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Probably no composer has ever been more clearly aware of his place in the great chain of music history than was Beethoven. Without unwarranted grandiosity he sensed the pivotal role of his work, building outward from the classical models of Haydn and Mozart to usher in a new musical era. The transformations which Beethoven effected are to be felt on all levels of musical coherence, from the size and shape of large scale, multi-movement works to the achievement of continuity in extended and unprecedentedly complex sonata structures. Even the means of maintaining momentum and direction in the individual phrase were re-thought in terms of a slower harmonic rhythm and a new use of rhythm and agogics (stresses created by longer note values).

Intimately linked with these changes in musical syntax, so frequently misunderstood in Beethoven's own day, was a re-evaluation of the norms of pulsation and tempo. A Mozart Allegro is not a Beethoven Allegro, and Beethoven was overjoyed when his friend Johann Maelzel invented the Metronome, a device by which he could stipulate the difference with precision. But although Beethoven's compositional practice is much clearer to us than it was to his contemporaries, many of the misconceptions which Beethoven railed at in respect to performance, and particularly tempo, haunt us still.

According to Schindler, Beethoven's first question on hearing of a performance of one of his works was always the same: "How were the tempi?" Every other consideration seemed to be of secondary importance to him. When Maelzel developed the metronome in 1815 and started production, Beethoven became his most enthusiastic advocate and left some 150 markings for his own works. They form an intelligible and consistent pattern, once a number of errors have been corrected, and tend to show that his estimation of the length of, for example, the Ninth Symphony (45 minutes) was reasonably accurate. Indeed, in a letter to his publisher Beethoven attributed the success of a Berlin performance of the Ninth to the observance of the metronome marks.

Of course, the fact that an interpretation has departed from the composer's conception does not in itself invalidate it. In respect to the symphony on today's program there spring to mind recorded performances by Furtwaengler, Klepper and Erich Kleiber, among others, which make for very gripping and moving encounters with the music, although their chosen tempi are often very far from Beethoven's. Indeed, an inspired and occasionally willful act of recreation may well come closer to the spirit of the work than a performance fettered by a sense of servile obedience to the letter. Yet surely the right tempo, especially for a composer for whom tempo was so crucial a consideration, is no pedantic matter. It is, rather, a master key to help unlock the heart of the music.

Although the first movement of the Fifth Symphony (Allegro con brio, \( \text{J} = 108 \)) is rarely performed at the speed indicated by Beethoven, the movement presents no fundamental problems at this tempo. The fact that the music is notated in eighth notes has probably contributed to musicians' conceiving it at a considerably slower tempo than indicated. If Beethoven had chosen to notate it in 16ths: \( \text{J} = 168 \), it is likely that the metronome indication would have presented less of a mystery.
It is worth noting that Beethoven originally wrote "presto" at the beginning of one of his early sketches for this movement. Like the Finales to the "Appassionata" Sonata and the Fourth Symphony, this movement is not really conceived in 2/4 but rather is one of the handful of examples in Beethoven's music of an actual 1/2.

Another result of taking Beethoven at his word in the matter of tempo in this movement is that the traditional "pounded" staccato eighth note figure \( \text{\textit{\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet}} \) gives way perforce to a more "quasi legato" stroke, thus revealing the underlying melody in quarter notes:

This in turn raises the issue of metrical structure with which interpreters have struggled for so long -- the matter of distribution of strong and weak bars. For example, the second theme of the first movement can be heard:

Among the theorists and musicologists who have wrestled with the movement, Schenker and Tovey opted for the first approach (see Norton score). Indeed, a case can be made for all of them (except, perhaps, the third). However, tonight's performance will reflect a decision to follow the fourth method of interpreting this crucial phrase which has extensive repercussions throughout the movement. For example, the horn call variant of the opening motive which ushers in the second theme must now be scanned:
By thus placing the heavy bar on the third half-note a surprising and marvelously satisfying solution can be found to a vexing problem of meter and phraseology much further on in the movement. That passage, near the end of the development where the basic motive attenuates into shifting half-note chords alternating between strings and winds, has troubled every musician who has ever attempted to grapple seriously with the work, due to its baffling phrasing and uncertainty of harmonic direction. By placing the heavy bar of the motive on the third half-note, the alternating chords are heard to be preceded by a five bar phrase and then, in place of the usual plodding (and metrically incoherent) phrasing of
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we hear placing the harmonic flow of the whole passage in a very remarkable new light. These and several other findings of a similar nature will be reflected in today's performance.

As can be seen from the manner of scanning the phrases shown above, issues such as these become even more significant at Beethoven's specified tempo. Now each bar is readily heard as a "beat" in a larger metrical structure, and therefore it is all the more necessary that each be subsumed into a larger pattern of heavy and light bars.

Regarding the second movement and its tempo indication, Andante con moto (\( \text{\textbar} = 92 \)), it may not be superfluous to point out that we have an early sketch bearing the label "Andante quasi Menuetto". Certainly there is an undeniable air of formal courtliness about much of the music. At the indicated tempo, the repeated cadences, which so often sound laborious, seem quite natural.

It is worth noting that while few conductors perform the first part of the movement at the indicated tempo, many seem to reach approximately \( \text{\textbar} = 92 \) for the middle section (beginning at bar 132) where the flute, oboe and clarinets play their intertwining figures. Since the movement is a set of variations in which each variation presents more subdivisions of the beat, and hence shorter note values, it would seem essential to resist the temptation to make a progressive increase in tempo as well. Starting at Beethoven's indicated tempo makes this unnecessary. As one can see from the short fourteen bar piu mosso section (\( \text{\textbar} = 116 \)), when Beethoven wants a substantial increase of tempo within a movement, he marks it.

In general the tempi of the scherzo movements in Beethoven have caused less controversy among interpreters than any other category and are generally followed rather closely. However, this movement has suffered more than most by being taken more slowly than indicated (Allegro, \( \text{\textbar} = 96 \)), thus acquiring a portentousness that its "Allegro" indication does not imply. The Trio, especially, is rarely played at Beethoven's tempo, though the cello and bass figurations (despite what many conductors claim) are quite playable and enormously exciting.
The scherzo has rarely been performed in the form in which it was first conceived, yet a good case can be made for doing so. At the first performance in 1808 and in several subsequent ones, the symphony was played with the scherzo and trio repeated -- i.e., scherzo, trio, scherzo, trio and then the final, shortened pianissimo statement, which leads to and reappears (altered) in the Finale. But some time after the first few performances, Beethoven decided to delete this repeat of the scherzo and trio, writing a somewhat ambiguous letter to his publisher instructing them to make the change. However, the correction was incompletely carried out (until Mendelssohn pointed it out in 1846), and so, in the first Breitkopf octavo edition (1826), the two original "first ending" bars remain in the score, but without the indications "1" and "2" or the repeat sign, causing confusion and controversy for a long time (many regarded this printer's error as a sublime stroke of genius). What is very strange here is that Beethoven never made the correction in the autograph manuscript, where the first and second ending signs and the indication "Si replica con Trio allora" ("Repeat 'the Scherzo' with the Trio") stand quite clearly unaltered. Perhaps he never finally made up his mind about the matter. At any rate, the documentary facts are sufficiently indecisive and contradictory that it seems appropriate to reconsider the whole matter of the repeats -- always a crucial question for Beethoven -- on purely artistic grounds.

The question of the cyclical repeat of the scherzo obviously affects the overall structure of the last two movements, since they are interlocked. Most conductors have instinctively felt it was right to omit the repeat of the exposition in the last movement, feeling, presumably, that it upsets the proportions, and they are surely right. The scherzo is rather short and is quickly annihilated by the blazing C major of the Finale if the repeat of the whole first section is observed. Moreover, the brief return of the scherzo in the Finale is weakened by being reduced to a mere flashback by all this crushingly disproportionate C major. But, as soon as one realizes that the original conception included a total repeat of scherzo and trio, the reason for the repeat in the last movement becomes clear.

The character of the scherzo, with its constantly repeated quarter-note hammer blows and wild trio, is magnetic and obsessive, and when repeated twice (especially at the indicated speed of $d' = 96$), gains a colossal momentum, driving itself into the brain almost beyond the point of tolerance. All this, followed by the foreshortened, breathless pp da capo (which, incidentally, only gains its full effect if the complete version is heard twice) and the momentous, brooding link section to the finale, gives the third movement a power and structural weight it cannot have without the added repetition.

The astonishing effect of all of this is that, at that moment in the Finale when the light fades and the mesmeric scherzo returns, it seems that it has always been there, brooding in the background. It emerges not merely as a flashback or memory, but, in a sense, as the very heart of the Finale. Thus, the struggle between two mighty forces -- the grimly threatening persistence of the scherzo and the glorious triumph of the Finale -- is a real and constant one, because the world of the scherzo never really ceases to exist.

The tempo indication for the Finale, Allegro ($d = 84$) is one of the most crucial of all Beethoven's metronome marks, because it makes no sense if his metronome was inaccurate. Apart from the scherzo group this is one of the most consistently observed of the metronome marks, and when not observed exactly, the tempo chosen is usually faster than the one indicated. (Even Klemperer, though he usually ignores Beethoven's metronome markings, favoring generally very slow tempi, observed it exactly in a magnificent recorded performance, revealing perfectly the majestic breadth and energetic power of the movement.) Opponents of the metronome marks will find it hard to explain how Beethoven could have set one here that is so perfectly suited to what present-day interpreters agree is its essence -- unless his tempo sense was absolutely $c'\text{rd}$ and recorded through an accurate metronome.