



BEETHOVEN

CONCERTO NO. 1 IN C MAJOR FOR PIANO AND ORCHESTRA, Op. 15

BACH

CONCERTO NO. 5 IN F MINOR FOR PIANO AND ORCHESTRA

GLENN GOULD, Pianist

VLADIMIR GOLDSCHMANN conducting
the COLUMBIA SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

Bach's F minor concerto appeared as a keyboard work at Leipzig around 1796 but is almost certainly a transcription of an earlier manuscript. If the original is by Bach, it is matter of considerable dispute if it is likely to have been composed at Cöthen a decade earlier.

Bach made little effort to rework the material in a manner suitable for solo keyboard. In the first movement the player's right hand reproduces eminently violinistic figures throughout the solo passages while the left hand is filling the role of the continuo in the original position. That is to say it consistently doubles the solo line of the orchestra without attempting to embellish it in the solo passages. Only during the pedal point C (bars 96-101) does the left hand make attempts to remind us of the central rhythmic motive of the movement.

By comparison the transcription of the A-minor violin concerto for keyboard in G minor is an embarrassment of fancy.

The second movement gives the solo instrument its due with a bewitching cantilena which lies so well beneath the fingers and so generally ornamented that it is hard to conceive of its belonging to any but a keyboard instrument.

The presto finale with its brilliancy waxes tutti thence.



and the perfect rejoinder of the principal solo theme



is the happiest and most adventurous of the three movements. It is also the most representative of the baroque concerto style, which reached its zenith with Bach and Pergolesi.

It is easy for us to misinterpret the intention of the baroque concerto. We are unable to analyze its formal outline by searching for comparisons with the modern concerto of style. By this measure it seems devoid of harmonic direction, to lack the point of culmination, the arena of resolution, which the modern concerto movements provide. Again, by comparison with the mature concertos of the nineteenth century, it would seem as though the concertos of Bach were, from the soloistic standpoint, simply the first tentative concessions to the emerging age of the virtuoso.

The baroque concerto subscribed to harmonic principles which are typically organical but of entirely different dimensions from the classical concerto. Formally the outer movements are closely allied to the cantata-aria style. The element of contrast of dynamic range—the heart of the concerto idea—is just as much in evidence but is achieved by direct rather than devious means. Instead of the subtle gradations of modulation in classical tonality we have the straightforward opposition of texture and dynamics. Examples 1 and 2 illustrate the contrast of solid block harmony (tutti) and finely woven strands of allegro, counterpart (solo). As will be seen from Examples 1 and 2 the inconstant modulation, of contrasting tonal regions, is altogether absent. When Bach modulates it is to present again the majority of his material in the key, or key-scheme frequently his modulation is of a compound sort in which several closely related areas form one larger digression. (I touched on this aspect of Bach's harmonic technique in notes to the Bach D-minor Concerto recording—ML 5211.) It follows that since the baroque concerto does not equate change of key and changes of theme, the formal principle involved will utilize a more restricted thematic vocabulary. The essential thing in Bach's idiomatic relationships is not their individuality but their interdependence.

Even during Bach's lifetime the word concerto came to represent a very different sort of structure. With Bach's sons the ternary principle developed into the more expansive form of the modern concerto, which came to dominate all symphonic form. Essentially, so far as the concerto repertoire was concerned, this change was concentrated on the relationship between tutti and solo. With Johann Christian the tutti and the tutti became a modulatory structure. It adopted a triangular relationship between the dominant (frequently without firmly establishing it) and returning before the entrance of the soloist. Thus the element of expectancy was added.

But the tutti had become much more than a fanfare. It had added a new dimension to first-movement structure. With Haydn the modulatory aim of the tutti expanded. The dominant became more than the apex of the triangle. It served to exhibit the principal theme in the new key in a manner which closely reached the format of the main exposition with the soloist. The orchestral expectation of having established the precedence of thematic order, the soloist was free to treat the material ornamentally and decoratively.

The great problem which remained was a psychological one—that of trying the listener's patience by a double exposure. The structural implications of this problem were clearly grasped by Mozart. In his later concertos the orchestral exposition is enlarged to unprecedented size. He not infrequently introduces material which is left unutilized by the main exposition with the solo instrument but which suddenly reappears in the recapitulation. Thus the mature concertos of Mozart achieve structural unity of the opening orchestral tutti and the principal exposition. This is accomplished by maintaining the tutti in the tonic key, most frequently by omitting

reference to the principal secondary theme, reserving its first presentation for the solo instrument, and by a complex orchestral unfoldment of the main thematic group of the movement.

The most awkward area for Mozart is that of the piano entrance through the transition to the secondary key. Obviously the soloist is reluctant to plunge in with the same material which has been so thoroughly developed by the orchestra. If the piano entrance is to make the impression which several minutes of tutti warrant, either the entrance must use new material, which is at once arresting and elegant but which sets aside the timelessness of development, or must surmount the theme of the tutti in a noble but neutral manner. The latter method is illustrated by the solo entrance in Mozart's Concerto, K. 467, with its long shake over the principal motive, but the former method, that of an entirely new theme, is the more frequent occurrence in Mozart.

With Beethoven the orchestra-solo relationship reached the peak of its development. It was with the fourth concerto, in G major, that the ultimate of concensation, of unity with the solo exposition, of imagination, and of highest discipline was attained. The first three concertos, those in E-flat major, C major and C minor, each attack the problem of the tutti from a different angle and with varying degrees of success. Though it was the earliest of the three, the concerto in E-flat major, Opus 19, has by far the best-constructed exposition. Here Beethoven adopts the Mozartian tactic of entering the second theme, presenting instead an intriguing variant of a portion from the first movement. This fragment appears in the tutti cast in the subdued light of E-flat major, which with its close relation to the tonic minor is, in effect, a compromise for modulation.

The Concerto in C minor, while of considerable breadth and vigor, is as a piece of construction, much the weakest of the lot. Here the tutti virtually duplicates the principal exposition. The secondary theme is re-presented in the relative key, thus disorienting the later solo statement, and the keyboard entrance is a doubling of the opening material of the tutti.

The tutti of the present concerto is built more on Mozartian lines. The second theme is present but is introduced in the key of E-flat major, which stands in similar relationship to the tonic as does the E-flat major episode in the E-flat major concerto. Indeed the treatment of it here is not so very different. The E-flat major statement launches a sequential episode which reaches its climax on the dominant of C minor and thus the quality of intensive movement within strict harmonic bounds is preserved.

This concerto does present a rather troubled aspect with the initial entrance of the solo instrument. This is the only Beethoven concerto in which the opening piano statement does not again appear after the orchestral transition to the development section, which is, in a way, rather fortuitous since the recitativo of Mozart which occurred in relation to Mozart's opening themes is here an obtrusiveness of manner quite uncharacter-

COLUMBIA
GUARANTEED HIGH FIDELITY
MASTERWORKS



istic of Beethoven. Having dispensed a dutiful twelve bars of nothing the movement continues on conventional lines. The second movement is a rather lethargic nocturne with an overly repetitive main theme possessed of the typically nocturnal habit of pleading the case once too often.

The final words of all Beethoven concerto movements owe most to Haydn. It has the characteristically Haydnian lucidity, economy (not excepting the thematically unrelated central episode in A minor which, in its nonconformity, is Haydnian also), and infectious charm.

A word about the cadenza.

I can scarcely hope to conceal the fact that my cadenzas to the first and last movements of this concerto are hardly in pure Beethoven style. In recent years it has become the commendable practice of musicians to contribute cadenzas which observe an idiomatic identification with the concerto subject. It should also be remarked that the more discreet and careful among us have reserved their contributions for those concertos which have no cadenzas by the author. That these historical quibbles were not always prevalent is amply demonstrated by the great many 19th-century writers (including Brahms) who undertook to produce cadenzas for various older works without forgetting their customers' anonymity. In writing these cadenzas I had in mind a contrapuntal poise of motive which was only possible in an often considerably more characteristic than the cadenzas of early Beethoven. Thus the cadenza to the first movement turns out to be a rather Regerian fugue, while that to the last movement became a rhapsody built to span the gap between the fantasia six-four and the subdued re-entrance of the orchestra in B major. Both in the first and second movements, in balance with the work, thereby of course denying the original promise of cadenzas written as a virtuosic display. At any event I have not yet requested the orchestra to file to the balcony while for three glorious minutes the piano is hung decorously from the chandelier.

GLENN GOULD

Library of Congress catalog card numbers
 RS5-1211 and 1212 apply to this record.

GLENN GOULD

Pianist

Beethoven: Concerto No. 1 in C Major for Piano and Orchestra, Op. 15

Bach: Concerto No. 5 in F Minor for Piano and Orchestra

Vladimir Golschmann conducting the Columbia Symphony Orchestra

G010003287344X

Ludwig van Beethoven 1770–1827

Concerto for Piano and Orchestra No. 1 in C major op. 15

C-Dur · en *ut* majeur

Cadenzas: Glenn Gould

1	I. Allegro con brio –	10:32
2	Cadenza	2:27
3	II. Largo	12:17
4	III. Rondo. Allegro scherzando –	8:30
5	Cadenza	0:35

Johann Sebastian Bach 1685–1750

Concerto for Keyboard and Orchestra No. 5 in F minor BWV 1056

f-Moll · en *fa* mineur

6	I. [Allegro]	3:50
7	II. Largo	2:56
8	III. Presto	3:48

Total Time 44:55

Glenn Gould piano

Columbia Symphony Orchestra

Charles Libove violin [4–6]

Vladimir Golschmann conductor

Original LP: MS 6017 / ML 5298 · Released October 6, 1958

Recording: Columbia 30th Street Studio, New York City,

April 29/30 & July 1, 1958 [1–5]; May 1, 1958 [6–8]

Producer: Howard H. Scott

Cover Photo: Fred Plaut · Liner Notes: Glenn Gould

Publisher: Barger and Barclay (Cadenzas Beethoven Concerto)

LP Matrix: XSM 44050 [1/2], XSM 44051 [3–6] (stereo);

xLP 43881 [1/2], xLP 43882 [3–6] (mono)

© 1958 & © 2015 Sony Music Entertainment. All rights reserved.

Bach's F minor concerto appeared as a keyboard work at Leipzig around 1730, but is almost certainly a transcription of an earlier violin concerto. If the original is by Bach (a matter of considerable dispute) it is likely to have been composed at Cöthen a decade earlier.

Bach made little effort to rework the material in a manner suitable for solo keyboard. In the first movement the player's right hand reproduces eminently violinistic figures throughout the solo passages while the left hand is filling the role of the continuo which the original possessed. That is to say it consistently doubles the cello line of the orchestra without attempting to embellish it in the solo passages. Only during the pedal point C (bars 96–101) does the left hand undertake to remind us of the central rhythmic motive of the movement.



By comparison the transcription of the A-minor violin concerto for klavier in G minor is an embarrassment of fancy.

The second movement gives the solo instrument its due with a bewitching cantilena which lies so well beneath the fingers and is so generously ornamented that it is hard to conceive of its belonging to any but a keyboard instrument.



The *Presto* finale with its brilliantly woven tutti theme and the perfect rejoinder of the principal solo theme is the happiest and most adventurous of the three movements. It is also the most representative of the baroque concerto style, which reached its zenith with Bach and Pergolesi.



It is easy for us to misinterpret the intentions of the baroque concerto. We are unable to analyze its formal outline by searching for comparisons with the classical sonata style. By this measure it seems devoid of harmonic direction, to lack the points of culmination, the areas of resolution, which the sonata-style movements provide. Again, by comparison with the bravura concertos of the nineteenth century, it would seem as though the concertos of Bach were, from the soloistic standpoint, simply the first tentative concessions to the emerging ego of the virtuoso.

The baroque concerto subscribed to harmonic principles as scrupulously organized but of entirely different intentions from the classical concerto. Formally the outer movements are closely allied to the cantata-aria style. The element of contrast of dynamic range – the heart of the concerto idea – is just as much in evidence but is achieved by direct rather than devious means. Instead of the subtle gradations of modulation in classical tonality we have the straightforward opposition of texture and dynamic level. Examples 1 and 2 illustrate the contrast of solid block harmony (tutti) and finely woven strands of stretto counterpoint (solo). As will be seen from Examples 1 and 2 the ingredient of modulation, of contrasting tonal regions, is altogether absent. When Bach modulates it is to present again the majority of his material in the new key – or keys – since frequently his modulation is of a compound sort in which several closely related areas form one larger digression. (I touched on this aspect of Bach's harmonic

technique in notes to the Bach D-minor Concerto recording – ML 5211). It follows that since the baroque concerto does not equate change of key and change of theme, the formal principle involved will utilize a more restricted thematic vocabulary. The essential thing in Bach's bi-thematic relationships is not their individuality but their interdependence.

Even during Bach's lifetime the word concerto came to represent a very different sort of structure. With Bach's sons the ternary principle developed into the more expansive sonata allegro, which subsequently came to dominate all symphonic form. Essentially, so far as the concerto repertoire was concerned, this change was concentrated on the relationship between tutti and solo. With Johann Christian Bach the opening tutti became a modulatory structure. It adopted a triangular shape, passing to the dominant (frequently without firmly establishing it) and returning before the entrance of the soloist. Thus the element of expectancy was added.

But the tutti had become much more than a fanfare. It had added a new dimension to first-movement structure. With Haydn the modulatory aim of the tutti expanded. The dominant became more than the apex of the triangle. It served to exhibit the principal theme in the new key in a manner which closely resembled the format of the main exposition with the soloist. The orchestral exposition having established the precedence of thematic order, the soloist was free to treat the material ornamentally and discursively.

The great problem which remained was a psychological one – that of trying the listeners' patience by a double exposition. The structural impli-

cations of this problem were clearly grasped by Mozart. In his later concertos the orchestral exposition is enlarged to unprecedented size. He not infrequently includes material which is left untouched by the main exposition with the solo instrument but which suddenly reappears in the recapitulation. Thus the mature concertos of Mozart achieve structural unity of the opening orchestral tutti and the principal exposition. This is accomplished by maintaining the tutti in the tonic key, most frequently by omitting reference to the principal secondary theme, reserving its first presentation for the solo instrument, and by a complex orchestral enfoldment of the main thematic group of the movement.

The most awkward area for Mozart is that of the piano entrance through the transition to the secondary key. Obviously the soloist is reluctant to plunge in with the same material which has been so thoroughly developed by the orchestra. If the piano entrance is to make the impression which several minutes of tutti warrant, either the entrance must use new material, which is at once arresting and eloquent but which sets no further problems of development, or must surmount the theme of the tutti in a noble but neutral manner. The latter method is illustrated by the solo entrance in Mozart's Concerto, K 467, with its long shake over the principal motive, but the former method, that of an entirely new theme, is the more frequent occurrence in Mozart.

With Beethoven the orchestra-solo relationship reached the peak of its development. It was with the fourth concerto, in G major, that the ultimate of condensation, of unity with the solo exposition, of imagination, and of highest discipline was attained. The first three concertos, those in

B-flat major, C major and C minor, each attack the problem of the tutti from a different angle and with varying degrees of success. Though it was the earliest of the three, the Concerto in B-flat major, op. 19, has by far the best-constructed exposition. Here Beethoven adopts the Mozartean trait of omitting the second theme, presenting instead an intriguing variant of a portion from the opening motive. This fragment appears in the tutti cast in the subdued light of D-flat major, which with its close relation to the tonic minor is, in effect, a compromise for modulation.

The Concerto in C minor, while of undeniable breadth and vigor, is, as a piece of construction, much the weakest of the lot. Here the tutti virtually duplicates the principal exposition. The secondary thence is represented in the relative key, thus disenchanting the later solo statement, and the keyboard entrance is a doubling of the opening measures of the tutti.

The tutti of the present concerto is built more on Mozartean lines. The second theme is present but is introduced in the key of E-flat major, which stands in similar relationship to the tonic as does the D-flat major episode in the B-flat major concerto. Indeed the treatment of it here is not so very different. The E-flat major statement launches a sequential episode which reaches its climax on the dominant of C minor and thus the quality of intensive movement within strict harmonic bounds is preserved.

This concerto does present a rather troubled aspect with the initial entrance of the solo instrument. This is the only Beethoven concerto in which the opening piano statement does not again appear after the orchestral transition to the development section, which is, in a way, rather fortu-

nate since the neutrality of content which was discussed in relation to Mozart's opening themes is here an obsequy of manner quite uncharacteristic of Beethoven. Having dispensed a dutiful twelve bars of nothing the movement continues on conventional lines. The second movement is a rather lethargic nocturne with an overly repetitive main theme possessed of the typically nocturnal habit of pleading the case once too often.

The final rondo of all Beethoven concerto movements owes most to Haydn. It has the characteristically Haydnesque lucidity, economy (not excepting the thematically unrelated central episode in A minor which, in its nonconformity, is Haydnesque also), and infectious charm.

A word about the cadenzas

I can scarcely hope to conceal the fact that my cadenzas to the first and last movements of this concerto are hardly in pure Beethoven style. In recent years it has become the commendable practice of musicians to contribute cadenzas which observe an idiomatic identification with the concerto subject. It should also be remarked that the more discreet and tasteful among us have reserved their contributions for those concertos which have no cadenza by the author. That these historical qualms were not always prevalent is amply demonstrated by the great many 19th-century writers (including Brahms) who undertook to produce cadenzas for various older works without foregoing their customary vocabulary. In writing these cadenzas I had in mind a contrapuntal potpourri of motives which was only possible in an idiom considerably more chromatic than that of early Beethoven.

Thus the cadenza to the first movement turned out to be a rather Regerian fugue, while that to the last movement became a rhapsody built to span the gap between the fermata six-four and the subdued re-entrance of the orchestra in B major. Both, in other words, effect an organic balance with the work, thereby of course denying the original purpose of cadenza writing as a virtuosic display. At any event I have not yet requested the orchestra to file to the balcony while for three glorious minutes the piano is hung decorously from the chandelier.

GLENN GOULD