

Atti del VI Seminario Internazionale di Filologia Musicale.

«La filologia musicale oggi: il retaggio storico e le nuove prospettive»

Publishers' Editors' Fingerprints in Sibelius's Piano Works

Anna Pulkkis

Jean Sibelius Works, The National Library of Finland

anna.pulkkis@helsinki.fi

§ Printed editions of Sibelius's piano works typically contain questionable and erroneous details. Some of these result from the intervention of publishers' editors, who revised the works during the proofreading stage. Sibelius's publishers needed the editors for copyright reasons: only in revised form could Sibelius's works obtain copyright protection in the USA. The nature of the revisions varies from the adding of 'harmless' details (such as fingerings) to more profound emendations of the note text (such as added dynamics or articulation marks). In any form, publishers' editors' intervention corrupts the note text, moving it away from the composer's original intentions. For the purposes of a critical edition, the interventions must be identified. Surviving autograph manuscripts provide a basis for the identification. However, changes that occurred during the proofreading stage may well originate from the composer himself. If the manuscripts are lost, the identification must be based on knowledge of the composer's, and the editors', personal styles. My paper illuminates the role of publishers' editors in the publishing processes of some of Sibelius's later piano works, illustrates the changes publishers' editors made to the scores, and ponders the consequences of these interventions from the viewpoint of critical editing.

§ L'edizione a stampa delle opere per pianoforte di Sibelius contengono discutibili ed errate lezioni, molte delle quali inserite dai redattori della casa editrice in fase di pubblicazione. Gli editori di Sibelius avevano bisogno dei redattori per questioni di copyright: solo dopo essere stati redatti i suoi lavori potevano ottenere il a tutti gli effetti la tutela del copyright negli Stati Uniti. La natura delle revisioni è varia: dall'aggiunta di 'innocui' dettagli (come la diteggiatura) all'eliminazione di sostanziali indicazioni nel testo (dinamiche o segni di articolazione). Tutti questi interventi hanno corrotto il testo e lo hanno allontanato dalle organarie intenzioni dell'autore. Come base di un'edizione critica è possibile usare un manoscritto autografo, anche se molti dei cambiamenti presenti in fase di correzione delle bozze sono stati inseriti dall'autore stesso. Se i manoscritti sono andati perduti l'identificazione si deve basare sulla conoscenza dello stile personale del compositore e dei redattori. Questo contributo fa luce sul ruolo che hanno avuto i redattori nel processo di pubblicazione in molti degli ultimi pezzi per pianoforte di Sibelius, mostra gli interventi dei redattori sugli spartiti e valuta le conseguenze di questi interventi nell'ottica di un progetto di un'edizione critica.

Sibelius and publishers' editors

Finnish composer Jean Sibelius is best known for his seven symphonies and other orchestral works. He has a vast output of piano works besides, 117 numbers collected under twenty different opus numbers, as well as numerous works without opus number. Here I concentrate on his later piano works, those from Op. 85 to Op. 103, composed and published between 1916 and 1925. My viewpoint is that of a critical editor's – I am currently preparing a critical edition of Sibelius's later piano works, belonging to the series *Jean Sibelius Works*, a complete critical edition of Sibelius's music.¹ I focus on one issue that has proved problematic in the course of producing the critical edition: the intervention of publishers' editors in preparing the early printed editions of these works. The additions and emendations made by the editors corrupt the note text, raising questions of authenticity.

Why were publishers' editors involved, and who were they?

The emergence of publishers' editors was an outcome of international copyright regulations, which were evolving in the early 20th century. The Berne Convention, an international agreement for copyright protection of literary and artistic works, was established in 1886. The Convention guarantees the authors of artistic works equal rights within its member countries. Within the member countries, thus, copyrights caused no problems. However, Finland signed the Berne Convention as late as in 1928. Another country which did not belong to the Berne Convention at that time was the USA. Finland and the USA did not have an individual copyright treaty either, which meant that in the USA, Sibelius's works were in public domain. If Sibelius's publishers wanted to obtain US copyright for their editions, the US copyright office required the works to be published as revisions, and publishers' editors were needed to execute the necessary alterations. At least in some cases, the editors were required to be US citizens. The requirement affected the Sibelius publications of both European and US publishers; in connection with my material, the Danish firm Edition Wilhelm Hansen, the British firm Hawkes & Son, as well as the US publisher Carl Fischer.

Not much is known of the editors and their work. Wilhelm Hansen's editor Julia A. Burt apparently worked in New York, but nothing else is known of her; not even whether she was a real person or just a pseudonym used by several editors. The editor of Hawkes was Charles Woodhouse, violinist and composer. W.F. Ambrosio was the pseudonym for Carl Fischer's editor-in-chief, the violinist Gustav Saenger. One Fischer print was also revised by the pianist and conductor Alexander Siloti.

The editors typically entered the picture during the proofreading stage. It is hard to judge how independently they worked; probably they followed the

¹ For more information on *Jean Sibelius Works*, see <http://www.nationallibrary.fi/culture/sibelius.html>.

respective publisher's practice of dealing with the copyright revisions. Judging from Wilhelm Hansen's markings on some of Sibelius's manuscripts, the first proofs were initially sent to the editor and then to the composer. Thus, the changes made by the editor were (at least tacitly) accepted by Sibelius. In all, there is little documentation on Sibelius's reactions to the interventions. It seems that the composer accepted the procedure, aware of its necessity with regard to the copyright.

Editors' emendations to the note text

How profoundly did publishers' editors alter the note text? There are different types and grades of intervention. A lighter type is adding 'harmless' details, most typically fingerings; these can serve a pedagogical purpose, though fingering also affects articulation. Furthermore, various 'clarifying instructions,' such as cautionary accidentals and *sempre*, were added. Publishers' editors commonly added pedal markings. While these may seem harmless or self-evident, they might misleadingly suggest a particular interpretation, maybe contrary to the composer's intentions. Sibelius typically only wrote *con Ped.* at the beginning of a piece, leaving the further choices to the performer. In addition, he would often add single pedals in certain passages. Sibelius's own pedal markings thus easily get mixed with the editor's additions. Another group of typical editor's additions is dynamic markings such as *crescendo* and *diminuendo* wedges. Also other performance instructions, such as *legato* and *ritardando*, and articulation marks, such as *staccato* dots and accents, were added. In a way, the most extreme interventions are those that affect the texture of the music. For instance, editors would sometimes rewrite arpeggio figures in order to make the music more 'pianistic.' Otherwise, the note heads and rhythms were rarely touched.

When preparing a critical Sibelius edition, publishers' editors' interventions create problems. First of all, the interventions make the composer's original intentions difficult to trace. How can the critical editor recognize the interventions and distinguish them from the composer's own markings? The printed sources with publishers' editors' intervention may be compared to autograph or other manuscript sources – if any exist, which is not always the case. If there are early printed sources which have not been edited and revised, they may prove helpful. As reference sources, earlier versions and arrangements of the same work can be studied. However, even if manuscripts survive, the differences between the manuscript and the printed source might well stem from the composer – Sibelius often emended his works during the proof stage. Identifying the additions would be easier if proofs survived, but they rarely do. Furthermore, even if no copyright revision took place, publishers often made their own suggestions to the note text.

To a certain extent, the critical editor may rely on his or her knowledge of the composer's personal style. What would he typically write, and what has he

not written elsewhere? The critical editor may also learn to recognize additions typical of a particular publisher's editor. However, these conclusions must be reached very carefully – even at their best, they are only assumptions. What if the composer was trying something new?

The consequences of interventions vary in significance depending on the role of the printed sources in the source chain. If the autograph manuscript is the main source, and the printed sources only hold a secondary position, publishers' editors' emendations hardly affect the reading in the critical edition. If, however, the printed source is chosen as the main source, the emendations may directly affect the note text of the critical edition.

Sample cases

The following examples illuminate the problems I have faced, and the solutions I have created, while preparing a critical edition of Sibelius's later piano works. The works discussed are *Bellis* (Op. 85 No. 1), published by Wilhelm Hansen in 1922 as edited and revised by Julia A. Burt; *Valse lyrique* (Op. 96a), published by Hawkes & Son in 1920 as edited and revised by Charles Woodhouse and by Wilhelm Hansen in 1921 as edited and revised by Julia A. Burt; *Valse chevaleresque* (Op. 96c), published by Wilhelm Hansen in 1922 as edited and revised by Julia A. Burt; *The Village Church* (Op. 103 No. 1), published by Carl Fischer in 1925 as edited and revised by W.F. Ambrosio; and *Scène romantique* (Op. 101 No. 5), published by Carl Fischer in 1925 as edited and revised by Alexander Siloti.

Bellis (Op. 85 No. 1)

Bellis was composed in 1917 and published by Wilhelm Hansen in 1922 as edited and revised by Julia A. Burt. The autograph fair copy served as the engraver's copy for the Wilhelm Hansen print. The interventions are relatively easy to trace by comparing the fair copy (Ex. 1a) to the print (Ex. 1b). The fingerings are definitely by Burt – as far as can be known, Sibelius never wrote fingerings in his piano scores. Also the pedal markings are most probably by Burt. Here the use of the pedal is not self-evident, although the wide leap in bar 19 might suggest it (moreover, the pedals would not necessarily be that long). Another addition by Burt is the 'clarifying instruction' *staccato sempre*. Sibelius obviously wanted the staccatos to continue, yet found it unnecessary to instruct the performer further.

In the Jean Sibelius Works critical edition, the autograph fair copy of *Bellis* is the main source; the critical edition thus basically follows the reading in the fair copy. The fingerings have been tacitly removed, and Burt's other interventions have been mentioned in the Critical Remarks.

The image shows the autograph fair copy of the first 25 bars of 'Bellis' by Jean Sibelius. The title 'Bellis' is written in a large, elegant cursive script at the top. Below it, the composer's name 'Jean Sibelius' and the work's identification 'Op. 85 Nr. 1' are also in cursive. The tempo marking 'Presto' is written in a smaller cursive hand. The music is written on three systems of staves. The first system includes the tempo marking and the instruction 'una corda'. The second system starts with a measure number '9'. The third system starts with a measure number '18'. The notation includes treble and bass clefs, a 2/4 time signature, and various rhythmic values and articulations.

Example 1a. Autograph fair copy of *Bellis* (Op. 85 No. 1), bb. 1-25; manuscript (Ö. 60) preserved at the National Library of Finland.

Reproduced by the permission of the legal successors of Jean Sibelius.

BELLIS

The image shows a printed edition of the first 23 bars of 'Bellis' by Jean Sibelius. The title 'BELLIS' is printed in large, bold, serif capital letters. The composer's name 'Jean Sibelius, Op. 85. Nr. 1.' is printed in a smaller serif font. The tempo marking 'Presto' is printed in a bold, italicized serif font. The music is written on three systems of staves. The first system includes the tempo marking, the instruction 'una corda', and the dynamic marking 'p'. The second system includes the instruction 'staccato sempre'. The third system includes the instruction 'sempre' and several asterisks. The notation includes treble and bass clefs, a 2/4 time signature, and various rhythmic values and articulations.

Example 1b. Wilhelm Hansen print of *Bellis* (Op. 85 No. 1), bb. 1-23.

Copyright © Fennica Gehrman Oy Ab, Helsinki. Printed with permission.

Valse lyrique (Op. 96a)

Valse lyrique, composed in 1919, was first published by Hawkes & Son in 1920, and secondly by Wilhelm Hansen in the following year. Interestingly, the Hawkes print was edited and revised by Charles Woodhouse, while the Wilhelm Hansen print was edited and revised by Julia A. Burt. Thus, there are two almost simultaneous early prints, revised by different publishers' editors.

The beginning of the work serves to illustrate the differences well. The fair copy (Ex. 2a) is quite 'empty,' and the two editors have embellished it with their own interpretations (Ex. 2b and 2c). There are no pedal markings in the fair copy, although pedal is obviously needed. According to her habit, Burt has added pedals (see Ex. 2c); later in the score, pedals also appear in Woodhouse's reading. Sibelius's performance instruction *mezza* has been emended to *mezzo* by Woodhouse and *mezza con grazia* by Burt (it must be mentioned that Sibelius frequently uses both *mezza* and *mezzo* as independent instructions). Woodhouse has also duplicated *mezzo* on the second system. There are many differences in the dynamic markings. The placement of wedges, entirely absent in the fair copy, differs between the two prints. Woodhouse has added *mf* and *poco f*, while Burt has added one *poco cresc.* Woodhouse has also added an arpeggio in the fifth bar.

In the critical edition, the autograph fair copy of *Valse lyrique* is the main source. The prints were not engraved after the fair copy but after a copyist's copies, and it is not known whether Sibelius participated in the proofreading of either of the prints. Thus, it is safest to base the critical note text on the reading in Sibelius's own hand. In themselves, both publishers' editors' readings surely lead to meaningful performances. However, as ready-made interpretations they narrow the performer's possible choices in a way not inherent in Sibelius's original notation.

Example 2a. Autograph fair copy of *Valse lyrique* (Op. 96a), bb. 1-16; manuscript (HUL 0051) preserved at the National Library of Finland.

Reproduced by the permission of the legal successors of Jean Sibelius.

VALE LYRIQUE.

Edited by CHARLES WOODHOUSE. JEAN SIBELIUS. Op.96a

Poco moderato.

PIANO.

mezzo mf mezzo poco f

Example 2b. Hawkes print of *Valse lyrique* (Op. 96a), bb. 1-16.
Copyright © Fennica Gehrman Oy Ab, Helsinki. Printed with permission.

VALE LYRIQUE

Poco moderato JEAN SIBELIUS, Op 96 a

mezza con grazia poco cresc. poco cresc.

Example 2c. Wilhelm Hansen print of *Valse lyrique* (Op. 96a), bb. 1-16.
Copyright © Fennica Gehrman Oy Ab, Helsinki. Printed with permission.

Valse chevaleresque (Op. 96c)

Valse chevaleresque differs from the preceding examples in terms of its source situation. The autograph fair copy is lost, and the only surviving direct source is the first edition, published by Wilhelm Hansen in 1922 as edited and revised by Julia A. Burt. However, there is one manuscript that can be used as a reference source: a copyist's copy of an earlier version. In addition to fingerings and pedals, the print (Ex. 3b) includes many staccatos not typical of Sibelius's piano writing, such as the circled staccatos (bb. 140-141 and 148-150), which are doubtful. In the early version (Ex. 3a), there are generally accents in the place of these staccatos. It is impossible to judge whether it was Burt or Sibelius who changed the accents to staccatos. For comparison, the right-hand staccatos beginning in bar 141 appear in the early version and are thus reliable.



Example 3a. Copyist's copy of the early version of *Valse chevaleresque* (Op. 96c), bb. 137-152; manuscript (HUL 1815) preserved at the National Library of Finland.

Reproduced by the permission of the legal successors of Jean Sibelius.

The passage beginning in bar 153 (see Ex. 3b) does not appear in the early version in this manner. Here, another reference source comes to the rescue, namely, an orchestral version written by Sibelius (Ex. 3c). The figure in bars 155-156 of the print (circled in Ex. 3b) represents articulation not typical of Sibelius's piano writing. Interestingly, the figure appears as such in the first

violin part of the orchestral version (circled in Ex. 3c). The piano and orchestral versions were composed, published and revised side by side. It seems that either Sibelius or Burt allowed violin articulation influence piano articulation.

All the mentioned staccatos, even the doubtful ones, have been retained in the critical edition due to the lack of further evidence. These doubts, together with comparison to reference sources, have been included in the Critical Remarks.

The image displays a piano score for measures 137 to 162 of Sibelius's *Valse chevaleresque* (Op. 96c). The score is presented in five systems, each with a grand staff (treble and bass clefs). Measure numbers 137, 143, 148, 153, and 158 are indicated at the beginning of their respective systems. The tempo/mood is marked 'energico' at the start and end. Dynamics include *f*, *p*, *mf*, and *meno*. Performance instructions such as 'p dolce cresc.' and 'v.' (vibrato) are present. Fingerings and articulation marks (staccato, accents) are clearly shown throughout the piece.

Example 3b. Wilhelm Hansen print of *Valse chevaleresque* (Op. 96c), bb. 137-162.
Copyright © Edition Wilhelm Hansen AS, Copenhagen. Printed with permission.

The image shows a page of handwritten musical notation for an orchestral score. The notation is arranged in several systems of staves. The top system includes a treble clef staff with a melodic line and a piano staff with accompaniment. The middle system continues the melodic line with a 'poco crescendo' marking. The bottom system features a treble clef staff with a melodic line and a piano staff with accompaniment, including a 'mp' marking. The word 'dolce' is written in cursive above the first and third systems. Other markings include 'cresc.', 'mp', and 'poco crescendo'.

Example 3c. Autograph fair copy page of the orchestral version of *Valse chevaleresque* (Op. 96c), bb. 150-157; manuscript (HUL 1816) preserved at the National Library of Finland.

Reproduced by the permission of the legal successors of Jean Sibelius.

The Village Church (Op. 103 No. 1)

The last examples come from the piano opera 101 and 103, published in 1925 by the New York publisher Carl Fischer as edited and revised by W. F. Ambrosio. The autograph fair copies which served as engraver's copies for the Fischer prints are lost. Some preliminary fair copies and drafts have been preserved. Owing to the absence of the final fair copies, however, the critical edition is greatly dependent on the reading in the printed sources.

The only complete surviving manuscript source for *The Village Church* is a relatively early draft. Luckily, however, a fragment of an autograph fair copy survives, which Sibelius abandoned, having written the first bar line too early (Ex. 4a). This tiny fragment proves that *Largo, con Ped.*, and *poco f* in the Fischer print (Ex. 4b) really are by Sibelius. The process does not work the other way round: the fact that the tenuto lines which appear in the print are missing in the fragment does not imply that they could not be by Sibelius.



Example 4a. Fragment of an autograph fair copy of *The Village Church* (Op. 103 No. 1), b. 1; manuscript (HUL 0719/2) preserved at the National Library of Finland.

Reproduced by the permission of the legal successors of Jean Sibelius.

The Village Church

8



Example 4b. Fischer print of *The Village Church* (Op. 103 No. 1), bb. 1-4.

Copyright 1925 by Carl Fischer Inc., New York. Printed with the permission of Carl Fischer, LLC.

On the next page, Ambrosio has placed *ps* as well as two cautionary accidentals in parentheses (Ex. 4c). In the critical edition, the additions in parentheses have been removed as obviously by the hand of the editor. Since the fair copies are missing, it is difficult to tell whether Ambrosio made any other emendations to the score.

Example 4c. Fischer print of *The Village Church* (Op. 103 No. 1), bb. 13-17.

Copyright 1925 by Carl Fischer Inc., New York. Printed with the permission of Carl Fischer, LLC.

Scène romantique (Op. 101 No. 5)

Number five of Op. 101, *Scène romantique*, makes an exception within the opera 101 and 103: it was not edited by Ambrosio, but by the Russian-born pianist Alexander Siloti. In November 1924, Fischer wrote to Sibelius that Siloti had «expressed a desire to add this number to his concert repertoire, but has recommended certain little changes in the setting as incorporated in a copy which he has prepared, and which he claims would add to the effectiveness of the piece as a concert solo.» The letter continues: «We are sending you this copy for examination and comment and would appreciate your opinion and also whether you might favor publication of the number as edited by Mr. Siloti.»²

² Carl Fischer's letter to Sibelius, dated 25 November 1924, is preserved at the National Library of Finland (Coll. 206.44).

Judging from a surviving reply draft, Sibelius had nothing against the pianist's interventions. Sibelius wrote: «It is with great pleasure that I have become acquainted with Mr. Siloti's edition of *Scène Romantique*. I naturally agree to its publication as "Edited by Siloti."»³ Unfortunately, except for an early draft, all autograph manuscript material for *Scène romantique* is lost. Siloti's edition is the only satisfying source for *Scène romantique*.

What could Siloti's 'little changes' be? The pedal markings in the print are probably not by Sibelius – there are simply too many of them (see Ex. 5b). Also the frequent wedges are doubtful. The dynamic differentiation between the pianissimo of the left hand and the piano of the right hand is not something Sibelius would normally do. The draft (Ex. 5a) does not provide support for these considerations.

The image shows a handwritten musical score for the first ten bars of 'Scène romantique'. It consists of three systems of staves. The first system has a treble clef staff with a melodic line and a bass clef staff with a complex accompaniment. The second system continues the same parts. The third system shows a continuation of the bass line. The handwriting is in dark ink on aged paper, with some corrections and slurs visible.

Example 5a. Autograph draft of *Scène romantique* (Op. 101 No. 5), bb. 1-10; manuscript (HUL 0742) preserved at the National Library of Finland.

Reproduced by the permission of the legal successors of Jean Sibelius.

In the continuation, the slurs and most of the tenuto lines seem to be in place in the print (Ex. 5d) compared to the draft (Ex. 5c). The doubled bass notes

³ Sibelius's letter draft to Carl Fischer, dated 18 December 1924, is preserved at the National Library of Finland (Coll. 206.44).

from bar 19 on are, however, doubtful. Such bass reinforcement is very rare within Sibelius's piano output. Compared to the draft, the left-hand arpeggio figures have changed. It was possibly Siloti who positioned the chord tones differently, perhaps to fit the hands better.

Scène Romantique

*Edited and revised
by A. SILOTI*

JEAN SIBELIUS, Op. 101, No. 5

Moderato assai *espress.*

iano

pp *p*

P + P + P + P + P + P +

P + P + P + P + P + P +

P + P + P +

Example 5b. Fischer print of *Scène romantique* (Op. 101 No. 5), bb. 1-10.
Copyright 1925 by Carl Fischer Inc., New York. Printed with the permission of Carl Fischer, LLC.

The final bars of the print (Ex. 5f) are nearly overloaded with performance instructions. The draft (Ex. 5e) simply contains *poco a poco dim. al mp*, and a crossed-out *dim.* Although belonging to an early stage, the draft represents notation more typical of Sibelius's later piano works. The amount of instructions seen in the print seems unnecessary from the viewpoint of a sensible

performer. This passage, especially the arpeggios, embodies a romantic piano idiom, towards which Siloti was probably striving.

In the absence of hard evidence, however, all the supposed additions by Siloti must be retained in the critical reading. The suspicions can only be expressed in the Critical Remarks and some footnotes. Besides, by accepting Siloti's edition, Sibelius – in a way – authorized the reading in the print.



Example 5c. Autograph draft of *Scène romantique* (Op. 101 No. 5), b. 19 ff.; manuscript (HUL 0742) preserved at the National Library of Finland.

Reproduced by the permission of the legal successors of Jean Sibelius.

Poco con moto

17 *mezza voce*

20

23

26

The musical score consists of four systems of music. The first system (measures 17-19) includes a vocal line with the instruction 'mezza voce' and a piano accompaniment with dynamic markings 'P', 'P', 'P', 'P', and 'pp'. The second system (measures 20-22) continues the piano accompaniment with 'pp' markings. The third system (measures 23-25) features a more complex piano accompaniment with 'pp' markings. The fourth system (measures 26-28) concludes the passage with 'pp' markings.

Example 5d. Fischer print of *Scène romantique* (Op. 101 No. 5), bb. 17-28.
Copyright 1925 by Carl Fischer Inc., New York. Printed with the permission of Carl Fischer, LLC.



Example 5e. Autograph draft of *Scène romantique* (Op. 101 No. 5), last 8 bars; manuscript (HUL 0742) preserved at the National Library of Finland.

Reproduced by the permission of the legal successors of Jean Sibelius.

The image shows a printed musical score for the piano, consisting of two systems. The first system is numbered 70 and contains three measures. It features a treble and bass staff. Above the first measure is the instruction "riten.". Below the first measure is "dimin.". Above the second measure is "mezza voce". Above the third measure is "sempre più riten.". Below the first measure is a dynamic marking of "p", and below the second and third measures is "P". The second system is numbered 73 and contains three measures. Above the second measure is "pp" and "dimin.". Above the third measure is "ppp". The notation is clean and includes various musical symbols like slurs, ties, and dynamic markings.

Example 5f. Fischer print of *Scène romantique* (Op. 101 No. 5), last 6 bars.

Copyright 1925 by Carl Fischer Inc., New York. Printed with the permission of Carl Fischer, LLC.

Conclusion

My examples proceeded roughly from more straightforward cases towards more problematic cases. The source situation proved to be of great importance. In *Bellis* and *Valse lyrique*, autograph fair copies provided a steady foundation for the critical note text. In the case of *Valse chevaleresque*, the critical note text had to be based on the reading in the revised print. However, reference sources provided background for the suspicions and considerations expressed in the Critical Remarks. In *The Village Church*, with no surviving fair copies, the publisher's editor had luckily made some of his additions visible by placing them in parentheses. Finally, Siloti's changes in *Scène romantique*, probably not 'little' at all, cannot be traced for certain and thus remain in the note text of the critical edition. The critical editor must content herself with enlightened guesses included in the Critical Remarks.

In conclusion, I would like to lessen the load somewhat. Namely, in a letter from 1926, US copyright office lectured Wilhelm Hansen about the insufficient nature of the copyright revisions made by Julia A. Burt. According to the copyright office, «some publishers» had been «attempting to claim copyright for works in the public domain [by] employing someone to “revise” or “edit” such works when such editing or revising results in little if any change in the text of such works.»⁴ This circumstance, however unfortunate from the viewpoint of the copyright authorities, comforts the burdened critical editor.

⁴ A copy of the letter was attached to Wilhelm Hansen's letter to Sibelius, dated 27 April 1926 and preserved at the National Archives of Finland, file box 45.

Bibliography

- JEAN SIBELIUS (1920), *Valse lyrique Op. 96a*, London, Hawkes & Son [H.&S. 5858].
- (1921), *Valse lyrique Op. 96a*, København, Edition Wilhelm Hansen [2110; 17590].
- (1922), *Bellis Op. 85 No. 1*, København, Edition Wilhelm Hansen [2185; 17722].
- (1922), *Valse chevaleresque Op. 96c*, København, Edition Wilhelm Hansen [2227; 17895].
- (1925), *Scène romantique*, New York, Carl Fischer [P.1475; 23406-6].
- (1925), *The Village Church*, New York, Carl Fischer [P.1476; 23398-3].

Anna Pulkkis works at the National Library of Finland as an editor of *Jean Sibelius Works*, the complete critical edition of Sibelius's works. She is currently preparing a volume containing Sibelius's later piano works. She is also a PhD student at Sibelius Academy, Finland.

Anna Pulkkis lavora alla National Library of Finland come curatrice dell'edizione critica *Jean Sibelius Works*: attualmente sta curando un volume dedicato agli ultimi lavori per pianoforte. Si è addottorata alla Sibelius Academy (Finlandia).