Beethoven's Choral Symphony. The Metronome Rate of the Trio

Author(s): E. W. Naylor

Source: *The Musical Times*, Vol. 53, No. 827 (Jan. 1, 1912), p. 33

Published by: [Musical Times Publications Ltd.](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/906864>

Accessed: 15-12-2015 08:52 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Musical Times Publications Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Musical Times*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Correspondence.

BEETHOVEN'S CHORAL SYMPHONY.

THE METRONOME RATE OF THE TRIO.

TO THE EDITOR OF 'THE MUSICAL TIMES.'

SIR,—The interesting letters of Sir Charles Stanford on Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, which appeared in *The Times* of October 30 and November 1, have only lately come to my notice.

We must accept Sir Charles Stanford's account of what Beethoven actually wrote with regard to the speed of the Scherzo and Trio, viz., that the dotted minim of the Scherzo is to be equal to the undotted minim of the Trio, both being = 116; but it would appear that the conclusion of the matter is by no means certain. There are considerations which it is impossible to place on one side, and which point to the likelihood of a 'primitive error.'

Your 'Occasional Note' in the December issue of the *Musical Times* alluded to these considerations, which are, shortly: (1) the Stringendo of eight bars, leading up to the Trio from the Scherzo; (2) The change of description as between the two sections—the Scherzo being marked *Molto vivace*, the Trio, *Presto*.

1. The writer of 'Occasional Note' suggests that the presence of the Stringendo need not trouble us, that it does not necessarily lead up to a faster beat at the Trio: 'It was Beethoven's delightful way to lead to the unexpected.' Yes! but does it not rather lead to the 'expected'; and is not the 'expected' plainly indicated by the change to *Presto*? Surely the Stringendo can scarcely mean less than that Beethoven did intend the Trio to go faster than the Scherzo!

2. If Beethoven really intended the *Presto* to go at the same pace as the *Molto vivace*, why did he make use of the two terms? Why, if he wanted to make sure, did he not simply say *Tempo primo*, or *L'istesso tempo*?

And when (1) and (2) are taken together, as they are together in the work, a strong doubt is thrown on the interpretation of the metronome mark, which we may admit Beethoven did actually write into his MS. at Berlin.

Dr. McNaught, in his letter, quoted from the *Westminster Gazette*, says that he has never heard any conductor take the Trio at double the rate indicated in Beethoven's MS. I hope not, indeed! For myself—and, I believe, for many others—I dare to say that I have not any confidence either in the mark $\text{♩} = 116$ which the publishers, as a rule, have adopted, or in the $\text{♩} = 116$, which Beethoven seems to have written. Both are plainly wrong, the one too fast, the other too slow; and the two considerations dealt with above must be allowed due weight in settling what should be a just view of Beethoven's real meaning.

Sir Charles Stanford's first letter appears to say that Beethoven's metronome marks are to be found in the original edition. In passing, though it matters little, it may be stated that the copy of the original edition, published by Schott in 1826, which is in the Cambridge University Library, and the plates of which are numbered 2322, has no metronome marks at all! Sir Charles, no doubt, refers to a later 'state' of this original edition.

In connection with this interesting difficulty, or error, whichever it is, your readers may be glad to hear of a positive blunder which appears in every pianoforte arrangement of the Ninth Symphony which I have seen in print. In the tenth bar from the end of the first movement there occurs a strange chord, viz., a dominant minor thirteenth on a tonic pedal (C# FA, with a D somewhere below).

Every one of the pianoforte arrangements, whether by Winkler, Czerny, Ulrich, Tours, Pauer, Reinecke, and even Liszt, gives this extreme harmony incorrectly. One or two, e.g., Louis Winkler and B. Tours, give an emasculated version of the chord without the F; but the rest content themselves with presuming a repetition of the chord which appears four bars earlier, and of which the central note is E. It is truly astonishing that a man of Liszt's calibre should have made such a mistake, and only a little less so that Pauer and Reinecke should do the same—a curious example of carelessness and deafness combined; for all of these eminent persons must have read the score wrong, and (worse) must

have never heard the chord right at the many performances which doubtless they had the privilege of attending.

I was able to point this out before a large audience at Cambridge on February 28 of this year, when I gave the first of two lectures on the Choral Symphony in connection with the performance conducted by Sir Henry Wood on March 16.

Yours faithfully,

E. W. NAYLOR.

(See further on p. 18.—ED., *M.T.*)

Cambridge, December 2, 1911.

[P.S.—Since writing the above I have seen two arrangements which give this chord correctly: one is Aug. Horn's, for four hands; the other, strangely enough, by Pauer, a two-hand arrangement of earlier date than that for four hands named above. How curious that he should get it right first, and wrong later!—E. W. N.]

SCIENCE AND SINGING.

TO THE EDITOR OF 'THE MUSICAL TIMES.'

SIR,—In reply to Mr. Clifton Cooke's inquiry in your last issue, I have to state that I *have* made a dead cock crow, and hope to do so in public at one of my own lectures. My offer was originally made to the critic of the *Musical Times* and not to Mr. Cooke, who had no right to expect me at his lecture.

I am quite aware that the vowel E may be produced as stated by Mr. Cooke, but that does not prove that my advice is wrong. Both methods are possible. I have written to the author of the passage which I quote from a 'System of operative Surgery,' and he tells me that his reference was to the speaking voice only. In this respect, therefore, Mr. Cooke is correct; but when he says that my deductions 'are simply preposterous' it is very clear that he is writing without knowledge, for in another part of the same volume from which I quoted, we read of a patient who had lost not only the vocal cords, but also the whole of the larynx, and yet it is expressly stated that he could sing. Again, a French medical journal in my possession speaks of a patient treated by Dr. Gougenheim who was able to sing a scale after the loss of both vocal cords.

It is a matter of interest to note that in November, 1909, Dr. Marage, of Paris, presented to the Académie des Sciences a report of some of his laryngological experiments, and in it he states that he has come to the conclusion that the vocal cords do not themselves produce tone.

May I conclude by stating that I have lately been challenged to produce a person who can sing after the removal of one or both of the vocal cords? As I do not know any individual who has undergone such an operation, I should be grateful if any reader of the *Musical Times* could introduce one to me. I will undertake to give gratuitous training. It is possible that I may be mistaken, because the vocal cords form an important part of the vocal apparatus.

Yours faithfully,

ERNEST GEO. WHITE.

Bechstein Studios,
Wigmore Street, W.

[We have felt it necessary to compress Mr. White's letter. Some remarks on the topic will be found in our 'Occasional Notes.'—ED., *M.T.*]

THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF MUSIC.

The following awards have been made:—Council Exhibitions to Emmie Gregory (pianoforte); Bessie Jones, Marjorie Lockey and Lillie Chipp (singing); Antonio Piedra (violin); Edith M. Colam (violoncello); and Geoffrey Leeds (organ). The annual amount bequeathed by the late Edwin S. Dove for pupils who have distinguished themselves, was awarded to Cedric Sharpe (scholar); the Leo Stern Memorial Gift for violoncellists (£5 5s.) to James Pond (Norfolk and Norwich scholar); the Lesley Alexander Gift (£21) to Maurice Soester (violoncello); the Manns Memorial Prize (£4 10s.) to Philip Levine (scholar). The enterprise and efficiency that characterize the important public concerts of this College reached their highest point of the year in a performance of Beethoven's 'Choral' Symphony on December 14, under the direction of Sir Charles Stanford. This is referred to on page 18.