies and other large works, the enthusiastic spirit and indomitable energy of the solo violin works reflect Nielsen’s character at its best. Combining a high level of virtuosity with solid structural integrity, textural variety and musical interest, these works deserve a much more prominent place in the standard violin repertoire.
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CHAPTER 1
LIFE AND INFLUENCES

Carl Nielsen (1865-1931) is considered to be Denmark’s most important composer, leading trends in Danish composition “from a predominantly Scandinavian late classicism to a rather advanced international modernism.”¹ Critics during and after his life gave varied opinions of his work; some were harsh while others lauded him. His efforts to codify Danish musical language by creating a body of popular songs in traditional folk style resulted in his music becoming “an integral part of Denmark’s national music culture.”² There is no question that he made a considerable impact on future generations of Danish composers.

His diverse compositional output and unique personal style make his works appealing to modern listeners. In recent years, performances of his orchestral works in particular have been more prevalent outside of Denmark. The Carl Nielsen Edition, a project begun in 1994, includes critical editions of his works with written introductions, a bibliography and relevant articles. This resource has aided scholarship on Nielsen’s vast output, increasing interest in Nielsen and his works.

Nielsen drew his musical inspiration from many sources throughout his early life. He was born and raised on Funen, a large sheltered island

often referred to as the “Garden of Denmark.”3 In this agricultural setting, his musical influences were few, but of particular importance to his development. His father was a house painter who worked part-time as a musician, playing fiddle and other instruments in a dance band. Nielsen learned to play violin and cornet, and in later years worked alongside his father, providing party entertainment. Nielsen’s mother sang, and he found inspiration in the expressive qualities of her voice. Nielsen often heard performances given by a regional string quartet and a classical music ensemble, comprised of amateur musicians from the surrounding rural area. He wrote of this experience, saying that “by hearing fragments of the more accessible music of good masters, I conceived a passion for music which cannot leave me.”4 His appreciation for the simplicity of classical forms and style, exemplified by Mozart and Beethoven and carried into the romantic period by Brahms, stayed with him throughout his compositional career.

Nielsen worked as a bugler for a military band during 1879-1893, and it was during this time that he was given his first formal education in music. He expanded upon this education during his years (1884-1886) at Denmark’s Conservatoire of Music, where he studied violin. Interestingly enough, he did not study composition here; “presumably this had seemed too ambitious for a modest country boy.”5 Whatever the case, he

---

5 Lawson, *Carl Nielsen*, p. 43.
absorbed what he thought was necessary, always frustrated with what he viewed as the close-mindedness of the Danish musical establishment. During this time, one of the principal teachers in composition at the Conservatoire was Nicholas Gade, a traditionalist trained in Leipzig. Nielsen’s favorite teacher, the one who became a mentor to him later on, was Orla Rosenhoff. Rosenhoff “had an ear for new music,” and he encouraged Nielsen to forge new paths.  

Nielsen traveled to mainland Europe after graduation on a travel scholarship. On this trip he attended as many concerts as he could, absorbing the current trends of late-Romanticism, Wagner in particular. He had heard Wagner’s music in Denmark, but diary entries from this trip attest to the fact that he was swept away by the performances of *Siegfried* and *Das Rheingold* that he heard in Dresden. He tempered these thoughts later, adding that he found Wagner’s use of *leitmotif* “very naïve” and “somewhat comical.” This was the first of many such trips; in fact, he “travelled obsessively throughout lower Europe in compensation for the perception that he stood at the fringes of the ‘mainstream.’” In the course of his journeys, he met many famous musicians from mainland Europe, including Sibelius, Busoni, Richard Strauss, Brahms, Ravel, Honegger and Milhaud.

---

7 Balzer, *Carl Nielsen Centenary Essays*, p. 76.  
Nielsen worked for a number of years at the Danish Royal Theatre, both as a second violinist (1889-1905) and as conductor (1908-1914). In addition to much-needed income, these jobs provided him with more experience and exposed him to a wide variety of musical styles. After his resignation in 1914, he conducted his own music abroad, expanding his sphere of influence to Sweden and mainland Europe.

Although he studied violin at the Conservatoire and supported himself by playing for many years, Nielsen never showed any intention of pursuing a serious performing career. “A great deal of the repertoire simply did not interest him,” and he was more interested in composition.  

Still, he was known to have played beautifully; he even gave a performance of his Violin Sonata No. 2 for a group of friends. Thorvald Nielsen, a close colleague present at this performance, gives this description: “Nielsen was not a brilliant violinist, but his intonation was perfectly correct; his tone, though not very full, was clear and steady, and his rhythm and phrasing bore the mark of a great musician.”

---

9 Lawson, Carl Nielsen, p. 43.
CHAPTER 2
WORKS AND STYLISTIC EVOLUTION

Nielsen’s compositional career shows a clear evolution from simple roots touched by moderate Classical influence to a mature musician well-versed in the international styles of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. His first known attempt at composition was a polka written when he was nine years old. He had the audacity to ask the band to play it during a party; when his father walked in during the performance, he wrote off the effort, saying it was “impossible to dance to.”\(^\text{11}\) This incident could have left a lasting discouraging mark on Nielsen; instead, perhaps, it served as an early lesson in resiliency, something he would rely on for the rest of his career.

Nielsen’s output covers a wide spectrum of genres, including chamber and solo pieces for various instruments, orchestral works, songs for voice and piano, operas and cantatas. He did not work exclusively in any one genre at any specific time, but embraced the diversity of large and small projects throughout his career. Even in his early professional years, he pushed the boundaries of the conservative establishment in Denmark. Although some early works were greatly appreciated, his first violin sonata received heavy criticism for being “too ‘learned,’” too experimental.\(^\text{12}\) Regardless of this reaction, he had an innate confidence

---

that allowed his originality to shine. In his own words, “the constant avoidance of obstacles is not conducive to the composer’s development. A fresh, live awkwardness is far better than a brilliant but over-ripe perfection.”

Although he composed many vocal and dramatic works, Nielsen believed that music at its best lived and breathed a life of its own, unhindered by outside forces. This sentiment is beautifully stated in this excerpt from his essay “Words, Music, and Programme Music:”

“Meanwhile, music neither can nor will bind itself to concrete ideas; that would be completely contrary to its nature. It will be free; and although it serves and obeys, it does so only because in this way, too, it delights in itself, reveling in the flexibility of its nature like the sea-lion in the water or the swallow in flight. And the less we try to bind it, the more we allow it to follow its own strange laws, the better it serves and the richer it is. If, in common with architecture, it can proclaim nothing definite and cannot, like poetry, painting, and sculpture, convey information about what we call nature and reality, it can, more than any of these, illumine, emphasize, suggest, and clarify with swift assurance the most elementary feelings and most heavily charged emotions.”

These thoughts would appear to be in direct contrast to his equally strong opinions against sentimentality and overt emotionalism in music. He sought a particular kind of expressive objectivity in his writing that allowed for the direct communication of feeling without unnatural exaggeration,

---

“[forging] a compromise between classicism, romanticism, and modernism with a sure hand.”

Since the late 1930’s, scholars have presented various thoughts on Nielsen’s compositional evolution, specifically whether or not to categorize his works according to stylistic periods, and if so, how. Given the number of differing views from credible sources, it seems clear that Nielsen’s style and the changes that occurred throughout his career are difficult to put in precise terms.

1910-1914 is commonly viewed as a midpoint in Nielsen’s career; works such as the Third and Fourth Symphonies and the Second Sonata for violin and piano are considered pivotal in his acceptance and development. The Third Symphony, written in 1911, marked a turning point in Nielsen’s professional career, as he received accolades from the public and the press for the “intense and joyous exuberance” it contained. His Second Sonata, on the other hand, has been considered the beginning of a “stylistic upheaval,” which continued throughout the remainder of Nielsen’s career as he drifted further from classical forms and traditional harmonic language. Nielsen considered his Fourth Symphony, written in response to World War I, to be a defining work; in this Symphony he found the means to express his deeply held convictions about life. In a public address following the performance of the work, he

---

16 Lawson, Carl Nielsen, p. 131.
17 Miller, ed., The Nielsen Companion, p. 22.
used these words to describe his beliefs: “Life is unquenchable and inextinguishable; yesterday, today and tomorrow, life was, is, and will be in struggle, conflict, procreation and destruction; and everything returns. Music is life, and as such, inextinguishable.”

Nielsen wrote of his love of contrast: “Here, in a nutshell, is what I demand of all art – opposing forces which meet, and glow, appearing one but remaining two, embracing and caressing like rippling water over pebbles, yet never actually touching and breaking the delicate interplay.”

This idea of a complex interaction between separate elements pervades his work at many levels; at the most basic level are his attachment to classical forms and his desire to break away from traditional harmony. Both elements are present throughout his career; his early period is characterized by a stronger reliance on classical forms, while his later output contains more experimental features.

His works for violin include two sonatas for violin and piano (1895, 1912), a concerto (1911) and the two solo violin works: Prelude, Theme and Variations, Op. 48 (1923) and Preludio e Presto, Op. 52 (1928). The First Sonata, dedicated to Henri Marteau, was written in 1895, very early in his career. The music of this period, which also includes the first two symphonies, exhibited the influence of Brahms in its structural and tonal clarity. These tendencies caused later theorists to write of the connection between Nielsen and Brahms, even “describing Nielsen’s music as an

---

extension of the link from Beethoven to Brahms.\textsuperscript{20} Nielsen combined these outward characteristics of more traditional music with his own personal style, inviting criticism from conservative Danish colleagues. Still, Nielsen was undaunted. Responding to a negative review of his sonata, he said, “no one can hold a work back if it is good, and time alone will reveal judgement and skill.”\textsuperscript{21}

The Violin Concerto was written in 1911 just after the Third Symphony, the work which more than any other vaulted Nielsen into a place of considerable respect as a composer. The public and critics loved the spacious nature of the themes and the positive outlook of this symphony. The Violin Concerto, described as “genial and relaxed,” received many performances in Denmark and abroad, but his Flute Concerto (1926) and especially the Clarinet Concerto (1928) are much more highly regarded as examples of this genre.\textsuperscript{22} The Second Sonata for Violin and Piano, written in 1912, contained a tonal freedom that was not as easily understood; upon hearing it, both the public and the critics were ready to revoke all the praise they had given since the Third Symphony.

Eleven years passed before Nielsen completed his next violin work, the \textit{Prelude, Theme and Variations}, Op. 48. The Prelude shows evidence of Nielsen’s continued innovation in its improvisational, rather than formal,

\textsuperscript{20} Miller, ed., \textit{The Nielsen Companion}, p. 18.  
\textsuperscript{21} Lawson, \textit{Carl Nielsen}, p. 79.  
design as well as its atonal nature. Composed in 1922-23 for Emil Telmányi, Nielsen’s son-in-law, this work was inspired by the violinist’s performance of solo Bach and fulfilled a lifelong wish of Nielsen’s to write a piece for solo violin. A letter to Telmányi written in October of 1922 hints that Nielsen may have originally conceived of the Theme with Variations as a substitute final movement for his Concerto. In a letter to a friend dated May 25, 1923, Nielsen refers to Op. 48 as a “bulky work,” and hints of its difficulty, by lightly questioning Telmányi’s ability to learn it quickly and mentioning his own time spent working out the technique. Finishing touches agreed upon by both composer and performer were completed on June 23, and the work was premiered in London on June 27, receiving excellent reviews.

The Preludio e Presto, Op. 52 was first presented in the form of a nine measure opening fragment as a birthday greeting to Nielsen’s friend and violinist Fini Henriques, published in the Danish newspaper Politiken. The nine measures correspond to the opening six staves of the complete piece, although the common time signature, the key signature and the bar lines are absent in the final version. When Telmányi saw this fragment in the paper, he immediately asked Nielsen to complete the work, and planned a first performance for the following year. Once again, Telmányi was faced with the task of learning a difficult new work in a short time; the final draft was finished on March 28, 1928 and the first performance was given two weeks later, on April 14.
The two works for solo violin are small in comparison to Nielsen’s compositional output. Even so, they hold an important place in his development. Both were considered experimental; the Prelude from Op. 48 was Nielsen’s first attempt at an atonal process, and the Presto is the best example of Nielsen’s “successful handling of a texture not regulated by tonal harmony.”

Nielsen placed equal importance on both small and large forms, saying “‘if you tackle the large forms, the small ones will come more easily,’ and ‘a large effort often lies behind a small thing.’” He took pride in his work, defending it against an apparent attack from his wife: “The violin work is no little thing, as you imply, and I have spent considerable effort on these new pieces.”

---

CHAPTER 3

NIELSEN’S PHILOSOPHY IN REGARDS TO INTERPRETATION

Any performer of Nielsen’s music should be aware of his views on interpretation. Although he was typically strong in his convictions, Nielsen was known for being very open to suggestion as well as interpretive license. Above all, he prized “the rhythmic flow of a composition,” which would come from “the performer’s conviction, imagination and intensity of interpretation.”

He also invited the suggestions of those musicians who performed his works; some of these suggestions became part of the published editions. One of Nielsen’s closest colleagues was his son-in-law Emil Telmányi. Not only were Op. 48 and Op. 52 composed for him, but he championed several of Nielsen’s works and shared some of Nielsen’s conducting responsibilities in his last few years. “In a letter to Telmányi, dated 22 November 1925, Nielsen wrote: ‘…Yes!, we understand each other, my friend, and so when I die, I’ll put my soul in your hands and ask that you alone be the rightful leader and judge of my work.’” The two works for solo violin contain many instances of collaborative work between the two men, and this statement of utmost faith and trust can give rest to any doubts about the authenticity of editorial markings attributed to Telmányi.

---

27 Ibid., p. 348.
Nielsen’s writings about rhythm are picturesque, and give a solid base for the interpretation of his works. He believed rhythm had a flexible quality, something natural and organic, well-ordered and yet not precise. An excerpt from his essay “Musical Problems” discusses rhythm at great length:

“We have all seen a rough sea, a waving cornfield, or a forest in a storm. As a child I often watched a flock of thick-fleeced sheep being driven through a narrow gate. It is a rhythmical treat to run one’s eyes over the backs of so many sheep, or follow the ripples of a cornfield or the sea. It is the irregular and the regular that have married to form a beautiful and vital unit. Such moving images are organic—the word I like to apply to rhythm.”

In this essay he states several times that organic rhythm is fluid, flexible, non-mechanical, non-metronomic. He believed that rhythmic integrity in music must be born of an innate understanding of the ebb and flow of time. “Rhythm must come from forces unequal in strength, or from resistance influencing or forming moving images in accordance with the laws of all life.”

---

29 Ibid., p. 45.
CHAPTER 4

INTRODUCTION TO THE ANALYSES

Wilhelm Hansen Edition scores for both Op. 48 and Op. 52 are provided in the appendix for reference. Edited by Kirsten Flensborg Petersen, under editor-in-chief Niels Krabbe, these critical editions can be considered definitive and authoritative with respect to all markings; this includes bowings, articulations and fingering choices. Petersen used the first printed edition of each work as a starting point, with slight alterations based on other sources, including fair copies and drafts which were edited and revised by both Nielsen and Telmányi. Throughout the following chapters, markings from the provided editions are referred to as “printed” markings, and represent the collaborative effort of both men.

To facilitate the discussion of the works, the writer has added several indications to the scores. These include line numbers for unmeasured sections, boxed rehearsal numbers and section headings, and handwritten harmonic and motivic labels and additional bowing and fingering options. These additional markings are the original ideas of the writer, except where specific credit is given to another source in the prose.
CHAPTER 5
THEORETICAL AND PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS OF
PRELUDE, THEME AND VARIATIONS, OP. 48

The Prelude of Op. 48 is through-composed, unmeasured, and atonal in the traditional sense. The movement is peppered with tempo changes, contrasting characters, articulations and dynamics. The combination of these elements makes the work difficult to approach, and yet provides endless fascination in the learning and performance of the piece.

The Prelude is built around the idea of the descending line, found at both micro and macro levels, in short motivic units and long phrases. The obvious contrast between the opening material, which is in the higher register of the violin, and the final phrase, placed in the lowest octave, points to an overall descent throughout the movement. Within these boundaries, several other divisions can be found. It is interesting to note the descending sequence at (4), which quickly transforms into a repeated chromatic descent from D-A as a transition into (5). In the section containing (6)-(10), a short motive containing a six-note descending chromatic scale is found at the end of each phrase, also repeated three times at the end of the section. This is expanded at (11), in a ten-note version. The arpeggiated section beginning at (13) also contains several descending lines, which serve to connect the chords. These are clearly marked in the score. This idea of overall descent loosely connects the
Prelude with the theme that follows, and many of the variations echo the chromatic nature of the motives mentioned here.

Another defining aspect of the Prelude is its motion from atonality to tonality. This can be traced through the double- and triple-stop passages from (5) through to the arpeggiated chords at (13). The section from (5)-(9) contains largely dissonant intervals: sevenths, ninths and tritones. Section (9) is entirely comprised of thirds, which lend a more tonal quality, although there is no evidence of traditional tonic-dominant relationships that would suggest a more direct link to tonality. This idea is continued at (10), with complete triads instead of thirds. Although many of the triads are not diatonic, the passage can begin to be heard in E major, with a clear tonic chord at (10) and a dominant chord at the high point of the phrase, the *forte* in the second quarter note of staff 2, page 3.

E major continues to (12), where it disintegrates into a series of non-diatonic seventh chords. The chords at (12) are built on a rising chromatic line, beginning with G♯ and ending on C♯ at (13); this rising line is answered with a descent found in the following section. The seventh chords at (13) are non-functional, although they also outline descending chromatic lines. The ultimate goal of the long descent is G, which can be heard as the dominant of C, the final note of the Prelude. This in turn is heard as the dominant of F, the key of the following theme.

It is easiest to learn this piece in sections, beginning with a scrupulous reading of the notes, ensuring that each interval is pure and
each accidental is read correctly. Note the directions at the bottom of page one: “Observe the accidentals in the Prelude until they are cancelled.” Given Nielsen’s reliance on the melodic interval to organize each phrase, and given the prevalence of accidentals and virtuosic flourishes, this preliminary step is crucial to the musical interpretation of the piece.

Once the sense of pitch organization is felt, the rhythm can be approached in an organic, musical way. To avoid straying too far off course, it can be helpful to start with a dry reading of the rhythm, but it is necessary to be mindful of Nielsen’s flexible rhythmic ideals.

The opening statement (1) presents the first technical challenge of the piece, the combination of a bowed note with left-hand pizzicato. The dynamic marking, *forte*, as well as the grace-note emphasis, suggests a declamatory feeling. The fingering in the part requires a strong 4th finger vibrato and well-coordinated pizzicato between the first and second fingers. The printed fingering can be restrictive, creating a tense, dry sound rather than a ringing pizzicato with a lush bowed note. A richer sound can be achieved by playing the D♭ with the third finger while quickly strumming the three open strings with the fleshy part of the first finger. While this presents the difficulty of maintaining consistent vibrato and intonation on the D♭, a flexible hand can manage, and the overall sound is much improved. Special focus should be given to the bow, which

---

needs to sustain, even crescendo, throughout the duration of the upper note in order to set up the descending line which follows.

The opening tempo marking *Poco adagio e con fantasia*, as well as the added *rubato* and *poco accelerando* give the performer a clear indication of Nielsen’s rhythmic expectation, but his notation leaves the performer to make decisions about how the freedom and flexibility are to be achieved. The melodic line descends from the D♭ to the A♭ in the second staff (2), becoming chromatic from the E♭. The combination of this chromatic line with the E♭ upper pedal creates intervallic tension which should guide the *rubato* and give finality to the A♭ (2). The two gestures which follow can be approached in a similar fashion; the indications *brilliante*, *fortissimo*, and *sforzando* demand a more powerful sound and energetic direction. The pizzicati at the end of this first statement are printed as three separate accented notes in this edition, which signals even more finality; in the autograph fair copy, the notation was simply a chord with an arpeggiation marking. The first section ends with a descent to B; a further chromatic descent to A♯ creates a smooth transition into the new section.

The next section, marked (3), begins with an *accelerando* into the *presto* marking at the end of staff 3. This *presto* is maintained until the *rallentare* and *ritard* at the end. The musical interest and drama come from radical changes in dynamic, from *pianissimo* to *subito fortissimo* and
back again. These changes can be most easily accomplished by means of changes in sounding point as well as bow weight. Nielsen has notated specific bow stroke alterations as well, between *spiccato* and *detaché*. The *spiccato* sections become *sautillé* at the marked tempo, and it takes a very relaxed bow arm in conjunction with a flexible bow stick to create the proper articulation on the lowest notes in *pianissimo*. If possible, the softest notes should be executed *sul tasto* for best effect.

The middle of this section (4) contains a short, inexact sequence, five groups of eight notes which have some common interval content. Each of the first four groups begins with a minor second, followed by a tritone. The first four statements can be grouped together into two sets of two, the second member of each set starting a perfect fourth lower than the first. Although the figure is atonal and original in content, rather than following a traditional scale or arpeggio pattern, it fits the left hand well, and the printed fingering is practical.

The section which follows (5) begins with a short introductory passage characterized by dissonant intervals, mostly sevenths and ninths. This dissonance sets up a feeling of relief in the following phrases, which combine an eerie glissando figure, a dissonant chord, and a descending chromatic scale. This phrase presents several technical challenges: the combination of extensions and shifting creates problems in intonation as well as stability issues for the sustained bow. To execute this
successfully, more bow weight should be given to the lower notes, and the
left-hand fingers should be as light as possible.

The second phrase (6) presents an even greater technical challenge. The printed bowing is Nielsen’s own, but it is difficult to create a sense of calm if the previous phrase ends up-bow, and the new phrase must begin *pianissimo* on a down-bow. A different option allows for the slurs at (5) to be played as printed, without changing bows mid-slur as indicated. Begin (6) up-bow, and again, play the slurs as indicated, instead of breaking them. This does create some difficulty in bow distribution, but facilitates a smoother line.

At (6), the left hand must gracefully contract in a glissando on both D and G strings, arrive in tune on perfect fifths, and vibrate only on that arrival. A light bow over the fingerboard in conjunction with a very light and supple left hand is critical. When executed well, phrases (6) and (7) are mysterious, expressive and beautiful. Given the technical difficulty, there is potential for great awkwardness instead; this requires that special attention be given to this section throughout the learning process. Nielsen’s markings between (5) and (10) are scrupulous in detail and give the performer a clear indication of the interpretation that is expected. The writing is romantic in nature, painfully expressive and rhapsodic rather than rhythmic.

The section at (10) begins with a *molto tranquillo* that contrasts with the dark, dissonant surrounding material, opening with an E major
arpeggio that dissolves into a non-functional but expressive arpeggiated progression. There is no dynamic marked in this edition for the opening E major arpeggio, but \textit{pianissimo} is found in the autograph fair copy, and seems appropriate to the musical language of the section. With this dynamic in mind, the bow must have a light yet clear contact with the strings, throughout the upcoming pseudo-\textit{bariolage} passage. Nielsen’s \textit{sul E} marking on p. 3, staff 1 creates a slight disruption for the bow, but solves an even trickier intonation problem.

This passage ends at (11) with a return to the material from (6). The following chordal section at (12) is marked \textit{sostenuto} at the beginning, \textit{pesante} in the six final chords. The marked bowing is present in the first printed edition, and it seems appropriate, given the \textit{pesante} marking, to change to all down-bows at this point. Still, the tenuto markings must be observed, with well-sustained chords and quick retakes. Gradually increasing the time spent on each chord break heightens the tension, creating an even greater sense of resolution on the C♯ fermata that follows.

Nielsen provides minimal guidance in shaping the next section (13). The dynamic markings that are given must be interpreted by the performer, rather than precisely executed, to provide meaning to the chromatic descent as well as the more subtle changes in harmony. Many exquisite colors are possible within this section, and it is an opportunity for individuality. The last arpeggio, G\textsuperscript{o}, becomes the first chord of the final
section (14). This section reduces the intensity of the four-note dissonant chord to a simple melodic line that easily moves *attacca* into the theme.

The theme and eight variations finish with a fully harmonized version of the theme. The theme is sixteen measures long, four phrases of four measures each. The melody is simple at first glance, leaving much room for embellishment and variation. Even in the fully harmonized final statement, the harmonies are ambiguous, leaving the possibility for subtle harmonic changes in the variations which provide even more interest. The hymn-like writing is not unprecedented for Nielsen, as he spent considerable time in 1913-15 writing hymns for the Danish Lutheran church hymnal. One of Nielsen’s greatest accomplishments (in the eyes of the Danish) was the collaboration with Thomas Laub to create an authentic Danish folk idiom.\(^{31}\) The folk element is heard in the theme and variations in the simple nature of the melody and the modal mixture found throughout.

The variations present a violinistic *tour de force* comparable to the Bach *Chacconne* and Paganini’s 24\(^{th}\) *Caprice*. Left-hand techniques include many large extensions, chains of double-stops, left-hand *tremolo*, artificial harmonics and left-hand pizzicato. A wide variety of bow strokes are required, as well as facility with slow and fast quadruple stops and arco-pizzicato alternation. Nielsen chose at least two contrasting

---

characters for each variation to showcase these virtuosic displays, lending variety to the work.

The theme is in common time and is marked \textit{andante} and \textit{semplice}. The opening measures contain a simple melody; a textural change is heard from this simple melody in the first phrase through an expressive \textit{dolce} section in the third to a grand heroic chordal sound in the final phrase. Modal mixture is found throughout the theme, with chromatic alterations of $B^\natural$, $E_b$, and $A_b$. These three pitches serve to create tonal ambiguity, as they can play several roles depending on the context in which they are placed.

Phrase one begins in F major but cadences on a G minor chord. This, combined with the preceding $B^\natural$’s, creates a temporary tonicization of C, which is further explored in Variations VI and VII. Phrase two begins in F major, but modulates to D minor, with a perfect authentic cadence in D. Phrase three begins in F major. The $b7$ ($E_b$), foreshadowed in the harmony in m. 7, is now solidly in both melody and harmony. This chromatic alteration creates the sound of F Mixolydian, a mode commonly found in folk music. The $E_b$ can also indicate a temporary tonicization of G minor, an aspect which is more fully developed in Variations I and VII. The fourth phrase contains $B^\natural$, $E_b$ and $A_b$, all of which reinforce the dominant key of C, and the phrase ends with an imperfect authentic cadence in F major. The \textit{mezzo piano} and \textit{morendo} in the second half of
phrase four, combined with a return from triple to double stops, create a sense of repose for the end of the theme.

Variation I is in common time, marked *più mosso*, and can best be described as playful in character. The first phrase beings in F major, and both the pitches and melodic contour of the theme are easily traced. Both sub-phrases (two measures each) disintegrate into chromatic descending lines leading to a tritone dissonance instead of the expected cadence. This creates tonal variety as well as an opportunity to explore a more menacing quality, the opposing character found in this variation. The second phrase wanders further from the original theme, with an extended descending chromatic line that obscures the original modulation to D minor. The phrase still ends on D, but there is no clear cadential pattern. Although some significant pitches from the theme are found in phrase three, one major change is the clear modulation to G minor. The perfect authentic cadence in G minor in m. 29 is the strongest cadence in this variation. The final phrase follows the harmonic implications of the theme, including the A♭’s in m. 31 which add an F minor color. The phrase ends with a *fortissimo* chromatically embellished figure in F major to match the D minor finish to the second phrase.

Technical issues in this variation include the trills in m. 20, the 10ths and continuing double-stops in mm. 22-24, left-hand pizzicati in mm. 26-28 and pizzicato-arco alternation in m. 29. The trills should remain light and short, with not too many iterations; this will allow them to sound
cleanly if the variation is played at the marked tempo. It is important to keep the left hand anchored yet loose for the 10ths in bars 22-23, singing through the descending chromatic line with the bow to maintain continuity as the left hand navigates the tiny expansions and contractions. Slow practice in this passage is difficult at first, yet pays great dividends in left-hand strength through the range of motion required for these extensions. A slight broadening of the third beat of m. 23 gives the phrase a nice shape.

The triplet left-hand pizzicati in mm. 26-28 are difficult since they are in first position, where the string is close to the fingerboard. It is especially important in this situation for the finger responsible for each pizzicato to be placed immediately on the far left side of the string, with as much flesh underneath the string as possible. This will allow for the most contact and the highest rate of audible pizzicati.

The grazioso pizzicato-arco combination in m. 27 creates a sharp articulation, adding extra energy for the end of this sub-phrase. These pizzicati must be played forcefully to be heard. For the pizzicato-arco alternations in m. 29, hold the bow so that the pizzicato is possible without adjusting the hand position. Balance the bow with the little finger, and keep the hand as flexible as possible. In slow practice, aim for the top note in each chord to ensure that this note is heard at a faster tempo.

Variation II is marked Andante quasi Allegretto, slower than the previous variation, but with a smaller overall subdivision. The character
suggestion “á la Arlecchino” combined with the light, playful artificial harmonics found throughout creates an atmosphere of color, humor and nimble acrobatics. “Arlecchino” refers to the character Harlequin from the commedia dell’arte, known most often as a “proficient tumbler and an inveterate trickster.” The first four notes of the theme are found in the first phrase, and provide the material for the rest of the variation. The harmonic structure is similar to the theme throughout, although increased chromaticism provides the potential for surprise phrase endings.

The variation should sound light and playful, with its technical difficulty not obvious to the listener. Comfort with artificial harmonics is paramount to success in this variation; if one is not adept, time spent practicing scales or other exercises would be most beneficial. The charm of this variation comes from the innocence of the harmonics followed by the surprise of the dissonant fortissimo ending notes. Nielsen’s marking “facile e con fantasia” in m. 38 is a great reminder to take time, play with the tempo, and stay light and easy in this awkward passage. On first reading, the marking seems tongue-in-cheek, but taken literally, it does help the execution.

Although not indicated in the score, the descending line starting with the pickup to m. 45 should begin on the D string; both this and the descending line in mm. 42-43 should be practiced with smooth inaudible

---

shifts, and quick indiscernible finger replacements for maximum musical impact. Throughout the variation, the printed bowing seems at odds with the articulation; the tenuto strong beats are better served with a down-bow, while the slur to staccato up-beats are more easily played up-bow. The autograph fair copy provides this bowing only in the final phrase, mm. 48-49, although it can be applied to every similar situation in the variation.

Variation III is the first in a minor key and is twice as long as those which precede it, containing six phrases of four and eight measures. It begins and ends in F minor, with an abrupt phrase modulation to E major/minor in the fourth phrase. The fifth phrase is highly chromatic and without strong cadential patterns, allowing for some tonal ambiguity. The leading tones in this passage point toward D minor and C minor, and the chromatic descending line eases the tonality back into F minor for the final phrase. The first three notes of the theme are found in the opening phrase, in minor form, and the entire variation is based on these. The sixth phrase is an answer to the first, which creates a beautiful sense of symmetry for this inner variation.

The tempo marking is Andante espressivo, with an additional molto espressivo printed underneath the staff. These marking, as well as the

---

slower tempo, indicate the first real opportunity in the piece to be soft and fully expressive. There is no opening dynamic marked, but piano seems appropriate, especially given the piano to fortissimo crescendo that comes in m. 52. Sul tasto bowing and flat hair combined with a light left-hand touch and rich vibrato bring out the dark sensual quality of the D string, and provide a contrast to the upcoming crescendo. It is important to note that the glissando on the D string in m. 52 is Nielsen’s intention. While this is not the best place for the violin to sound fortissimo, the glissando is much more dramatic when played all on one string, and the quality of sound on the D string is darker, more painful, and more fitting for this molto espressivo variation than a glissando to a louder note on the A string.

The B major chord and fortissimo dynamic in the pickup to m. 66 give strong definition to the second half of this variation. The maestoso in phrase 4 leads into a more extroverted espressivo section. Technical difficulty in this section is found in the chains of 6ths, which must be smooth and secure to provide clarity in the repetitive half-step descents. Taking an additional up-bow for the second eighth note in m. 73 addresses two issues; it allows the performer to move lower in the bow, thus aiding the fortissimo dynamic, and it results in an intuitive down-bow to start m. 74. The tenuto markings in m. 73 should be followed to the utmost; in the autograph fair copy, Nielsen originally marked slurs
between the 2nd and 3rd eighths and 4th and 5th eighths, making it clear that he wanted this passage very loud but smooth, not detached.\textsuperscript{34}

Like Variation III, Variation IV is in F minor, full of modal mixture and possible leanings toward A♭ major and C major/minor. The tempo marking \textit{Poco allegro}, \textit{molto ritmico} applies throughout the variation, which is comprised of a steady stream of sixteenth notes, interrupted by occasional 32\textsuperscript{nd} note scales. The variation is loosely related to the theme by the melodic shape in the first beat of bar one. This fragment is used as a motive throughout the variation, manipulated in various ways. The harmonic motion is also similar to that of the theme; the main key of F minor encapsulates the variation while various secondary keys play a role within those boundaries. An emphasis on A♭, the relative major, in the second phrase contrasts with the theme, which moves to D, the relative minor. Nielsen incorporates the first five notes of the \textit{Dies Irae} as an accompaniment to phrase three (mm. 91-92), adding to the other-worldly quality of the variation. Measures 96-97 provide a chromatic descending line, echoing the descent in the theme, to finish out the variation.

The marking \textit{sotto voce (mystico e fantastico)} combined with the \textit{spiccato} articulation gives the movement a spritely effervescence. The \textit{spiccato} should be light and pointed, the fast scales effortless. The energy in the opening gesture makes it easy to choose a tempo for this variation that is too fast; when the printed tempo marking is followed,

\textsuperscript{34} Petersen, p. 260.
many more colors and subtle expressive qualities can be explored. The character should be one of piquant grace, quick but unhurried. The most difficult technical passage is in mm. 94-95, involving a descending line of alternating sixths and thirds. The fingering given is the most conducive to success, yet it is still a challenge in coordination. It is helpful to practice slowly with focus given to organizing each new hand frame starting with the first finger, rather than playing through the passage from note to note. The final descending line provides an opportunity for quick bow hand reflexes, with *forzandi* followed by *pianissimo spiccat*o.

Variation V marks a return to F major, and makes use both of the first three notes of the theme, as well as the harmonic plan. The tempo marking *Più mosso* (∫ =96) is the same as Variation I, although the triplet subdivision provides a different rhythmic energy. The marking *molto deciso*, with the addition of *martelé* clarifies the character and the bow stroke. As in the other variations, a contrasting character is found in the third phrase, marked *piano grazioso*. Although this variation looks simple and repetitive in rhythm and gesture, Nielsen has provided clues to the interpretation in every phrase, with markings such as *pesante, grazioso* and *più leggero*. The performer must add to these indications appropriate dynamic shadings, rhythmic inflections and (although *simile* is clearly marked in m. 99) slight changes in articulation to exaggerate the dramatic qualities.
One difficulty in this variation is finding a workable balance between the heavy *martelé* bow stroke and the light left hand required for the many shifts in both double stops and arpeggios. The light left hand also allows for more flexibility, necessary for the extensions that are prevalent throughout. The most awkward of these are found in mm. 100-101 and 110, as the fourth finger remains anchored and the lower fingers must reach back. It is necessary to maintain a free left shoulder and elbow to execute these extensions; this freedom also helps to accomplish the string crossings required for the changes between double stops and arpeggios. Adding a touch of vibrato as well as opening up the bow at the top of each arpeggio helps release any tension that may have accumulated in the course of the phrase, and gives a musical direction to the passage which aids in the technical execution. Regardless of the difficulty, these flourishes must be carried off with brilliance and abandon to be truly effective.

Variation VI, once again in F major, returns to a slower tempo and lighter character, although the page is black with 64th-note *tremolos* and 32nd sextuplet scales. The phrase structure and harmonic language are close to those of the theme, although in this variation, two measures of 3/8 are equal to one measure of the original common time. The C major inflection in the fourth measure of the theme is emphasized more strongly here, with a clear modulation ending in a half cadence in C in m. 121. The second phrase begins in C, but modulates to D minor as in the theme.
The remainder of the variation is in F major. The melody of the theme is clearly seen in the first phrase, although the rhythmic displacement and change of meter make it less obvious to the listener. Phrases 2-4 reflect the motives in the first phrase, rather than the melody from the theme.

The first half of Variation VI is marked piano cantabile, and focuses on one textural idea: the alternation between arco with left-hand tremolo and pizzicato. This presents difficulty in coordination as well as dynamic control. Nielsen has marked specific dynamics in this variation, with many hairpins and subito dynamic changes that require incredible right arm control. It is beneficial to practice mezzo-forte throughout to gain experience creating an even dynamic between the arco and pizzicato. Once this coordination and dynamic control are achieved, the printed dynamics will be much easier. The second half of Variation VI is marked semplice e gracioso and is much easier technically. The fourth phrase brings a return to the opening material, with an extended measured trill passage that decorates the chromatic descent.

Variation VII is the most visually intimidating, a Presto composed in $64^{th}$ notes. It is similar to the theme in phrase and harmonic structure, although slight deviations in phrase length exist. The sheer quantity of notes in each phrase creates a sense of modulation in many passages that do not contain true modulations in the theme. Since the variation is reliant upon melodic intervals rather than chords, cadential patterns are
not always clear. Still, key inflection and the accompanying modal mixtures play a significant role in the dramatic content of this variation.

Of particular interest are the chords containing $E_{\flat}$, which have appeared throughout the theme and preceding variations. In Variation VII, these chords are given special prominence. The first of these is in the first beat of m. 152, a $E_{\flat}$ VII chord in the key of F minor. This dramatic chord gives additional emphasis to the *fortissimo* dynamic at the height of the phrase, preparing more contrast as the passage descends into a *pianissimo* D minor section.

The second instance of the dramatic use of $E_{\flat}$ comes in a new place, the C minor chord in m. 157. The corresponding chord in the theme is C major, so $E_{\flat}$ is a shock to the listener. In addition, the third of the chord is doubled, and placed in the melody, giving even more emphasis to the altered note. This chord acts as a strong mid-point to the variation, setting the stage for the turbulent chromaticism, extreme dynamics and multiple stops found in the last two phrases.

This variation is best approached in sections, as the technical difficulties follow the phrase structure. The key to success in the entire variation is a light and calm left hand. This is in direct contrast to the work of the bow arm, which must alternate between *pianissimo spiccato* and *detaché*, open in quick crescendi to *fortissimo*, execute rapid string crossings, and finally play multiple stops while doing all of the above. This
variation is a workout for the right arm, and it is essential that the shoulder remain dropped, the elbow be free and the hand be completely flexible. Nielsen is specific in the articulations given throughout the variation; the amount of bow used in both *detaché* and *spiccato* and the height of the *spiccato* should be determined by the dynamic. The string crossings, such as in mm. 157-158, create a nice bounce in the bow, as long as the elbow is positioned at a height appropriate for the G and D strings.

Measure 161 is challenging for sound quality, as both triple and quadruple stops are required at the 64th-note subdivision. The triple stops are easier, for obvious reasons, but it is still important to consider the placement of the bow. It is most effective to aim for the A string to bring out the chromatic line, with a sounding point that is as close to the bridge as possible while still allowing the bow to touch all three strings. The quadruple stops must be forceful for all four notes to sound; luckily Nielsen has provided the *fortissimo* marking, with accents, to validate this. A sounding point close to the fingerboard is necessary to play the four-note chords *non-divisi*, but does take away some of the clarity in articulation. For this reason, it can be beneficial to slightly roll each chord, quickly so that it is not noticeable, and just enough that the open G continues to ring throughout the passage. This allows the sounding point to be slightly closer to the bridge, and provides a better overall sound.

There are no indications to change tempo during this movement, and given the *Presto* marking and the steady stream of 64th notes, one
might assume that this is a perpetual motion. Nielsen’s writings on rhythm and interpretation indicate a more flexible approach, with tempo fluctuations to bring out obvious phrasing, as well as time taken on the chords and significant harmonic twists.

Variation VIII is marked *Poco adagio*, and at first appears to be a return to a minor statement of the theme. It is in fact a truncated version, more like a cadenza than a true variation. The first and second phrases, in B♭ minor and A♭ minor respectively, follow the melody of the theme for the first six notes, before venturing off into a more fantasia-like interpretation of the original.

The sound quality of the opening phrase should mirror that of Variation III, only the *pianissimo* marking as well as the new key indicate something even darker and more ethereal. Subtle tempo fluctuations are indicated in the first two phrases. The variation is most effective when these suggestions are taken literally, and the music is allowed to breathe freely without being restricted to a specific tempo. Each melodic interval should be given one last chance to be fully expressed; each chromatic alteration should be fully explored.

The only unusual technical issue in this variation is the left-hand pizzicato in m. 166. It is difficult to maintain consistent intonation on the stopped E while playing the pizzicato chord. Because the chord contains two stopped notes, the printed fingering seems the best (stopping the notes with first finger and plucking with 4th provides the longest string
length and therefore the best sound quality). This fingering can cause the flesh of the first finger base knuckle to touch the E string. The performer should consider this when first placing the finger, blocking the E and B with an open left-hand posture that will allow for the open E to ring. The bow should remain pianissimo during this gymnastic feat.

The Tempo di Tema is the fleshed out version of the theme, identical in phrase structure, melody, and harmonic implication. The marking solenne at the opening indicates a regal quality, a more introverted forte rather than a brazenly extroverted sound. The third phrase is marked dolce, and a lighter touch allows this difficult phrase to speak more sweetly.

The many left-hand extensions required to play the chords are the main technical difficulty in this final version of the theme. The intonation is tricky, as Nielsen has created many octave doublings throughout. After playing the preceding pages, one should be warmed up and should not find the extensions too taxing. Still, it is important to release the left hand after each chord if possible, in a sense to bounce out of the string from one chord to the next. The feeling of release can carry over into the bow, making the first two phrases in particular more buoyant. This allows the fortissimo at the end to be a more effective contrast. The final phrase, marked fortissimo pesante, should encompass all of the energy of the entire work. The bowing for this phrase can be approached creatively,
with an individual sound concept that will allow each performer to achieve the most satisfying conclusion.
CHAPTER 6
THEORETICAL AND PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS OF
PRELUDIO E PRESTO, OP. 52

The Preludio is passionate, energetic and full of extreme juxtapositions of character. The complex chromaticism and rhythmic elements as well as the violinistic technical challenges stimulate the intellect. Learning the piece well demands a balance between these two forces, with large doses of intellectual working-out combined with a free-flowing emotional energy that governs all.

The score is full of specific articulations and bow stroke markings, tempo changes and mood indications. These markings are helpful in communicating Nielsen’s vision to the performer, but if taken only in the literal sense, they can make the music seem cluttered and unnatural. In music such as this, the performer must internalize each phrase and find a natural direction that corresponds to the specific markings, always being sure that an organic freedom is the main priority. A study of Nielsen’s manuscripts shows his often inexact placement of dynamic and tempo markings, indicating that these markings are intended to be a guide to interpretation, rather than a decree to be taken literally. For this reason, flexibility in following these markings is important, as the performer searches for a balance between transcending the writing on the page and remaining true to the composer’s intentions.
As in the Prelude to Op. 48, Nielsen provides a note regarding accidentals at the bottom of the first page: “In the Preludio the accidentals apply only to the notes they immediately precede.” Because of this, as with Op. 48, it is best to learn the notes and absorb the highly chromatic language before determining the musical gestures. Nielsen makes use of marked articulations and specific sometimes speech-like rhythms to bring out dissonances and resolutions. Finding one’s personal response to the chromaticism before becoming entrenched in the notation will ensure that the end product is a more natural expression.

The movement can be divided into four large sections; the outer sections contain both A and B themes, while the inner sections are comprised of new material. This layout creates a solid structure that is loose enough to make room for the impulsive nature of the fantasia, while allowing for a strong sense of closure.

Although not tonal in the traditional sense, the Preludio contains significant tonal and modal inflections. Section 1 begins with the A theme, identified by the opening scale gesture. This scale can be heard as a type of C minor or as E♭ Lydian; the ambiguity adds to the potential for connection with other material and development later in the movement. The sense of E♭ returns in the 4th staff of p. 17, but the phrase ends with an open fifth between C and G, pointing again toward the key of C.

It is convenient to play the opening run in second position, shifting to fourth position for the F♭ in the fourth beat, and shifting to first position
for the F♮ in the first beat of the second staff. This fingering is not only more fluid for the hand, requiring fewer extensions, but brighter overall, giving more punch to the second staccato.

The dramatic quality of the molto accelerando in the third staff can be heightened by using more bow in the first few notes, which increases the energy and holds the tempo slightly before giving in to the forward momentum of the phrase. The opposite works for the tranquillo in the fourth staff; the preceding five notes, beginning with the tied C, can begin to stretch in time and the energy in the bow can begin to dissipate in anticipation of the tranquillo. This sets up a lovely quiet feeling for a passage that still remains technically difficult.

The poco agitato that follows in the fifth staff is one of the most awkward passages in the piece for the left hand. To ensure proper left-hand organization, the performer should focus first on the shifts, and then on evenness throughout each set of eight sixteenth notes. In performance, the passage is more easily executed if each sub-phrase is given its own sense of agitato, rather than a steadily increasing tempo throughout the longer phrase. This allows the performer to anchor the left hand into each new hand frame. Given the dynamic marking and obvious phrase markings, this makes more musical sense as well, as it serves to emphasize each forte.

A¹ begins with the same 32nd note run as the beginning. Ideally, the fingering here would match that of the opening, but given the technical
difficulty of the extensions that follow, it is necessary to anchor the first finger on C and shift 2-2 on the half step D-E♭, extending the left-hand frame into a shared second and third position. When the E♭-G is played by second and first fingers, the following A-C can be played with fourth and third fingers. This large extension should be approached with caution and complete relaxation in the left shoulder, upper arm and hand. Musically speaking, there is no real alternative, as shifting back and forth cleanly is impossible in the given tempo. The section ends with a long fermata over a thirty-second rest. Clearly this gives much license to the performer to create drama without thought to precise counting, and should be long enough to set up the B theme with plenty of suspense.

The B theme is dark and brooding, marked adagio molto and espressivo, a clear contrast to A. Despite the chromatic nature of the theme, there is a strong sense of C Phrygian mode in the beginning, with the raised third present at B1. The triplet pickup into the third quarter note of B is a motive which is explored later in the movement.

The fast passagework in staves 2 and 4 require some extensions, and B1 involves smooth lateral left-hand finger motion. The main technical issue in this section lies with the trills in the fifth staff. It is most efficient to play the first trill with the third finger on the G, the first finger on the F. This allows for the upcoming C♭ to be played with the second finger. The second trill is less problematic; played 2-1, the D♭ is easily played with
the third finger. Special attention should be given to the string crossings, ensuring that the sound quality the open E and sul D notes are as similar as possible.

Section 2 includes new material which is highly chromatic and atonal; it begins with the markings molto agitato, molto rallentando and molto tranquillo, all within three beats. The molto agitato is given a metronome indication, but the molto tranquillo, which holds for the rest of section 2, is not specifically marked, and should be determined by the playability of the top of the third page. The bowing for the quarter notes on staff 6 of page 18 is a bit stifling, especially with the marked crescendo and difficult glissando extension in the left hand. Splitting both slurs and starting up-bow allows for greater dynamic contrast and a more resonant sound overall.

The pickup notes into staff 8 mark a change in character, from the preceding languid chromatic descent to the spiky upcoming section. The new character is achieved by the forzando spiccato articulation as well as the increase in rhythmic intensity. It is important to note that the meno forte from staff 7 remains valid here, which allows for more drama in the crescendo to the top of page 19.

The passage in the first half of page 18 presents several technical challenges, which are most easily solved if separated at first. The section should be practiced on open strings for the arco-pizzicato coordination, incorporation of the open A’s, and sound quality on the E string. It is
helpful to include the left-hand pizzicato during this exercise. The left-hand pizzicato sounds better and is more easily executed when played with the third finger, rather than the fourth as notated. The finger should be as flat as possible, strumming with the flesh of the finger, not the hard corner. Keeping the finger flat also helps the left-hand frame to remain loose for the passages which follow. The notes and fingering in the left hand should be practiced until reflexive so they become the least consideration when putting everything together.

Musically, this section is extroverted, energetic and somewhat aggressive. The performer should maintain intensity until the \textit{molto diminuendo e rallentando} in staff 6, playing into the dissonance of the seconds before releasing into the \textit{ppp}. The trills that finish section 2 are identical in fingering and approach to those earlier in the piece.

The opening flourish of Section 3 is marked \textit{molto agitato e marcato}, and should be played with great intensity in the bow. The stroke is most easily achieved in the middle of the bow with slightly stiff fingers, maintaining freedom in the bow arm to achieve a crescendo at the top of page 20. The left-hand passagework is difficult, but the printed fingering is good. The \textit{meno forte} and \textit{mezzo-forte giocoso} on page 20, staves 1 and 3 respectively, should be markedly different in character from the opening phrase of the section. A flexible tempo and lively bow stroke in these lighter sections helps to define the more jovial character, and foreshadows the playful ricochet sections to come.
Staff 4 on page 20 contains a dizzying six dynamic markings in 3.5 quarter note beats. The final crescendo in that line is easily missed and should start softly, building gradually to forte for the fourth group of 32nds in staff 5. This ensures that the string crossing will be lush and beautiful, making the diminuendo and change to saltato bowing in staff 6 more effective.

The next section, beginning with staff 7 on page 20, recalls the triplet motive found in B, and is characterized by the juxtaposition of light, unemotional ricochet and harmonics with accented, agitato material. This obviously presents a challenge to the performer; not only are the ricochet-harmonic combinations technically difficult, but switching so quickly from one type of energy to another requires tremendous control. It is advisable to take the printed rallentando or tranquillo markings given before each ricochet section literally, as this time gives the performer the ability to reset. It is important to take enough time to allow each phrase to breathe; without this sense of repose, the section easily becomes a jumble that passes too quickly to be absorbed.

The ricochet in staff 4 of page 21 presents a technical dilemma—the dynamic is presumably still forte, from the previous staff, and the saltarello marking comes a beat and a half after the first set of hooked 16ths. To create a forte sound with ricochet articulation, it is necessary to play these first two sets of notes in the middle of the bow, lower than the
typical ricochet stroke. The stroke can become lighter and closer to upper half of the bow after the *saltarello* marking.

The next phrase, beginning with pickups into staff 5 of page 21, is marked *a tempo, con forza* and *agitato*. Accents are also printed on each note. It seems logical to assume that these pickup notes need more time and space than a typical *a tempo* might indicate; the downward arpeggiation creates plenty of forward momentum in staff 5. The upcoming *glissandi* should be slow and luxurious, romantic in feeling to contrast with the cold quality of the harmonics. The B♭–G♭ glissando can be played with the second and third fingers for more strength and improved chance of executing the indicated *molto vibrato*. It should be noted that *molto vibrato* in this upper position must be accomplished in a way that does not affect the stability of the violin, as the bow needs to remain in solid contact with both strings throughout the duration of the glissando.

The section ends with a diminuendo on open A, which segues into the muted section B². In the score, Nielsen calls for a special type of mute, patented by a luthier in Copenhagen. This mute was semi-permanently affixed to the strings, with a lever that could quickly be moved to cover the bridge. “The mute is not on sale today, and its use on modern violin strings cannot be recommended, since it tends to break
them.” It is possible to use a standard rubber mute for this effect, although some practice for speed and coordination is required.

It is most effective to remain forte until the printed diminuendo, positioning the left hand over the mute to be ready to touch the mute to the bridge just as the diminuendo begins. In this way, the change in dynamic coincides with the change in timbre, creating a lovely transition to the new B theme. Nielsen has indicated a rallentando to allow for this transition to happen in a naturally graceful way.

The muted B theme is marked piano, but the dissonant second in both B² and B³ creates more tension, more expectancy. Even in the soft dynamic, the phrase should be molto espressivo with the bow, while the left hand must be relaxed to achieve the smooth lateral motion and extensions required. The first double-stop passage in staff 7 can be played entirely on the D and A strings, rather than crossing to use an open E as indicated in the part, with the fingering: B-D with 4-2, A♯–C♯ with 3-1, B-E with 3-2 and A♯–C♯ with 3-1. This is slightly more difficult for the left hand, but is more graceful for the bow and creates a smoother line.

The rhapsodic double-stop passage at the end of staff 8 into staff 9 is marked poco agitato ma molto espressivo, molto forte and sempre gliissando. This ultra-romantic phrase is found again in the Presto movement, recurring several times as one of the prominent structural elements. It is not really possible to overdo this moment in the piece; it

---

35 Petersen, p. xxii-xxiii.
should be something entirely out of context, from a different world than the rest of the movement.

Repeated segments from the opening of B draw this section to a close. A fingering option at the top of page 22 is given by Emil Telmányi in the autograph fair copy. He suggests a glissando with the fourth finger to the A♭.\(^{36}\) It is easier to execute this glissando if both preceding harmonics are also played with the fourth finger. The resulting double stop at the top of page 22 must be well-balanced with the bow so that the open A does not overpower the glissando, which fits the character that has been established in the preceding phrase, as well as the teneramente marking.

The section ends with an extended phrase marked sempre molto tranquillo, teneramente and sempre pianissimo with diminuendi to ppp. Each note of this phrase should be more spacious, less intense, and the energy found throughout the first five pages should entirely dissipate. Slow glissandi, light sul tasto bowing and a posture of complete calm add to this effect.

The più vivo in the middle of the third staff on page 22, labeled C in the score, is made up of new material. This short section serves to revive the energy given up in the previous section, preparing for the final statement of the A theme. It should come out of nowhere, unexpected, bouncing cleanly off of the 16\(^{th}\) note rest. The molto rallentando can be

\(^{36}\) Petersen, p. 265.
started a bit early, but should be controlled in such a way that the listener
cannot predict the end of the phrase.

The Tempo I brings back the A theme in its third version; again, this
scale is more easily and cleanly played in second position. The G°7 chord
that immediately follows is a surprise, after the E♭/G that occur the first
two times. Extra weight and time should be given to the lower two notes
to emphasize this change. The printed double down-bows on the chords
tend to be too harsh; it is possible to mitigate this problem by playing the
16th note chord up-bow, with the longer chord down-bow. Petersen has
removed from this edition what she considered to be superfluous
fortissimo markings on the second through fourth sixteenth note chords in
staff 5, page 22.37 These original repeated fortissimo markings are
important, as they show Nielsen’s desire for steady emphasis rather than
a possible decline in intensity. Section A² ends as it began, with an
ascending scale; this time the E is natural rather than flat.

The B theme returns at the beginning of staff 7, this time forte and
molto espressivo. Beginning on a new tonal center of F, this statement is
more a variation on the triplet sixteenth pickup motive than a full rendition
of the original B melody. Once again the mute is added, during the
sustained open string. It is most effective if the mute is applied gradually
to create a smooth transition to muted sound. The expressive tritones

37 Petersen, p. 265.
resolve to a perfect fifth, to end the piece, but the ominous quality lingers. The final chord is E♭ major, a variation on the pitch center of the opening.

The *Presto* is a highly integrated movement; Nielsen relies on the variation of short melodic motives and rhythmic consistency to create a sense of compact unity. While it is not in any standard form, decisive structural points are made by constant returns to the opening material as well as appearances of the rhapsodic double-stop passage from the *Preludio* (p. 21, staff 8-9).

Measures 1-37 comprise the first large section of the movement, and they contain several elements which can be traced throughout. To avoid exact repetition, Nielsen dismantles the themes found in this first section, using recognizable fragments instead of complete themes, sometimes separately as they first appear, other times in unique combinations.

The A theme, found in mm. 1-20, evolves from a symmetrical arrangement of two main motives. Motive 1 is found in the opening two measures, an atonal collection of 16 pitches which highlights the tritone. The second measure follows the contour of the first, creating the illusion of a sequence, but the intervals are slightly altered. This two-measure motive is found throughout the movement in exact transposition and inversion. Motive 2, found in m. 3, is comprised of the syncopated rhythm and harmonic emphasis of the chord and double-stops. This motive is
found in various forms throughout the movement, in both the A and B themes.

The A theme is organized symmetrically into three phrases: six bars, eight bars, and six bars. The six-bar phrases can be further divided into two three-bar phrases. The first of these contains an original version of Motive 1 punctuated by Motive 2; the second is comprised of an inversion of Motive 1 punctuated by Motive 2. The dismantling of this symmetry becomes the structural focus of the movement.

Given the quick tempo, it is important for the performer to create a clear distinction between these short phrases so the listener can perceive the structure. The dynamic indications make this easier; the *subito* dynamic changes between phrases call for a quick breath before diving into the next phrase. Nielsen is specific in his articulation markings in m. 3, with a staccato sixteenth note followed by a sixteenth rest. The sixteenth note should be as short as possible, to ensure that the syncopation is not late. This applies throughout the movement, wherever this version of Motive 2 is found.

Technically, the A theme is straightforward, and most of the printed bowings and fingerings are appropriate. One important alternative fingering is found in measure seven: the first four notes can be played 4-3-2-1, to affect a creeping motion rather than shifting on the first finger as indicated. The extension between 4 and 3 requires some dexterity, but avoids the potential for an audible slide between the B♭ and F. The
bowing in m. 17 is not indicated in the part. It may seem natural to play the second eighth of the bar up-bow, but beginning this motive down-bow may allow for a more controlled *piano* in m. 18 (which should also begin down-bow). The same bowing applies in m. 20, for the sake of consistency.

The B theme also contains sixteenth-note motion, this time more tonal in nature, as the tritone is replaced by the perfect fourth. Nielsen employs both the ideas of sequence (mm. 21-24) and melodic inversion (mm. 25-28) here. He specifically marks this theme *détaché*; the performer should use a more relaxed bow stroke to add to the effect created by the increased consonance. Section 1 ends with the first of several rhapsodic double-stop passages found throughout the movement. A slight emphasis on the dissonant seventh in m. 34 combined with a *rallentando* into m. 35 sets up a beautiful feeling of resolution into the thirds of mm. 35-36.

Section 2, mm. 37-54, is a truncated version of Section 1. The first six measures correspond to the first six of Section 1, while the next four are a variation on material from the B theme. The *pianissimo spiccato* marking along with the artificial harmonics in mm. 39 and 42 give this section a magical feeling of expectation. This is fulfilled in the rhapsodic double-stop passage beginning in m. 47, this time starting with consonant sixths which disintegrate into major seconds.
Section 3 introduces a variation of Motive 1, including a sequence of this variation. Nielsen again calls for a détaché bow stroke, which aids in the dramatic crescendo that is required. The material from m. 59-66 is not specifically traceable to Section 1, but the preponderance of the perfect fourth in this passage most closely connects it to the B theme. The rhapsodic double-stop passage in this section is more aggressive, and leads into five and a half bars of new material. Measures 73-76 present a technical challenge, with the combination of a bowed fifth on the D and G strings and left-hand pizzicato on A and E. It is effective to play the fifths with the second finger, while plucking with the third. This makes the shifts slightly more difficult, but solves two greater problems: the flesh of the first finger base joint no longer covers the open E string, and the thicker third finger is able to pluck both strings with a much more consistent tone.

Section 3 elides with Section 4, as the new statement of the A theme begins on the second sixteenth of m. 77. For the first time, this material is presented in forte, with a poco rallentando and diminuendo into the B material in m. 83. The a tempo in m. 83 marks the ascent to the climax of the movement, found in mm. 90-96. This rhapsodic double-stop passage begins with sevenths, and is marked fortissimo appassionato.

A cadenza follows, and the con fantasia marking should be taken literally, allowing all of the melodic contours and tonal changes to speak. Although there are no indications in the score of a lessening in dynamic
until the diminuendo at the bottom of p. 25, the performer should feel free to release the intensity as necessary. This will give greater emphasis to the *forzando tenuto* and *poco feroce* that are marked.

The final rhapsodic double-stop passage follows the cadenza, and it is interesting that Nielsen leaves this section unmeasured, creating room for a flexible interpretation of the visually static progression of eighth notes. This section is more melodic and more complete than previous iterations, and the consonance of the harmony adds to the sense of inevitability as the fragment finally resolves.

Section 5 begins with new material, an *Allegretto* in triplets. This transitions into an extended passage of material from m. 43, leading to the final statements of both A and B themes. Heightened drama is achieved through the use of triple stops in Motive 2 and both the higher register and *fortissimo furioso* in the B theme in m. 120. The movement ends with three conclusive iterations of Motive 2; both the consonance of the E♭ major chords and the return to the opening key center of the Prelude create a strong sense of finality. The bowing for these last three measures is not specified. The chords need to be played down-bow, especially given the *forzando* and *molto pesante* markings. It is possible to lift after the first two chords to play the last eighth notes of mm. 133 and 134 down-bow, rather than hooking the eighths. This creates a more crisp attack on the *staccato* notes and greater potential for a release of bow speed on the chords.
CONCLUSION

Considering the quantity of violin repertoire, it is easy to see how these two solo violin works have been overlooked. In terms of solo repertoire alone, Nielsen’s Op. 48 and Op. 52 stand with many works that were published in the same decade, including the six solo sonatas by Eugene Ysaÿe and the two solo works by Paul Hindemith. Despite highly acclaimed performances during a concert tour in 1924, Telmányi’s attempts to get Op. 48 published in the United States were not successful, postponing its influence to later decades. Many writers have attributed Nielsen’s widespread difficulty in disseminating his works to his position on the fringe, stylistically as well as geographically. The technical difficulty of the works is often mentioned as a possible reason for their neglect during Nielsen’s lifetime.

Regardless of the reasons why these works have been neglected in the past, they contain many outstanding features which commend them to a more prevalent position in the violin repertoire. Techniques such as left-hand pizzicato, artificial harmonics, extensions and contractions of the hand frame within glissandi, and complex multiple stops serve to strengthen the hand, increase flexibility and solidify left-hand organization. A wide range of bow strokes, articulations and sounding points, as well as bariolage and four-string arpeggiations are found within both works, adding to their pedagogical value. Musically, the works inspire both personal creativity and dedication to the detailed markings in the scores, a
perfect combination for artistic expression. Current audiences thrive on a blend of old and new works; these pieces qualify as both, providing a fresh look at familiar elements of structure and harmony, while creating drama with a diverse rhythmical and textural palette.
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APPENDIX A

PRELUDE, THEME AND VARIATIONS ANNOTATED SCORE
PRELUDE, THEME AND VARIATIONS FOR SOLO VIOLIN

Poco adagio e con fantasia (∫ = ca. 36) rad. poco accel.

Op. 48

brillante

accel.

presto (∫ = ca. 100)

pp

sempre pp

molto di - ndo - e - do - pp

spiccato

detaché

detaché

spiccato

Observe the accidentals in the Prelude until they are cancelled.
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Var. II
Andantino quasi Allegretto \( \dot{q} = \text{ca.} 66 \)

\[ \text{molto accet.} \quad \text{su A} \quad \text{molto rall.} \quad \text{su D} \quad \text{su G} \]

\[ \text{dim.} \quad \text{cresc.} \quad \text{vibr. ten.} \quad \text{dégriffé con fantasia} \]

\[ \text{f poco espressivo} \quad \text{transp.} \quad \text{dis- 

\[ \text{amore} \]
Var. V
Più mosso \( \textit{d} = 96 \)

\( \text{molto deciso} \)

\( \text{pizzicato} \)

\( \text{p grazioso} \)

\( \text{expressivo} \)

\( \text{sul G} \)

\( \text{detached} \)

\( \text{brillante} \)
APPENDIX B

PRELUDIO E PRESTO ANNOTATED SCORE
Section I

Preludio

Con Fantasia (d = ca. 60-72)

Op. 52

In the Preludio the accidentals apply only to the notes they immediately precede.
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APPENDIX C

PERMISSION TO USE COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL
From: Michelle Vallier  
Sent: Sat 2/04/12 1:29 PM  
To: EWH  
Subject: Permission to use copyrighted material for DMA document

To the Representative from Edition Wilhelm Hansen:

I am a Doctoral Candidate at Arizona State University (US), completing my research on Carl Nielsen's two solo violin works, op. 48 and op. 52. My document, a Performer's Guide, will include an analytical discussion of the music, and it would be helpful to my readers if I could present annotated scores of each work as appendices to my document. I would love to use your critical edition as the basis for my analyses, and I need your permission to do so. Thank you so much for your help.

Sincerely,

Michelle Vallier

From: Kevin McGee  
Sent: Tue 2/07/12 3:00 PM  
To: Michelle Vallier

Dear Michelle,
Thank you for the request, which has been forwarded to me for handling, as we are the sub-publisher for Wilhelm Hansen here in the US. Wilhelm Hansen expressed that they would like us to give this permission on a gratis basis, as long as you can confirm it will not be printed in large print runs and will not be distributed for sale.

Thank you,

Kevin McGee  
Mechanical / Print Licensing Manager  
Music Sales Corporation  
1247 6th Street  
Santa Monica, CA 90401  
www.schirmer.com