



Rued Langgaard: Symphony no. 11 “Ixion” (BVN 303)

Critical first edition by Ole Ugilt Jensen and Bendt Viinholt Nielsen

Sources and critical commentary

Sources

- A. Autograph score
- B. Score fragments
- C. Sketches

A. Autograph score

Royal Library, Copenhagen. Rued Langgaard’s Collection, RLS 27,1 (mu 7902.1773). Autograph. Fair copy in ink; a few annotations outside the musical text in another hand.

Provenience: Danish Radio music library; deposited at the Royal Library in 1965; transferred in the same year to Danish Radio (registration no. 5242) and finally returned to the Royal Library in 1979.

Title 1: “*Ixion*” / *Symphony no. 11* / by / *Rued Langgaard* / 1945. [the word *Ixion* and the number of the year are in Constance Langgaard’s hand; an earlier title is erased and illegible]

Title 2: [Paste-down label on which an unknown hand has written: *IXION.*] / *Rued Langgaard* / “*Ixion*” / *Stretto-Symphony N^o 11.* / *Score* / *Composed January 1945.* [the word *Ixion* is in Constance Langgaard’s hand; an earlier title in RL’s hand, *Sun Horror (Eternal War)*, has been erased]

Dating at end: *17 January 1945. Ribe*

23 leaves, 34.5 × 27 cm; 43 pages of writing, pagination: (title page 1), (1 unnumbered page with a paste-down note and annotation), (title page 2), (blank), 1-39, (blank), (1 page with annotation), (blank)

Paper type: *W.H. Nr. 9. F. 24* (24 staves)

Attached with tape to the verso of title page 1 is a pencilled note in RL’s handwriting. According to an addition signed Constance Rued Langgaard, the note was made at Esbjerg Central Hospital in June 1952; it mentions among other things “*Ixion. Symphony*”. On the same page another hand has added a remark about the mythological figure of *Ixion*.

On the recto of leaf 23 (back cover) there is an annotation at the top in RL’s hand: *Ixion was bound to an eternally rolling, burning wheel of flame*; below is the title *Fire Sun* (scored out) and the following title in an unknown hand: *Eternal war, Stretto Symphony no. 11* (likewise scored out).

The clarinet parts are notated in the score for B flat clarinets, but in the margin on p. 1 RL has remarked: *To be transposed into E flat!*

Commentary.

The manuscript was sent back and forth several times in the years 1945-1951 between the composer’s address in Ribe and the State Radio in Copenhagen. The chronology of the extant title pages is difficult to establish, but when the manuscript was registered at the State Radio immediately after its completion in 1945, the radio music library noted the title *Eternal War* and the subtitle *Stretto Symphony*. When RL submitted the work for the last time in 1951 it was registered by the radio as *Sun Horror*. Subsequently the manuscript lay for some years in the radio archives as “on loan”. In 1965 Constance Langgaard had it deposited in the Royal Library, where a collection of the composer’s posthumous manuscripts was in process of being put together. It must have been returned to the State Radio already the same year with a view to

being broadcast, but prior to that CL had taken the opportunity to erase RL's autograph titles and add the name *Ixion*. Her authority for this change was undoubtedly the pencilled note written by RL in Esbjerg Central Hospital about a month before died; there he entitles the work *Ixion* (the note is taped to the score, cf. above). CL must have regarded the note as her husband's last will in this respect. *Ixion* occurs as a title annotation on a sheet of manuscript paper (source **B2a**), and we also have an explanatory note about the figure of Ixion in RL's handwriting; this note is actually extant in source **A**, cf. the description above, but this is doubtless a coincidence, for the sheet of manuscript paper on which it occurs has been 'turned over' in order to function as a 'new' cover for the manuscript.

B. Score fragments

Royal Library, Copenhagen. Rued Langgaard's Collection

1. Fragment bb. 1-10.

RLS 25,3 [fol. 14]. Ink. Title: *Symphony N° 11*.

1 leaf, 34 × 27 cm; 2 pages of writing, pagination: 1-2. The fragment occupies the last leaf of a bifolio now functioning as the cover for RL's sketch of his Symphony no. 10.

Contents: Score pp. 1-2 in a preliminary fair copy, both pages cancelled. These pages must have been replaced on aesthetic grounds (corrections, incorrect disposition of the score); there are nevertheless some differences in dynamics and articulation compared with the corresponding bars in **A**.

2. Title pages and covers

a. RLS 30,4 [fol. 2]: *For as the lightning cometh out of / the east, and shineth even unto the west; / so shall also the Son of man's / coming be. / Matthew ch. 24. / Eternal War [this title corrected in crayon to:] *Fire Sun*. – On the other side of the leaf: *Ixion* / [...] (annotation unrelated to the symphony).*

One of the two leaves of a bifolio, the blank pages of which were filled out in July 1948 with sketches for the introductory fanfare of Symphony no. 14.

b. RLS 25,4 [fol. 4]: *Rued Langgaard: / Symphony N° 11, short / "Mordacita" / (Eternal War) / for large Orchestra and / four Double bass tubas.. / Score / Begun in Ribe Dec. 1944.*

On a single leaf, the blank verso of which was filled out in Feb. 1945 with a score sketch for Symphony no. 10, bb. 774-779.

C. Sketches

Royal Library, Copenhagen. Rued Langgaard's Collection

1. RLS 119,3 [fol. 2]. Sketch (notated on 2 staves). Pencil. Designation: *Symphony No 11*; beside the sketch the word *Paranoia* is written (suggested title?). Undated.

1 leaf, 34.5 × 25.5 cm; 1 page of writing.

Contents: bb. 1-10 + draft of the following 8 bars; also contains material for other works.

2. RLS 27,2 [fol. 2]. Fragmentary sketches (notated on 1-3 staves). Ink and pencil. No designation and no dating.

1 leaf, 25.5 × 16 cm; 2 unnumbered pages of writing.

Contents: bb. 69-74 + b. 99, bb. 103-106 + bb. 152-159 + draft of 5 bars designated: *just before the end*.

3. RLS 27,2 [fol. 1]. Fragmentary sketch (notated on 2-3 staves). Ink. Designated: *Notes for 11th symphony (otherwise scored immediately!)*; also notes such as *NB* and *Third (last) time*

Dating at the beginning: *Dec. 1944 Jan. 1945*

1 leaf, 25 × 16 cm; 1 unnumbered page of writing.

Contents: bb. 144-148 + bb. 152-154 + bb. 157-160 (161?).

4. RLS 122,72. Sketch (notated on 2 staves). Pencil. Designation: *Coda*; at the end: *Fanfares*. Undated.

1 leaf, 13.5 × 26 cm; found on the one of two unnumbered pages of writing.

Contents: 8 bars (not included in the finished symphony); also contains material for other works.

5. RLS 122,24. Fragmentary sketches (notated on 1-2 staves). Ink. Designations: *Symph. No 10*. [i.e. 11] and *Coda*; also supplied with the title *Eternal War* in pencil (written twice, the first time hyphenated and struck out). Undated.

1 leaf, 24.5 × 16 cm; the sketches are on the one of 2 unnumbered pages of writing.

Contents: bb. 161-172 + motif designated *For variation* (1 b.) + draft of piano part (bb. 99-103); also contains material for other works.

Textual basis of the edition

The present edition is based on the fair-copied autograph score (source **A**). The preliminary fair copy of bb. 1-10 (**B1**) contributes supplementary information regarding details of articulation, while the discarded title pages (**B2**) are of no interest as sources for the edition. The same applies to the extant sketches, which are of a fragmentary, preliminary and incomplete nature (**C**).

Editorial guidelines

The Editor's additions and emendations are indicated typographically in the score by square brackets; added slurs are printed with broken lines and altered slurs with a combination of unbroken and broken lines. Cautionary accidentals in round brackets are editorial, as are the directions “(div.)” and “(unis.)” in the string parts (such directions are not in round brackets in the source).

Clarinet 1-3 in B flat have been rewritten in E flat as instructed by the composer in the score; fixed accidentals have been supplied editorially. Editorial comments and information about points not typographically identified in the edition are to be found in the notes below.

Missing triplet marks and missing dots have been silently supplied. Adjustments of asymmetrically located dynamic marks have also been made without comment.

Finally, repetitions and parallel passages have been supplemented and their notation made uniform according to principles explained in what follows.

Special editorial problems

Articulation and dynamics

The source displays parallel passages whose musical content is identical (or nearly identical), but in which the notation often varies with regard to articulation, dynamics and – to a lesser extent – phrasing. These are not merely imperfections which might be due to forgetfulness; apparently we have to do with inconsistencies or unmotivated changes and additions.

The editors have striven to eliminate those imperfections which seem fortuitous and – with as few alterations and omissions as possible – to achieve notational consistency between unambiguously parallel places. The following considerations about the form of the symphony have been taken as a point of departure for these editorial interventions.

The symphony is constructed from four short modules which are repeated in different variants and in ever-changing transpositions (cf. the survey of the form and harmonic progression of the work in the preface to the edited score). The basic form of the modules, which we here call A, B, C, D, is presented at the beginning of the work:

- A = bb. 4(upbeat)-8
- B = bb. 9-12
- C = bb. 13-17
- D = bb. 18-21(first half of bar)

During the symphony changes occur in the length, instrumentation and rhythmic patterning of the modules. Thus module A occurs in six variants, module B occurs in versions comprising 4 (2+2) bars, 2 bars and 1 bar, and module C occurs in six variants comprising 3 or 5 bars. Module D on the other hand is stable throughout the work. With few exceptions each variant of a module is repeated one or more times in the course of the composition.

The manuscript leaves no significant doubt about the notes as such, for the thematic and tonal structure of the work is well organised and transparent. However, a similar measure of consistency in the scoring is hard to find with regard to the varying notation of articulation and dynamics. This lack of uniformity is doubtless to some extent coincidental, but in the course of the work changes also take place which admittedly are not particularly striking, but often concur with changes (these, too, not particularly audible) in the instrumentation. That such changes occur at all could be attributed to the composer's desire for some measure of progression in the orchestral sound and dynamics. This hypothesis is strengthened when we focus on the places in the work exhibiting the most significant changes in instrumentation, dynamics and articulation. These places are found at bb. 98 and 151, which constitute the formal points of division in the work, and also at b. 59. Accordingly, all in all a dynamic and articulatory progression in four main phases emerges:

- I = bb. 1-59
- II = bb. 59-97
- III = bb. 98-151
- IV = bb. 151-172

Within each of these phases the composer seems to have striven for uniformity of expression. The editors' interventions apply the principle that the phases are to be treated independently and that generalisation cannot (normally) take place from one phase to another. Another basic principle is that changes or additional details which are 'introduced' as the work proceeds cannot mechanically be transferred 'back' editorially to an earlier place (but by all means 'forward' to a later place). These principles imply that a given module can appear with varying articulation and dynamics in the course of the symphony.

The survey below shows the groups of bars in phases I-III which have been compared with a view to mutual supplementation and the achievement of internal consistency. Phase IV has not been thus treated because it appears independently as conclusion and coda. The survey has been expanded with information on isolated details and on divergences retained in the edition. The musical interpretation must determine whether and to what extent these details should be generalised. Straightforward editorial emendations and deletions are mentioned in the notes below.

One part does not quite fit into the pattern, viz. the timpani which is inconsistently notated throughout the score – perhaps suggesting that the player is permitted a certain improvisatory freedom in the execution of the part. An attempt to standardise the notation would hardly be meaningful in this case. The part appears in the edition exactly as in the source (with the addition of a few articulation signs in editorial parentheses).

The string articulation (module A, phases I-II) constitutes a special editorial problem which is dealt with the following section.

Module A Parallel groups of bars:

phase I	bb. 4-8, 21-25, 26-29, 42-46
phase II	bb. 59-63, 79-83
phase III	bb. 98-102, 108-112, 118-122, 128-132, 138-142

Divergences:	b. 4	vl 1	<i>tutta la forza</i> (only the first time)
	b. 5	fag, str	<i>pesante</i> (only the first time)
	b. 5	trb 1-2	<i>mf(f)</i> (only the first time)
	b. 25	tuba, timp	dim. hairpin (only occurrence, justified by what follows)
	b. 42	str	marc. introduced
		cor 1-2	marc. (only this time)
	b. 43	tuba	<i>f</i> (<i>mf</i> in bb. 5, 22)
	b. 80	str	<i>marc.</i> (only this time)
	bb. 99,		

100	tuba	marc. (only this time)
b. 119	str	<i>ben marc.</i> (only this time)
bb. 129-131	cl, fag	cl added, <i>f</i> , cresc. hairpin and <i>ff</i> introduced
b. 131	cor	cresc. hairpin and <i>ffz</i> introduced

Module B Parallel groups of bars:

phase I	bb. 9-12, 30-33, 47-50
phase III	bb. 103-104, 113-114, 123-124, 133-134

Remarks: The module B-variants in phase II (bb. 64-67 and 84-85) are individual; the same applies to the last variant in phase III (b. 143)

Divergences:	b. 9	tr	<i>ten.</i> (only here, see Notes b. 9)
	b. 103	picc, fl, ob, cl, cor	<i>ff</i> (<i>fff</i> in bb. 113, 123, 133)
	b. 123	fag	<i>fff</i> (<i>ff</i> in b. 103)

Module C Parallel groups of bars:

phase I	bb. 13-17, 34-38, 51-55
phase II	bb. 68-70 + 71-73(74-75), 86-88 + 89-91(92-93)
phase III	bb. 105-107, 115-117, 125-127, 135-137, 144-146, 147-150

Remarks: Dynamics in ob, cl, cor, tr unclear in bb. 105-106, 115-116, 125-126, 135-136

Divergences:	b. 35	ob, cl	<i>ffz</i> (<i>fz</i> in bb. 14 and 52)
	b. 86	ob, cl, cor, tr 1-2	<i>ff</i> (in tr <i>f</i>) and cresc. hairpin introduced
	b. 90	picc	<i>fff</i> (only this time, but cf. b. 149)
	b. 105	str	cresc. hairpins (only this time!)

Module D Parallel groups of bars:

phase I-II	bb. (1-3), 18-20, 39-41, 56-58, 76-78, 94-97
------------	--

Remarks: Beginning of b. 1 differs from bb. 18, 39, 56 etc.
Module D does not occur in phase III

String articulation, module A

The waltz theme in the strings (module A, bb. 4-7 and comparable places) occurs six times in phases I-II. All six occurrences are rhythmically and melodically congruent, whereas articulation and slurs are notated in a contradictory and clearly deficient manner. There is no reason to believe that the articulation and phrasing is supposed to vary between phase I and phase II. Counting the preliminary fair copy of pp. 1-2 of the score (source **B1**), which contains one presentation of module A, there are altogether seven notational variants. The only thing which RL has retained consistently and in all the string parts is marc. on the second and fifth notes of the motif.

It provides food for thought that source **B1** contains the fullest notation of the theme. If this source is restored to its original location as pp. 1-2 in **A**, we obtain a defective, but for all that less self-contradictory and 'casual', notation of the theme the first time it is presented. It is therefore very reasonable to believe that RL's intentions are expressed most clearly in **B1** and that the corresponding bars in **A** are deficient. Articulation

lation marks and slurs have been supplied editorially with this in mind. Here the articulation and phrasing accordingly follows **B1** supported by **A**, as appears from the following survey. The last column shows the places in the two sources where the notation is complete:



<i>note no.</i>	<i>subject of comment</i>	<i>part(s)</i>	<i>source(s)/remarks</i>
note 1	marc.	tutti	introduced at b. 42 (A)
note 2	marc.	tutti	B1 b. 5, A bb. 5, 22, 43, 60, 80
notes 3-4	articulation and phrasing	tutti	A b. 5 (in B1 b. 5 only in vl 1-2)
note 5	marc.	tutti	B1 b. 6, A bb. 23, 44, 61, 81
notes 6-7	articulation and phrasing	tutti	B1 b. 6 (in A b. 6 only in vl 1-2)
note 8	marc.	tutti	B1 b. 7 (in A b. 82 in vl 1, vla, vlc, cb)
note 9	marc.	vl 1-2 + vla	B1 b. 7 (in A only in vl 1 bb. 24, 29, 62 and cb b. 29!)
note 10	marc.	vl 1	suppressed; very faintly represented in A bb. 7 + 24 and B1 b. 7
note 12	marc.	vl 1-2 + vla	A bb. 24, 29, 82 (in B1 only in vl 1-2)

Notes

In addition to editorial remarks these notes mention variants in source **B1** (bb. 1-10)

<i>bar(s)</i>	<i>part(s)</i>	<i>remarks</i>
7	vl 1	note 3: marc. (A and B1) suppressed, see above
	tr	note 1: marc. supplied in agreement with B1 and by analogy with b. 24
9	tr 3	note 2: A and B1 both have <i>ten.</i> , which however is wanting in A in the parallel bars 11, 30, 32, 47, 49; on the other hand <i>ten.</i> in bb. 10 and 12 recurs in bb. 48 and 50 (and is therefore supplied editorially in bb. 31 and 33)
14	cl	note 1: <i>f</i> + marc. emended to <i>fz</i> by analogy with ob
24	vl 1	note 3: marc. suppressed, see above
28	cb	note 2: marc. suppressed, see above
29	vl 2	note 11: ♩ emended to ♩ [♯] by analogy with bb. 8, 25, 46, etc.
30	picc	unclear whether RL intends <i>f</i> or <i>ff</i> ; the reading <i>ff</i> has been selected in agreement with b. 32
37, 38	vl 2	two slurs (notes 1-6, 7-12) emended to four slurs by analogy with vl 1 and bb. 17-18, 54-55, etc.
39	vla	d ¹ (♩) emended to a ¹ - d ¹ (♩♩) by analogy with bb. 1, 18, 56, 76 and 94
47	cl	note 1: sounding b _♭ ² emended to b ² by analogy with unison ob and in agreement with b. 49
52	cl 3	note 1: <i>f</i> + marc. emended to <i>fz</i> by analogy with ob
60	cor 3-4	note 1: <i>f</i> emended to <i>ff</i> by analogy with b. 80
63	vl 1	note 12: d _♭ ¹ emended to e _♭ ¹ (from the seventh to the tonic in the broken chord in the bar) by analogy with bb. 8, 25, 29, 46, 102, etc.
68	fl picc	note 6: ♮ suppressed and ♮ supplied by analogy with unison vl 1 and vl 2 at the octave
	tr 1-2	notes 1-2: cresc. hairpin suppressed by analogy with ob, cl, cor (this hairpin introduced simultaneously with dynamic change b. 86)

71-72	fag	slurs adjusted by analogy with b. 89
72	ob, cl, cor	<i>fz</i> emended to <i>ffz</i> by analogy with b. 69
74	cl 3	tie wanting, but its continuation is present in b. 75 after page-turn in A
	fag 2	note 1: obviously incorrect \sharp before E in A suppressed
75	vl 2	two slurs (notes 1-6, 7-12) emended to four slurs by analogy with vl 1 and b. 74
76	vl 1, vl2	two slurs (notes 1-2, 3-4) emended to one slur notes 2-4 by analogy with bb. 18, 39, 56, etc.
82	tr 1-2	note 3: <i>ff</i> + marc. emended to <i>ffz</i>
83	vl 1	note 12: d^1 emended to e^1 (seventh emended to tonic in the broken chord in the bar) by analogy with bb. 8, 25, 29, 46, 102, etc.
91	cb	notes 7-9: the notation goes below E, which is an isolated error, for everywhere else RL avoids this by writing the note an octave higher or inserting rests; the notation has been allowed to stand in the edition, but a note to the conductor has been supplied on p. 6 in the score
99	fag	in bb. 99-156 the three instruments are notated in A on a single staff with no indication of the distribution of parts; the edition distributes them by analogy with parallel passages where fag 2 and 3 alternate between the bottom and the middle part
103	fl 1-2	<i>a2</i> wanting in A (an obvious oversight)
(103)	vl 1, vl 2	note 3: lowest note in the consonance supplied by analogy with bb. 113, 123, 133 and 143
104	vl 1, vl 2	note 3: lowest note in the consonance supplied by analogy with bb. 114, 124, 134 and 144
111	cor	cresc. suppressed by analogy with bb. 101 and 121 (cresc. introduced b. 131 together with other dynamic changes)
112	cor 1-2	empty bar in A ; editorially supplied by analogy with bb. 102, 122, 132 and 142
119	fag	<i>f</i> emended to <i>ff</i> by analogy with b. 98
125	fag 1, vla	note 2: orig. \flat corrected by RL in A (rather unclearly) to \flat
133	fl	<i>a2</i> wanting in A (obvious oversight after page-turn)
	ob, cl	<i>a3</i> wanting in A (obvious oversight after page-turn)
135	vla	note 2: $b\sharp$ emended to b (\sharp suppressed) by analogy with unison fag 1 (cf. remark on b. 144)
141	tuba	note 1: superfluous <i>f</i> suppressed
144	fag 1, vla	note 2: $c\sharp^1$ emended to c^1 (\sharp suppressed) by analogy with scale passages in bb. 105, 115 and 125
154	cl	note 5: wanting in A (empty space in the bar); supplied by analogy with unison ob
156	fl	note 3: a^2 emended to $a\sharp^3$ by analogy with picc, ob, cl (and b. 9, etc.)

Bendt Viinholt Nielsen/Ole Ugilt Jensen, rev. 9 Sep. 2003

English translation: Michael Chesnutt

Published score, colophon:

Rued Langgaard: Symphony no. 11 "Ixion" (BVN 303)

© 2014 The Rued Langgaard edition and Edition Wilhelm Hansen, Copenhagen

BVN-numbers refer to Bendt Viinholt Nielsen: *Rued Langgaards Kompositioner. Annoteret værkfortegnelse. (Rued Langgaard's Compositions. An Annotated Catalogue of Works. With an English Introduction)*. Odense Universitetsforlag, 1991.

General editor of the Rued Langgaard Edition: Bendt Viinholt Nielsen.

Editors of the present publication: Ole Ugilt Jensen and Bendt Viinholt Nielsen.

The Rued Langgaard Edition was established in 2000 with the support of the Carlsberg Foundation.

The present publication was subsidised by the Langgaard Foundation and the Augustinus Foundation.

This edition was originally produced and published in 2003 by Edition Samfundet, (Edition-S), Copenhagen.

Duration: 5½ minutes