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This thesis describes and analyses stylistic change in violin performance (c. 1900-1960) by examining the so-called Hungarian violin school as an exemplar of stylistic change in this period. The thesis uses examples from both written and recorded sources to examine shifts in the use of expressive fingering, vibrato and flexibility of rhythm and tempo. The sources used include: performing editions; treatises; and recordings. In respect of the study of stylistic change, the thesis argues that recordings provide a valuable research resource for assessing the theoretical use of expressive devices, as well as the prominence, character and actual application in performance of such devices. The thesis focuses on the relationship between a player’s formal training and the cultural-aesthetic influences to which he/she was subsequently exposed, and also considers the relationship between performing theory and performing practice. Chapter one explores nineteenth-century French and German antecedents to the Hungarian school, before discussing the syllabus and pedagogy of Jenő Hubay in Budapest. The chapter concludes with a case study of the changing approaches to technique and expression of Hubay’s pupil, József Szigeti. Chapters two, three and four concentrate on the expressive devices used in the performances of violinists in the twentieth century: chapter two explores fingering; chapter three concerns vibrato; and chapter four addresses rhythm and tempo. The thesis shows that, in the case of the Hungarian school, players retained aspects of their initial training, but that other influences played a more decisive role in their evolution as mature artists. The thesis concludes by arguing that recorded sources have a vital and significant contribution to make to the field of twentieth-century performance practice.
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Preface and Acknowledgements

As a practising violinist, I have long been interested in how research into the performing practices of the past have shaped or can inform the way in which violin music is played in our own time. The research presented in this study aims to understand the changes in how expression was conveyed on the violin in approximately the first sixty years of the twentieth century, using recordings from players of the Hungarian school as a case study.

The thesis specifically examines fingerings, vibrato and rhythmic and tempo flexibility. At another level, it offers evidence to aid a 'historically informed performance' based on the performance styles of players from the era under scrutiny.

Recent research into late-nineteenth century violin playing presented me with a fertile point of departure to explore later developments and an opportunity to fill a gap in the available literature on the subject.¹ The present study thus begins where David Milsom's *Theory and Practice in Late Nineteenth-Century Violin Performance* (2003) terminates at the beginning of the twentieth century, just when the recording industry was in its ascendancy. The approximate outer limit of my survey was then determined by the career spans of the first generation of violinists who, as it were, grew up in the recording studio. This time-period enabled me to see a complete picture of several players’

¹ David Milsom admits that his 'is a macroscopic study of historical style, not a work of detailed performance analysis' (*Theory and Practice in Late Nineteenth-Century Violin Performance*, Ashgate (Aldershot, 2003), p. 9), while Robert Philip (*Early Recordings and Musical Style*, Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, 1992)) does not concern himself exclusively with performances by violinists, providing instead a more general survey of changing tastes in the first half of the twentieth century.
performing styles, as well as allowing for discussion of the first commercial recordings of
Joseph Joachim (1831-1907) (enabling what Milsom has called ‘style-backdating’\(^2\)),
encapsulating evidence of a manifest decisive shift in players’ attitudes to conveying
expression on the instrument.

As others have shown, the most direct access to information about performance styles in
the nineteenth century (and in earlier periods) is through the treatises of its most
prominent authors. But a similar investigation into the playing of twentieth-century
violinists is facilitated by the largely untapped resource of commercial recordings (as
well as written sources), allowing for an altogether more detailed and accurate survey
than is possible for their predecessors. As Robert Philip writes, ‘recordings present us
with real history, not history as we would like it to be.’\(^3\) In particular, therefore, the
thesis shows the importance of adopting a methodological strategy which encompasses
both printed and recorded material.

Chapter one introduces key nineteenth- and twentieth-century personnel, considers the
syllabus at the Budapest Academy at the time of Jenő Hubay (1858-1937) and offers an
overview of the stylistic changes evident during the period in focus. It concludes with a
case study examining the shifting attitudes and practices of Józef Szigeti (1892-1973),
one of the most prominent Hungarian violinists of the twentieth century. Each
subsequent chapter begins with a brief exploration of nineteenth-century practices.

Chapter two deals with fingering and is the most fine-grained, that is to say empirically

\(^3\) Philip, R., *Early Recordings*, p. 3.
thick, of the chapters in this thesis. This is for two reasons. First, whereas directions for
vibrato and aspects of rubato are largely absent from performing editions in the twentieth
century, finger implying expressive slides is abundant, supplying a vast quantity of
data. Secondly, portamento was perhaps the most telling expressive means in violin
performance during the era under examination, justifying its position at the kernel of this
thesis. As such, it begs descriptive examples from a variety of available sources.
Recordings allowed me not only to address the type of slide, its location and frequency of
use but also its speed, character and manner of execution. Chapters three and four
concern changes in the approach to vibrato and tempo and rhythm respectively. The data
chosen for discussion in the text was selected for its ability to illustrate similarities and
differences between players or epochs and/or to show changes in individual playing
styles. The musical examples (contained in volume II) are given mostly in shortened
forms of only a few bars each and are intended to be representative of a given practice,
since the study does not seek to offer a bar by bar analysis of entire works.

In the preparation of this study, I am especially grateful to my supervisor, Professor
Robin Stowell, who has at all times given liberally and patiently of his time and
expertise. I owe an indirect debt to Robert Philip's Early Recordings and Musical Style
(1992) which provided not only the original inspiration for my study but also pointed to
several written sources. My thanks are also due to: the Arts and Humanities Research
Board (AHRB) for fully funding the period of research and for contributing to the
expenses of a research trip to Budapest; to Mr Tim Day and the board of trustees of the

---

4 In giving so much detail in this and other chapters, I hope and intend that these sections
will provide material for future research.
SAGA trust at the British Library Sound Archive (BLSA) for awarding me an ‘Edison Fellowship’ for a period of study at the BLSA (and thus greatly facilitating data collection); to Mr Jonathan Summers at the BLSA for his invaluable assistance; to Dr László Gombos at the Hubay Foundation, Budapest; to Mr Paul Merrick (Franz Liszt Academy, Budapest) for his work as a translator in several interviews with Hungarian speakers; to Professor László Dobszay and his staff at the Franz Liszt Academy archive and library; to staff at the National Széchenyi Library, Budapest; to Kati Evans in Oxford for her indispensable help in translating Hungarian language texts and for kindly allowing me to give some of my findings in a paper for the Oxford University Hungarian Society in 2004; to Kato Havas; to my violin teacher, Krzysztof Smietana; to Gillian Jones and Judith Hurford at Cardiff University Music Library; and to my family and friends for their support. Despite the interventions of many of those listed, any oversights or errors are wholly my own.
Abbreviations

Sz  Józef Szigeti
Ch  Léopold Charlier
V  Up-bow
n  Down-bow
\hline
\hline
l  e-string
II  a-string
III  d-string
IV  g-string

Pitch registers are indicated by the following letter scheme

\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{ccccc}
g & c^1 & c^2 & c^3 & c^4 \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}

' ex.' is an abbreviation of 'example' and refers to musical examples given in volume two of this study. Thus, 'ex. 2.3/5' refers to bar 5 in example 2.3.

Movements within a concerto or sonata are described by a number corresponding to their position in a work; 1/71 means first movement, bar 71. Similarly, Souvenir/24 refers to
bar 24 in that piece. Unless otherwise acknowledged, all translations other than those from Hungarian language texts are my own. All Hungarian language texts have been translated with the assistance of Kati Evans, unless otherwise accredited.
Introduction

This thesis is about stylistic change and is thus concerned with how shifts in taste, trend and fashion may be understood. In the historical study of architecture, painting, fashion and the plastic arts it is a commonplace to state that what is thought to be beautiful in one age may be considered ugly, inappropriate or even brutal in the next.\(^1\) What is true for the study of human artefacts such as these is also true for musical performance.\(^2\) Leopold Auer once observed that ‘a type of playing extravagantly admired and cultivated in one age may be altogether rejected in another... The aesthetic truth of one age - the interpretive truth of one generation - may be accounted a falsehood by the tenets of the next. For each age sets its own standards [and] forms its own judgements.’\(^3\) Similarly, Flesch points out that ‘in each and every generation the need of expression is a different one, to say nothing at all of the difference of expressional means.’\(^4\) This thesis sets out to

\(^1\) For example, the architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe writes, ‘architecture is the will of an epoch translated into space’ (New York Herald Tribune, 28th June 1959, cited in Gaither, C. C., and Cavazos-Gaither, A. E., Practically Speaking: A Dictionary of Quotations on Engineering, Technology and Architecture, Institute of Physics Publishing (Bristol, 1999), p. 246), and the fashion historian Elizabeth Wilson notes, ‘fashion is dress in which the key feature is rapid and continual changing of style over time’ (Wilson, E., Adorned in Dreams, Fashion and Modernity, Virago Press Ltd (London, 1985), p. 3).

\(^2\) Indeed, in terms of music, van der Rohe’s assertion may be effectively transposed to read ‘performance is the will of an epoch translated into sound.’

\(^3\) Auer, L., Violin Playing As I Teach It, J. B. Lippincott Company (Philadelphia, 1921), pp. 76-77.

understand the kinds of shifts in aesthetic taste recognised by Auer and Flesch in violin performance and takes their statements as an initial hypothesis.

Robert Pascal defines style in music as 'a term denoting manner of discourse [or] mode of expression; more particularly the manner in which a work of art is executed... for the historian a style is a distinguishing and ordering concept, both consistent with and denoting generalities.'

This thesis examines similarities (that is 'generalities') in how a given set of 'distinguishing' expressive devices (portamento, vibrato and fluctuations of rhythm and tempo) has been applied, tracing significant changes of approach throughout approximately a sixty-year period from the beginning of the twentieth century. Using recordings, performing editions, pedagogical treatises and other written sources it seeks to analyse and describe the development of common patterns in the use of such expressive devices.

My examination of the use of expressive devices has provided evidence to address two wider themes. The first concerns whether a player's musical 'genes' (those features of his or her playing showing 'familial' resemblances between a teacher and his pupil) or the 'environmental' influences and cultural trends to which he or she was exposed proved to be the more defining element in his or her artistic development.

In their positions in perceived 'family' groups, the pupils of a given teacher may not always have wholeheartedly aligned themselves with a given musical genealogy. But

---

such artists were undoubtedly united, albeit temporarily in some cases, by their adopted
taught) musical mannerisms and by the principles and artistic outlook of a shared
mentor. Without wanting to pursue the metaphor beyond its limitations, a 'genealogy' of
violin playing may be seen in an enforced mimetic relationship between a teacher and his
pupil. Auer perceived the appropriation of another’s distinguishing musical
characteristics as detrimental. He writes

a student’s acquisition of certain technical tricks and individual mannerisms –
whether they be mannerisms of bowing, of expression [or] interpretation copied
from some famous virtuoso or teacher – does not for a moment imply that the
student… really plays in the style of the master… His jackdaw mannerisms may
in the course of time become second nature, but they will still be mannerisms.\(^6\)

And

the communion between the spirit of the music and the soul of the interpreting
player must be immediate; it must not be complicated by the player’s attempts to
express the music by means of someone else’s bag of tricks… I have always
insisted on one great principle – that my pupils express \textit{themselves}, and that they
must not try to express me.\(^7\)

\(^6\) Auer, L., \textit{Violin Playing}, pp. 82-83.
\(^7\) \textit{Ibid}, p. 83.
But, as this thesis sets out, a mimetic relationship between a teacher and his pupil was, nonetheless, often central to teaching practices in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Recordings show that some of Jenő Hubay's musical mannerisms and his strategies for the location of expressive devices were long lasting and recurrent in the performances of his pupils. Stefi Geyer (1888-1956) (a pupil of Hubay at the beginning of the twentieth century) noted that her playing and that of her classmates ‘show[ed] all the hallmarks of Hubay’s methods.'\textsuperscript{8} That Geyer was able to discern inherited stylistic traits and similarities between the playing of Hubay and his pupils (and by implication between one student and the next) sets a brief for investigating the validity of such a claim. Comparatively, Józef Szigeti (a contemporary of Geyer in Hubay’s class) considered ‘environmental’ influences to have been more decisive than pedagogical intervention in the development of a player’s performing practices. He writes, ‘the neat genealogical tables showing how twentieth-century violinists descend from this or that illustrious chef d'École are not as dependable as the authors of these books would like to make out.'\textsuperscript{9} Clarifying his preferred explanation of artistic development, Szigeti proposes that ‘trends start by being in the air and then emerge gradually and simultaneously in several areas so that there can be no question of priority claims.’\textsuperscript{10} Elsewhere he comments that, rather than his training with Hubay, ‘Queen’s Hall in London was for my teenage years schoolroom and mountain top… Henry Wood… Ysaïe, Busoni, Kreisler, Mischa Elman… young Mr. Beecham, Nikisch, Hamilton Harty accompanying

\textsuperscript{10}\textit{Ibid}, p. 89.
Thibaud… these were my real teachers." New technology, too, may have been an important influence. Szigeti writes ‘there is a certain type of sonority that leads to phonogenic playing." But his comment could also be reversed; perhaps the process of recording and the dissemination of those recordings developed a sound that was viewed in the early days as specifically ‘phonogenic.’ Certainly it is interesting, for example, that the use of a more continuous form of vibrato in the first years of the twentieth century flourished at the same time as the fledgling commercial recording industry. By using recordings, this thesis surveys those aspects of a player’s use of expressive devices which may be accredited to such ‘environmental’ influences, although it does not set out to investigate these influences individually.

The second ‘wider theme’ highlighted in this thesis concerns discrepancies between recorded and written sources, raising questions about the relationship between pedagogic and performing practice in the early twentieth century and supporting Flesch’s description that there was ‘an unbridgeable gap between theory and practical application.’ Indeed, differences between Hubay’s own recordings and printed editions, the advice imparted by him as recalled by his students and the first recordings of his young protégés often suggest something of the maxim ‘do as I say not as I do’ on Hubay’s part, as well as reflecting his own changing practice.

---

13 Such an enquiry would be a suitable ‘next step’ for this research.
This thesis utilises the so-called Hungarian violin school as a case study for the
appreciation of stylistic change. This school has been largely neglected in historical
studies to date, and it is especially relevant to the period under investigation because,
from the 1880s onwards, it strove consciously to be both West-European and modern.
An examination of the recordings of its membership thus creates a picture of its stylistic
development as an exemplar of violin playing in general in the twentieth century. The
key figure in its formation was Jenő Hubay, a native of Budapest.\textsuperscript{15} His father, Károly
Huber (1828-1885), was one of the most distinguished violin teachers of his time and
began the formal violin instruction of his son when Jenő was five years old. From 1873
Hubay continued his studies with Joseph Joachim in Berlin, returning to Budapest in
1876. Later in that year Liszt visited the city and he and Hubay commenced a period of
concert giving soon after their first meeting.\textsuperscript{16} Acting on Liszt’s advice Hubay travelled
to Paris in May 1878. Here he became associated with Henri Vieuxtemps (1820-1881)
and accompanied him, in April 1881, to Algiers, where sources suggest that he received
the last known lessons of Vieuxtemps during the final few months of Vieuxtemps’ life.\textsuperscript{17}
Vieuxtemps appointed Hubay administrator of his estate, entrusted with him the
orchestration of his Violin Concerto No. 7 and recommended him for the post of
Professor of Violin at the Brussels Conservatory. Hubay remained as Professor in
Brussels for the next four and a half years, only returning to Hungary in 1886 at the
request of the Minister of Education to replace his late father as head of violin studies at

\textsuperscript{15} Hubay changed his name from Eugen Huber to the more Hungarian sounding Jenő
Hubay at the age of twenty.
\textsuperscript{17} See Radoux, T., \textit{Vieuxtemps, Sa Vie, Ses Oeuvres}, Bénard (Liège, 1891), p. 139.
the Academy of Music, although he also continued to teach periodically in Brussels for
the next fifteen years. From 1919 to 1934 he was Director of the Budapest Academy and
remained head of violin studies there until 1936. Given his apprenticeship, it is not
surprising that writers have described Hubay's contribution to the formal establishment
of a national school in Hungary as having been founded on a symbiosis of the approaches
of the German and the Franco-Belgian schools. Appropriately for a man who invigorated
and modernised violin teaching in Hungary by importing European pedagogical methods,
Hubay's obituary reads 'what bliss... that this land, isolated in its greatness, had a son
who not only spiritually, but in his everyday life successfully broke down the barriers that
separate the Hungarians from the culture of the Western World.'\footnote{Tóth, A., cited in Gombos, L., Jenö Hubay, p. 20.}
For reference
purposes, a chart presenting the pedagogic connections between the principal violinists
examined in this thesis is supplied below (fig. I.1).\footnote{A representative sample of Hubay's pupils is shown in the chart due to constraints of space.}
A time line showing when the
players discussed studied formally with Hubay in Budapest is also provided (fig. I.2).\footnote{It may be noted that when the 'Hungarian violin school' is mentioned in this thesis, this refers to Hubay and his pupils.}

Philip's observation that 'recordings present us with real history'\footnote{Philip, R., Early Recordings, p. 3.} needs to be treated
with a degree of circumspection since, especially at the beginning of the twentieth
century, only 'the best' players were recorded. Because of their often highly individual
approaches to performance, celebrated players such as Kreisler, Szigeti, Vecsey, Heifetz
or Elman were out-of-the-ordinary and themselves trendsetters rather than clones of their
teachers, as lesser players might have been. Thus, the violinists considered in this thesis

\footnote{Tóth, A., cited in Gombos, L., Jenö Hubay, p. 20.}
\footnote{A representative sample of Hubay's pupils is shown in the chart due to constraints of space.}
\footnote{It may be noted that when the 'Hungarian violin school' is mentioned in this thesis, this refers to Hubay and his pupils.}
\footnote{Philip, R., Early Recordings, p. 3.}
may not individually be entirely representative of ‘normal’ practice. For this reason, the thesis examines as wide a range of artists playing as wide a variety of repertoire as has been possible to collate during the period of research. Details of those recordings used in the preparation of the research are provided in the discography.

Fig. I.1: Chart showing the pedagogic/professional connections between violinists in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

---

22 A similar problem may be also perceived in treatises written by exceptional pedagogues such as Spohr, Joachim and Auer, who perhaps do not always recount ordinary practice but nevertheless recommend it.
1890

- Adila Fachiri (1886-1962), studied 1896-1905
- Stefi Geyer (1888-1956), studied 1899-1906

1900

- Ferenc Vecsey (1893-1935), studied 1901-1903
- Eddy Brown (1895-1974), studied 1902-1906
- Jelly d'Arányi (1893-1966), studied 1902-1907
- József Szigeti (1892-1973), studied 1903-1905
- Emil Telmányi (1892-1988), studied 1905-1911

- László Szentgyorgyi (1897-1954), studied 1907-1912
- Eugene Ormandy (1899-1985), studied 1908-1913

1910

- Ede Zathureczky (1903-1959), studied 1912-1917
- Zoltán Székely (1903-2001), studied 1914-1921

1920

- Gabriella Lengyel (b. 1920), studied 1929-1936

1930

- Johanna Martzy (1924-1979), studied 1933-1936

1940

Fig. 1.2: Time line showing Hubay’s pupils’ periods of study with their teacher in Budapest.
Chapter 1

Antecedents and Developments

‘Only since Hubay’s arrival in Hungary can we talk specifically of a Hungarian School.’

The Oxford English Dictionary defines ‘school’ as ‘a body or succession of persons who in some department of speculation or practice are disciples of the same master or who are united by a general similarity of principles and methods.’ This definition seems appropriate in terms of musical performance not only because a school of violin playing can be seen as a lineage of players descending from a celebrated pedagogue (that is, indicative of a ‘genealogy’) but also because it comprises a given set of characteristics which, as Pascal describes in regard to ‘style,’ are ‘both consistent with and denoting generalities.’ Such a comparison of definitions shows that concepts of ‘style,’ ‘school’ and musical ‘genealogy’ are interlinked.

4 The concept of a ‘school’ may also be closely associated with an actual building, that is, a venue within which the passing on of established practices (and sometimes the deliberate quashing of a student’s individual style) takes place. For example, Joachim’s
The Hungarian violin school may be said to have developed thanks to Hubay's long and influential teaching career in Budapest, as Flesch's statement clarifies. Hubay brought to his role as 'master' many of the didactic and performing practices he had learned formally under Joachim's guidance as well as those he had adopted during his time in Brussels. The Hungarian violin school is thus a hybrid of two distinctive nineteenth-century schools of violin playing; the German school, renowned for its stylistic conservatism; and the Franco-Belgian school, typically then perceived as being focussed on virtuosity and showmanship. But as Boyden explains, 'although we may sometimes talk quite properly of 'schools' and their characteristics and although great players like Joachim and Ysaÿe played in markedly different styles, sharp distinctions of instruction became less clear [in the twentieth century].' The availability of quicker means of travel at the beginning of the century and the emergence of commercial recordings, the

position as the most prominent German violinist and teacher of his time was cemented by his founding of the Königliche Hochschule für Musik in Berlin in 1868 and, as Schwarz observes, Vieuxtemps' presence at the Brussels Conservatory 'contributed decisively to the growing success of the Belgian violin school' (Schwarz, B., 'Vieuxtemps;' New Grove II, Vol. 26, p. 598). Similarly, Hubay's insistence on a new building for the Budapest Academy in 1907 shows the significant role that physical place played in the dissemination of his teaching.


5 Many of Hubay's most successful pupils established international careers abroad following their Budapest débuts. Before World War One there was a steady exodus of young Hungarian violinists from Budapest: Vecsey left in 1903, Szigeti in 1905, Telmányi in 1911 and Eddy Brown and Helen Ware returned to their native America in 1913. The d'Arányi sisters established themselves in London by 1914 and Erna Rubinstein, István Partos and Zoltán Székely began their careers in Holland. A career such as that pursued by Szigeti and d'Arányi and others, encompassing regular recording sessions, concert appearances, concert tours and teaching commitments in locations as far apart as Japan, America, North America, North Africa and Russia as well as Europe, would have been considered almost inconceivable by the previous generation of players.
dissemination of which, notes Philip, 'meant that musicians could influence each other more directly than in earlier periods,' began to blur previously evident scholastic and stylistic boundaries between schools of playing.

The Nineteenth Century

Joachim and the German School

Joseph Joachim departed his native Hungary in 1839 to study in Vienna with Joseph Boehm (1795-1876), also a Hungarian expatriate. He transferred five years later to Leipzig to continue lessons with Ferdinando David (1810-1873), himself a pupil of Louis Spohr (1784-1859). Joachim has thus been considered as the natural successor to the Spohr tradition of violin playing and teaching in Germany. Indeed, Joachim and Moser cite Spohr verbatim several times in their Violinschule.\(^7\)

The idea of a 'Joachim school' of playing in the sense of a taught method is difficult to visualise. One of his students, Leopold Auer (1845-1930), recalled that Joachim's pupils 'hardly ever played any scales or études for him' and that he 'rarely entered into technical details, and never made any suggestions to his pupils as to what they were to do to gain technical facility.'\(^8\) According to several sources including Auer, the only remark Joachim would make, having himself first demonstrated a point, would be, 'So müssen

---


Sie es spielen' (‘that's the way you must play it’). Likewise, Sam Franko (1857-1937), an almost exact contemporary of Hubay and also a pupil of both Joachim and Vieuxtemps, states that in trying to imitate his teacher, Joachim, in this way he consequently 'lost his own individuality,' a result that also 'affected everyone else in the class.' Joachim's lack of attention to teaching technical details suggests that he concentrated on musical and interpretative aspects of performance and the mimetic relationship he established with his pupils surely indicates an agenda to disseminate his own approach to violin performance. Indeed, Joachim's assistant and collaborator Andreas Moser (1859-1925) was confident that Joachim's approach would endure, admitting 'he has placed the stamp of his individuality upon the art of violin playing... his numerous pupils will carry his teaching well into the next century.' But Moser denied the existence of a 'Joachim school,' instead viewing Joachim as a descendant of the Italo-French school of Viotti and Rode. In reality, Joachim's teacher, Boehm, had only a very brief acquaintance with Rode, and Joachim's bowing certainly differed from that of the French School. In line with his advocacy of Spohr's approach in written sources, both Joachim's bowing and general style were closer to those used by Spohr, which Joachim knew well through David. In terms of bow position Schwarz describes Joachim as having used

---

9 Ibid.
a very low upper right arm pressed against the body, which necessitated a highly
angled wrist. He gripped the bow stick with his fingertips; the fingers were kept
close together, the index finger touching the stick at the first joint (counted from
the nail), while the little finger remained on the stick at all times. The change of
bow at the frog was accomplished by a rotary wrist movement and stiff fingers.¹³

Such a posture is shown in Adolph von Menzel’s 1854 drawing of Joachim.¹⁴ This
manner of holding the bow was shared by Károly Huber, in whose Hegedüiskola (1875)
directions were given for a straight-thumb, an arched wrist when bowing at the heel and a
low-right elbow position.¹⁵ Joachim’s great-niece, Adila Fachiri (née d’Arányi) (1886-
1962), a pupil of Hubay and Joachim, notes that ‘Joachim’s instructions to me were that
the [right] arm should be in such a position that a ruler placed across the arm would stay
there horizontally.’¹⁶ Notwithstanding that such a deed is possible when playing in the
middle to upper-half of the bow when the upper-arm is kept close to the body, Fachiri’s
description is unsupported by Menzel’s drawing, in which Joachim is depicted playing
below the middle of the bow on the d- or a-string with a highly arched wrist and a lower-
forearm inclined so that a ruler would be unlikely to ‘stay there horizontally.’ Joachim’s
bow hold was criticised by Flesch who commented that ‘a majority of the students thus
maltreated contracted arm troubles and, as violinists, became cripples for life.’¹⁷ By
comparison, players in the French school at the time of Joachim had begun to adopt a

¹⁴ See reproduction in Schwarz, B., Great Masters, p. 260.
¹⁵ Huber, C., Hegedüiskola, Táborszky (Budapest, 1875), p. 4.
¹⁷ Flesch, C., Memoirs (1957), p. 34.
higher right arm position than their forebear Baillot (1771-1842) had prescribed.\textsuperscript{18}

Henryk Wieniawski (1835-1880) was a case in point, Moser commenting that Wieniawski’s bow arm was ‘incredibly stiff… His high angular elbow and inflexible wrist had a ruinous effect on many violinists.’\textsuperscript{19} Similarly, Joachim himself writes that ‘[French and Belgian violinists] carried the use of the too high elbow, with the resultant stiffness of bowing, to [a] most mischievous extreme.’\textsuperscript{20} By the close of the nineteenth century a high right elbow was regarded as acceptable in French practice.

Joachim’s approach to music (as opposed to violin teaching) was certainly regarded as being more intellectual than other virtuoso players of his day, as his lack of technical emphasis in the classroom would appear to indicate. Indeed, Moser, his view clearly prejudiced by his proximity to Joachim, writes ‘he is the first person who has played the violin, not for its own sake, but in the service of an ideal, and has lifted up his calling from the rank of mere mechanical skill to an intellectual level.’\textsuperscript{21} Moser’s opinion was shared; Hanslick describes Joachim at his debut in Vienna in 1861 as ‘no mere virtuoso but rather a significant and individual personality’\textsuperscript{22} and, in Sir Henry Wood’s opinion, Joachim’s playing was ‘free from any trace of exaggeration and [was] always musical and scholarly.’\textsuperscript{23} Joachim’s flexible approach to tempo and rhythm was particularly


\textsuperscript{19} Moser, A., in Schwarz, B., \textit{Great Masters}, p. 244.


characteristic of the Spohr tradition. Furthermore, his use of expressive slides was minimal and he employed vibrato very sparingly, supporting Woods's comment that Joachim's playing had been 'free from any trace of exaggeration.' Such observations are confirmed by available recordings and will be discussed in the succeeding chapters.

Vieuxtemps and the Franco-Belgian School

Born in Belgium in 1820, Henri Vieuxtemps was taught principally by Charles-Auguste de Bériot (1802-1870), then the chief pedagogue of the French school and a pupil of Pierre Rode (1774-1830). Even in his earliest concerts, commentators noted Vieuxtemps' 'original, novel, and yet classical manner'\(^\text{24}\) of performance. While it is unclear in which part of his performing style the newness of Vieuxtemps' approach had been most manifest, attention was often directed towards an apparent 'lack of expression,'\(^\text{25}\) especially when comparisons were made between Vieuxtemps and other players. Hanslick comments in 1861 that Beethoven's Violin Concerto Op. 61 'sounded more brilliant [and] more lively, when Vieuxtemps played it; Joachim searched it more deeply and surpassed through a truly ethical force that which Vieuxtemps had achieved through an irresistible temperament.'\(^\text{26}\)

Certainly Vieuxtemps' virtuoso brilliance, the apparent energy of his performances and his choice of repertoire (including his own transcriptions and concertos) align him with
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\(^{26}\) Hanslick, E., *Vienna's Golden Years* (Eng. trans.), p. 77.
the virtuoso violinist-composer tradition of Paganini, a style central to the Franco-Belgian school and one that Joachim had shunned fairly early in his career. But Vieuxtemps’ first biographer, Kufferath, writes, ‘it could be said that Vieuxtemps was a blood brother of Spohr… but that he had been born of a different mother; the French spirit, the desire for brilliance, the need for applause… in a word the opposite of the naïve sincerity of German violinists.’ In truth, however, Vieuxtemps’ association with Spohr seems to have been limited to a few isolated meetings in the winter of 1833. Kufferath’s somewhat confusing perception of Vieuxtemps’ musical genealogy nonetheless acknowledges the differences between the two schools and perhaps makes Hubay’s close connection with both the more noteworthy.

Joachim criticised Vieuxtemps for adhering ‘too strictly to the printed notes when playing the classics, unable to read between the lines,’ implying that Vieuxtemps’ performance style was less ‘searching’ than his own and that Vieuxtemps’ approach to rhythm may have been less flexible and more literal than Joachim’s. Phipson’s criticism that Vieuxtemps’ playing occasionally lacked expression seems to underline the essential difference between Vieuxtemps’ and Joachim’s individual playing styles, at least in terms of popular perception; the loftiness of Joachim’s ‘ethical force’ versus Vieuxtemps’ ‘technically infallible’ virtuosity.

\[\text{Kufferath, M., Henri Vieuxtemps, Sa Vie et Son Oeuvre, Rozez (Brussels, 1883), p. 106.}\]
\[\text{ibid, p. 48.}\]

For a fuller account of the differing practices of the French and German Schools in the mid-nineteenth century see Milsom, D., Theory and Practice, pp. 18-27.
Hubay

Hubay arrived in Paris in 1878, doubtless equipped by Joachim to play in the German manner. But it seems unlikely that his playing wholly resembled Joachim's at this time since Vieuxtemps appreciated Hubay's style enough to recommend him for a job in Belgium. At the Brussels Conservatory Hubay joined a predominantly French teaching staff including Hubert Léonard (1819-1890). The prescribed study materials for this period at the institution included Wieniawski's *Ecole Moderne* and *10 Etudes* (1854) and Vieuxtemps' editions of Kreutzer's *42 Etudes*, Fiorillo's *36 Etudes* and virtuoso pieces by Léonard, Vieuxtemps and Wieniawski. Above all, it seems, the syllabus concentrated primarily on technical advancement.

Mária Zipernovszky, a pupil of Hubay in Budapest, writes that Hubay 'respected the French tradition of playing’ and that ‘he always used the correct French terminology’\(^{31}\) when teaching in Brussels, and Henri Laoureux, a pupil of Hubay in Brussels, later recalled that Hubay taught him 'in the French style,’\(^{32}\) although he does not elaborate on this. On his return to Hungary to take up his late father’s position at the Budapest Academy in 1886, Hubay's pedagogical approach and didactic priorities had been demonstrably influenced by his experiences in Belgium. His exposure to the Franco-Belgian method appears to have provided Hubay with the backbone of his own teaching programme, remaining unchanged in terms of its preoccupation with technical advancement and its reliance on French study material for the following four decades.

---


\(^{32}\) *Ibid.*
Hubay seems to have modified his bow hold following his proximity to French models. Zipernovszky notes that Hubay held the bow ‘lightly as if catching a feather, with the index finger and little finger touching the stick and the other fingers resting on the stick and a slightly bent thumb.’ Such a report contradicts Huber’s and Joachim’s practice and suggests that Hubay had adapted his posture. Hubay’s commentaries for his *Etudes* Op. 63 (*pour développer la technique de l'archet*) No. 1, No. 2, No. 4 and No. 5 clarify that he regarded the flexibility of the wrist as of critical importance, a feature not conveyed in accounts of Joachim’s posture. But the right arm positions of Szigeti and Ferenc Vecsey (1893–1935) (also taught by Hubay in the early years of the century) bore a close resemblance to Joachim’s hold, with the right elbow kept close to the body.

Indeed, Szigeti recalls his earliest (pre-Hubay) lessons as having used ‘the book under the arm method,’ whereby a book placed under the right arm was intended to maintain the closeness of the arm to the body without the book dropping to the floor. In contrast, in a 1935 photograph of Wanda Luzzato (one of Hubay’s final students), Luzzato uses a prominently high elbow posture for a bow position resting on the a-string. Clearly, therefore, Hubay’s approach to teaching posture had changed somewhat in the intervening decades, reflecting a more modern style by the 1930s.

---

33 *Ibid*, p. 146.
The Violin Syllabus at the Budapest Academy

In 1889 the Budapest Academy’s violin preparatory class, designed by Hubay and taught principally by Joseph Bloch (1862-1922) (a pupil of Károly Huber), required its pupils to prepare: Kreutzer’s 42 Etudes (ed. Vieuxtemps); Rode’s 24 Caprices (ed. Vieuxtemps); and Donte’s 24 Etudes Op. 35 in addition to Huber’s Hegedűiskola. Hubay’s own advanced class was divided into three parts, each representing one year of study. His teaching was based on the systematic progress through selected technical treatises: Kreutzer’s 42 Etudes (ed. Vieuxtemps); Fiorillo’s 36 Etudes (ed. Vieuxtemps); Rode’s 24 Caprices (ed. Vieuxtemps); and Campagnoli’s Metodo per Violino (ed. Schradieck). As requisite study material students prepared selected Tartini sonatas in editions by Léonard, short pieces by Vieuxtemps and Wieniawski, a selection of Paganini’s 24 Caprices Op.1 as well as Hubay’s own Suite Op. 5 and concertos by Vieuxtemps, Wieniawski, Brahms and Beethoven (ed. Wilhelmj).36 In addition, requirements also included the preparation of Bach’s Sonatas and Partitas for Solo Violin BWV 1001-1006 (ed. David), Spohr’s Violin Concerto No. 7 and short pieces by Joachim.

The inclusion of a fourth year of the course in 1892 introduced further virtuoso repertoire to the syllabus; show-pieces by Wieniawski and Sarasate and Hubay’s Concerto Dramatique Op. 21, as well as Meerts’ Etudes Rhythmiques. In 1894 additional technical volumes by Saint-Lubin, Mayseder and Bériot were added to the already extensive list of requirements, and concertos by Dvorák and Tchaikovsky were stipulated as study

36 Hubay’s own edition of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61 was not published until 1918 (Rozsnayi Károly, Budapest).
material. The requisites for Bloch’s preparatory class remained unchanged. Hubay’s requirements were consistent from 1894-1900, changing only with the inclusion of his own *Scènes de la Csarda* and his *Variations in D minor* Op. 72 in 1898. In 1904 Hubay added his *Six Etudes de Violon (pour développer la technique de l’archet)* Op. 63 and *Six Etudes de Violon (pour développer la technique de la main gauche)* Op. 64. Following the gradual inclusion of Hungarian-character pieces as study material, first noticeable in 1900 with Hubay’s *Scènes*… and later (in 1904) with Károly Huber’s *Magyar Ábránd*, the 1905 syllabus recommended the preparation of Auer’s *Rhapsodie Hongrois* and Joachim’s *Konzert in Ungarischer Weise* Op. 11. In 1908 Joachim’s transcriptions of Brahms’ *Hungarian Dances* were added to the list and in 1909 Herzfeld’s *Magyar Tanok*, Koessler’s *Magyar Tanok* and Bloch’s *Airs Hongroises* Op. 49 appeared for the first time on Hubay’s syllabus. The preparatory class requirements for 1905 included Hubay’s *Six Poèmes Hongroises* Op. 27, his *Régi Idokbol* Op. 37, *Magyar Alfoldi Képek* Op. 44, *Mazurka* Op. 45, and *Magyar Hangok* Op. 54, followed in 1909 with Joseph Bloch’s *Prèmiere Rhapsodie Hongroise* Op. 44. In 1906 Károly Huber’s *Hegeduiskola* was removed from the preparatory syllabus and shortly afterwards, in 1908, the previously recommended Vieuxtemps edition of Kreutzer’s *42 Etudes* was replaced with Hubay’s own edition, followed in 1909 with his editions of Rode’s *24 Etudes*, Mayseder’s *Six Etudes*, Saint-Lubin’s *Six Grand Caprices* and Gaviniès’ *24 Matinées*. Hubay’s edition of Vieuxtemps’ *Six Etudes de Concert* was added to the list in 1914. His edition of Bach’s Sonatas and Partitas for Solo Violin BWV 1001-1006 was published in 1909 and
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replaced David's edition on the syllabus from that year. For both the preparatory and advanced classes the syllabus remained largely unchanged at least until the Academy's yearbook was produced using a new format in 1917, excluding any list of requisite study material from its contents.\textsuperscript{38}

In rejecting the previous syllabus of the Academy, Hubay's curriculum was characterised by three main features: the development of a virtuoso technique using predominantly French study material; the promotion of Hungarian-character pieces; and the advocacy of Bach and Spohr to be studied in German editions.

Hubay's most prominent pedagogical resources in designing a curriculum dedicated primarily to technical advancement were études of the Franco-Belgian schools and virtuoso repertoire in French editions. By 1900, 75\% of the technical study volumes stipulated for use in Hubay's class was French, Italo-French or Belgian.\textsuperscript{39} Comparatively, in his 

\textit{Hegedűiskola} (1875), Károly Huber suggests the preparation of pedagogical works 80\% of which are represented by German authors (David, Mayseder, Schön, Hasel, Kayser, Böhmer and Spohr) with only a few titles from the classical French school. Hubay's choice of technical studies and repertoire in French editions reveals much about his pedagogical influences and ambitions, and his mixture of German and French material (albeit with a huge bias towards the French) is suitably symbolic of the approach he had formed.

\textsuperscript{38} Franz Liszt Academy year books 1889-1917, Franz Liszt Academy, Budapest.

\textsuperscript{39} In addition, when Hubay published his own editions of key pedagogical texts, the suggested fingerings and expressive directions were most often taken directly from Vieuxtemps' editions of the same works.
That Hubay viewed his method primarily in terms of teaching a virtuoso level of
technique rather than concentrating mostly on interpretation as Joachim had done is
supported by accounts from his students in the early twentieth century. Szigeti recalls ‘an
obsession for exhibitionistic virtuosity... in Hubay’s classes’ ¹⁴⁰ amid an atmosphere of
‘puerile technical rivalry.’ ¹⁴¹ Similarly, Dénes Kovomzay comments that ‘[Hubay’s]
teaching was absolutely concentrated on technique and virtuosity.’ ¹⁴² Although not
actually a pupil of Hubay (but rather a student at the Budapest Academy during the
1930s), Kato Havas also reports that technique had been Hubay’s main pedagogical
preoccupation. ¹⁴³ This theme is taken further by Flesch in his assessment that Hubay’s
pupil Vecsey’s playing as a child was ‘primitive and undistinguished musically’ and that
Vecsey’s ‘musical and ethical education was left to chance — to the vagaries of concert
life.’ ¹⁴⁴ Flesch’s accusation that Hubay had neglected the ‘musical and ethical education’
of at least one of his stellar pupils in favour of teaching technical precision is echoed in
Szigeti’s insistence that his studies with Hubay ‘lack[ed] a solid musical foundation and
outlook.’ ¹⁴⁵ In popular perception, too, Hubay’s teaching was considered as having being
focussed on ‘mastering the technicalities of violin playing in the shortest possible time.’ ¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁰ Szigeti, J., With Strings, p. 43.
¹⁴¹ Ibid, pp. 87-88.
¹⁴² Koromzay, D., interview by Rolston, T., (The Banff Centre, Banff, Alberta, Canada, 5th
June 1981), cited in Kenneson, C., Székely and Bartók, The Story of a Friendship,
¹⁴³ In conversation with the author, Oxford, 18th February 2004.
¹⁴⁴ Flesch, C., Memoirs, pp. 251-252.
¹⁴⁵ Szigeti, J., With Strings, p. 88.
In contrast, however, Zipernovszky comments that Hubay always insisted on his pupils ‘making an artistic performance of the highest standard.’

Such consistent criticism that Hubay’s teaching method was predicated for the most part on the teaching of mechanics is intriguing given his own long association with string quartet playing. Nonetheless, Szigeti recalls that his timetabled chamber music classes with David Popper had been regarded as ‘token lessons.’ Rather, as Zoltán Székely, Kato Havas and Dénes Kovomzay each observe, it was Leo Weiner and Imre Waldbauer rather than Hubay who had instituted compulsory chamber music classes.

Hubay’s insistence on the presence of Hungarian-character works on his syllabus from 1900 onwards indicates both a nationalist tendency in musical terms and a conspicuous and conscious intent to promote the ‘Hungarianess’ of his teaching programme. His replacement of his father’s Hegediüiskola in 1906 with studies by Bloch and others exhibits both a decision to modernise his approach and a shift in the pedagogical emphasis of his syllabus away from the German tradition. But the formal rejection of Huber’s text may have been unrepresentative of Hubay’s way of teaching at the time;

47 Halmy, F., and Zipernovszky, M., Hubay Jenö, p. 166.
48 On his return to Budapest in 1886 Hubay formed, with David Popper, the Hubay-Popper string quartet. Until Popper’s death in 1913 the group maintained a prominent role in the musical life of the city. See Gombos, L., Hubay Jenö, pp. 13-15.
49 Szigeti, J., With Strings, p. 37.
50 Székely, Z., Székely and Bartók, p. 21.
52 Koromzay, D., interview by Rolston, T., (The Banff Centre, Banff, Alberta, Canada, 5th June 1981), cited in Kenneson, C., Székely and Bartók, p. 15.
Zipernovszky recalls that Hubay used his father’s exercises throughout his career, suggesting that he remained convinced of their pedagogic value.\(^{53}\)

That Hubay continued to accept the pre-eminence of some German school texts by including them in his syllabus testifies to the influence of his training with Joachim. Until his own edition was published in 1909, for example, Hubay recommended David’s edition of Bach’s Sonatas and Partitas for Solo Violin BWV 1001-1006. In his preface Hubay writes ‘Joachim used the very excellent edition made by Ferdinand David… At the same time Joachim changed a great deal in this edition, with regard to the manner of playing, bowing, fingering, and marks of interpretation. I kept to all the alterations made by him.’\(^{54}\) Székely recalls that Hubay had used his own printed edition when teaching the works in 1920, remembering that ‘he taught the articulation as it appeared in his publication.’\(^{55}\) Reflecting Hubay’s partially revised approach to this music, Zipernovszky notes that Hubay believed ‘Bach should be played according to our own age.’\(^{56}\) Thus, in Hubay’s edition of Bach’s Sonata for Solo Violin in A minor BWV 1003, *Adagio/22* (ex. 1.1) the trill on the fourth beat concludes upwards with a pre-emptive statement of the final note (e\(^2\)) whereas Joachim suggests both an additional trill on the third beat of the bar and a downwards resolution of the final trill (ex. 1.2). Even though Hubay’s loyalty undoubtedly lay with the German school in regard to these works, his approach in this bar bears more similarity to Franco-Belgian editions by Capet (ex. 1.3), Flesch (1.4) and


\(^{55}\) Kenneson, C., *Székely and Bartók*, p. 22.

Champeil (ex. 1.5) in terms of the direction of resolution of the final trill. In general, however, his edition owes much to the German tradition, as his preface makes clear. In the same sonata, Allegro, for example, he stipulates the use of *spiccato* in some *piano* bars, matching David’s suggested approach and Joachim’s *leggiero* markings. Likewise, Hubay’s recommended articulation for the opening theme of Bach’s Sonata for Solo Violin in C major BWV 1005*/Fugue* follows the practice of both David and Joachim to use *legato* bowing as opposed to the French approach which often suggests a *détaché* reading as in Capet’s 1915 edition (ex. 1.6). Such an example supports Szigeti’s case that Hubay was linked to a tradition of playing ‘that goes back to the executions and editions of Ferdinand David and Joachim,’\(^{57}\) and it certainly appears that Hubay regarded his German training to have been relevant to a modern pedagogy in terms of these works.

Accounts of violin teaching practices at the Budapest Academy during the early years of the twentieth century are often vague. Székely notes ‘as good a reputation as the Hungarian school of violin playing had, its operations were not that specific.’\(^{58}\) In common with Joachim’s practice, the formal arrangements of both Hubay and Bloch relied on teaching assistants (usually former pupils) to prepare students for their weekly classes. Székely recalls that Sándor Köszegi (a former pupil of Bloch) primed pupils for their lessons with Bloch in the 1910s, but that Köszegi ‘no longer knew how Bloch required certain works to be studied.’\(^{59}\) His remark seems to imply both that the communication between teaching assistants and senior staff may have been minimal and


\(^{58}\) Kenneson, C., *Székely and Bartók*, p. 11.

that Bloch’s style of playing was outmoded by this time. Furthermore, reports of Bloch’s actual teaching reveal rather indistinct pedagogical aims; he typically provided a pizzicato accompaniment to his pupils and corrected their mistakes by alerting the student to the error. Székely notes that Hubay’s teaching style had been similar; Hubay accompanied at the piano and rarely interrupted. Henri Laourex, recollects, however, that when Hubay wanted him to play ‘as an individual’ he would accompany him at the piano, at other times requiring him to imitate his teacher. On the basis of Laourex’s evidence, Hubay seems on every occasion to have wanted Székely to play ‘as an individual,’ Hubay most frequently accompanying his pupil.

Commenting on Hubay’s approach in 1920, Székely explains

Hubay’s masterclass was not a real teaching class. One was supposed to “do it well,” and Hubay did not go into specific details. Somehow the work was supposed “to go by itself…” nobody specifically instructed us. The principle seemed to be ‘prepare the next piece for next time,’ and the result was supposed to be good in itself… It seemed as if the prevailing attitude was that whatever one did, one was good, perhaps the best, and one could not do better… I am not very enthusiastic about what he did.

---

60 Ibid, p. 11.
62 Kenneson, C., Székely and Bartók, p. 21.
Szekely implies that Hubay did not 'teach' in the sense that he conveyed his manner of playing to his pupils at this time, contesting the possibility of a perceivable stylistic 'genealogy' (unless, that is, Hubay's pupils imitated their teacher without being consciously aware of doing so). Testimonial accounts of his teaching from other pupils recall an altogether more sympathetic approach at the start of the century, and one removed from the somewhat casual attitude noted by Szekely. Szigeti notes Hubay's 'extraordinary flair and suggestive power,'\(^63\) and Stefi Geyer comments:

> Hubay's teaching had such an effect on me, that if he had wanted I could have solved the impossible... I cannot be more appreciative than to say that he treated us as individuals and varied his teaching techniques accordingly. We became independent at a young age because we were taught to think for ourselves. It thus became possible for the three of us, Vecsey, Szigeti and I to have our own individual styles, but at the same time to show all the hallmarks of Hubay's methods... common to us all was a full and sonorous sound.\(^64\)

Geyer's observations provide two important clues to Hubay's style of teaching. First, Hubay varied his teaching techniques according to the needs of each pupil, offering an alternative view from Székely and strongly implying that his was a flexible method. Secondly, she intimates that Hubay did not expect his pupils to imitate any other player, including himself. This ethos contradicts both the practice of demonstration and imitation central to Joachim's approach and Laoureuse's account of Hubay's own earlier

\(^63\) Szigeti, J., SoV, p. 4.  
\(^64\) Halmy, F., and Zipernovszky, M., Hubay Jenö, p. 166.
teaching style. But that Geyer perceived certain discernible 'hallmarks of Hubay's method' present in the playing of his pupils (in spite of her teacher's apparent aim to promote artistic independence) suggests that there were indeed unifying characteristics which defined Hubay's approach. Zipernovszky also acknowledges the similarities between Hubay's pupils, noting, like Geyer, that 'every Hubay pupil is recognised by their strong and resounding tone.'\textsuperscript{65} She goes further, commenting that 'the playing of Hubay's pupils mirrored the playing of their teacher because he demonstrated,'\textsuperscript{66} clearly supporting the view that a convincing musical genealogy can, indeed, be traced from teacher to pupil. In agreement with Laoureux (but disagreeing with Geyer), therefore, Zipernovskyy suggests that imitation had formed an important part of Hubay's teaching. Elsewhere, Zipernovszky acknowledges that 'wherever they came from Hubay always changed their playing,'\textsuperscript{67} perhaps implying that the relationship between teacher and pupil may have been mimetic in the manner of Joachim's approach, or at the least that the playing style of Hubay's students had been stylistically derivative from his own.

The Hungarian School After Hubay

From the close of the nineteenth century to the end of the period under scrutiny, violin playing in general underwent two important stylistic changes. These are exemplified by changes in the Hungarian school. First, the approach of younger players at the beginning of the twentieth century challenged the older style of playing in terms of the expressive

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid, p. 165.
\textsuperscript{66} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid, p. 141.
devices used and their frequency of application. In particular, vibrato was used more
often, developing into a so-called continuous vibrato, portamento was more routinely
employed and detailed rhythmic flexibility became gradually less frequent (although
rubato remained an important expressive device). Szigeti comments that a 'new ideal of
beauty' in performance emerged after the First World War and states that 'those who
did not develop towards this new trend had little chance of maintaining their hold.'
He cites the examples of Henri Marteau (1874-1934), Juan Manén (1883-1971), Arrigo
Serrato (1877-1948) and others who received their training in the nineteenth century as
those who did not make this transition successfully. Similarly, following a meeting with
Joachim in 1905, Szigeti perceived Joachim's playing style to be 'already so much part of
the past.' Szigeti's reluctance to continue his training with Joachim coincided with his
hearing Elman, Kreisler and Ysaÿe play for the first time in the same year. He writes

I sensed a dividing line between the violin playing I had heard in my
Budapest days and what I was hearing now. One I associated with the
past, the other with the future.

Szigeti's comment makes clear that, in comparison to the playing styles of Ysaÿe,
Kreisler and Elman, he considered his training in Hungary to have been out dated.
Indeed, he states that the single unifying feature of the playing of Ysaÿe, Kreisler and
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68 Szigeti, J., With Strings, p. 91.
69 Ibid.
70 Ibid, p. 58.
71 Ibid, p. 90.
Elman seemed, to him, to be ‘something that proclaims it of our time.’

Likewise, Ysaïe comments that a performance of Tchaikovsky’s Violin Concerto Op. 35 by Mischa Elman in 1912 ‘took on a new beauty which I had not expected in it.’

Especially in terms of the type and speed of vibrato used in their first recordings, the playing of Szigeti and Vecsey appears to owe much to the influence of these players. The increased application of expressive devices that, for the previous generation, had been more selectively employed, created a progressively more sentimental style of playing, causing Szigeti retrospectively to describe his own recordings made at this time as ‘aberrations from good taste.’

Szigeti’s idolisation of Kreisler et al clarifies that his main influence at this time was not his own formal education with Hubay but, rather, the visceral environment of his teenaged years.

The second important change in violin playing in the period examined was a move, apparent by the late 1930s, towards a simpler approach to musical expression in performance. This is most evident in recordings of younger players such as Zoltán Székely (1903-2001), Johanna Martzy (1924-1979), Gabriella Lengyel (b. 1920) and Ede Zathureckzy (1903-1959) and some older players such as Adila Fachiri (1886-1962), Vecsey and Szigeti. Day offers a general explanation for this change, stating that ‘the 1920s were characterised by disillusion, by a distrust of dramatic gestures after the high

72 Ibid.
sounding rhetoric and propaganda of the Great War. His observation corresponds to
Szigeti’s previously noted perception of ‘a new ideal of beauty emerging after the War.’
Furthermore, younger players showed less interest in allowing their own personalities
(often manifested through a ‘schmaltzy’ reading) to become more important than the
music they played than their older contemporaries. Read’s description of the manner of
prose delivery in the 1920s as being ‘not so much an aggrandisation of the theme as an
aggrandisation of the self’ provides an apposite parallel. Players thus began to reassess
the stylistic approaches of their forebears and in so doing to reevaluate the relationship
between technique and expression. Szigeti is a case in point. In response to one critic’s
comment in 1938 that ‘[Szigeti’s] rhythm was precise, his tonal textures dry, the
expressivity complete,’ he notes

It is interesting to see the adjective dry used otherwise than in a disparaging sense:
as a positive feature of a performance. Can this be a reaction against the eternal
‘schmaltz’ of our recent past? These seem healthy trends; they point up certain
excesses of the opposing school of thought.

75 Day, T., A Century of Recorded Music, Yale University Press (London and Newhaven,
76 Read, H., English Prose Style, Bell and Sons (London, 1952), p. 173, cited in Day, T.,
Recorded Music, p. 160.
78 Szigeti, J., With Strings, p. 100.
In this way, too, reviews of Székely’s playing in the 1920s praise his ‘purist classical style’\textsuperscript{79} and note that ‘he is not at all tempted by sentimentalism.’\textsuperscript{80} But other of Hubay’s pupils did not develop in this way, notably Eddy Brown (1895-1974), László Szentgyörgyi (1897-1954) and, to some extent, Jelly d’Arányi (1886-1962) (among others) whose playing retained many of the stylistic characteristics associated with the overly sentimental style of the first years of the century. The difference between the two styles of playing is evident in duo performances by Jelly d’Arányi and her sister Adila Fachiri. In a review published in 1925 of a performance of Bach’s Concerto for Two Violins in D minor BWV 1043, a critic observes that ‘the solo parts stand out for their difference in style; Fachiri’s classical restraint and d’Arányi’s romantic warmth.’\textsuperscript{81} Based on two recordings of the work made by these players in 1921\textsuperscript{82} and 1926,\textsuperscript{83} the critic was doubtless alluding to the more frequent use of portamento and the freer approach to tempo and rhythm in d’Arányi’s playing in contrast to her sister’s more literal reading.

Szegeti’s approach to violin playing constitutes a useful case study in which to consider some of the changes in the relationship between technique and expression in the time period surveyed. Szegeti studied with Hubay from 1903 to 1905. At the end of his long career he described his ‘personal method’ as being based on the central principle that

\textsuperscript{79} Unsigned review, unidentifed newspaper, (Budapest, c. 1920), cited in Kenneson, C., \textit{Székely and Bartók}, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{80} Tóth, A., \textit{Nyugat} (Budapest, c. Spring 1921), cited in Kenneson, C., \textit{Székely and Bartók}, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{81} Unsigned review, \textit{The Times}, 14th September 1925, British Library collection.
\textsuperscript{82} Discography item 7.
\textsuperscript{83} Discography item 9.
one should question everything. Moreover, he emphatically rejected the idea that traditions of conveying expression should be passed from teacher to pupil by demonstration and imitation. Rather, he advocated 'a working method... starting from scratch in which imitativeness, whether conscious or unconscious, can have no part,' sharing Auer's contention that 'tradition in music is the antithesis of progress... [it] weighs down the present with the dead formalism of the past.' In his writings, Szigeti's discouragement of the reliance on tradition is associated most frequently with fingering choices. Conversely, he often stresses the importance of following tradition in regard to issues of bowing.

Fingering

Szigeti writes

I believe it was Mahler who once exclaimed "Was ihr für Tradition hält ist eher Schlamperei" ("what you call tradition is more like simple slovenliness"). We tradition-ridden violinists should take this to heart particularly when faced with fingering problems, where the bad old days of the nineteenth century still influence our reflexes and our thinking too much... To think in terms of positions instead of considering the natural

---

86 Auer, L., *Violin Playing*, p. 77. Auer's remarks should be read within the context that he insisted on teaching late-nineteenth century ('traditional') attitudes to expression well into the 1920s.
fall of the fingers as the determining factor, to rely mostly on the first, third and fifth positions... are part of the same unfortunate heritage.\textsuperscript{87}

By the end of the nineteenth century violin fingering had become more or less fixed on exploiting mostly only odd-number positions, as Szigeti describes. Furthermore, finger contractions and extensions were used very rarely, contributing to the frequency with which slides are implied in editions of the time. Thus, in Joachim's 1905 edition of Brahms' Violin Concerto Op. 77, 1/120-1 (ex. 1.7), the recommended fingering implies that this passage should be executed using frequent slides, exemplified in practice by Szigeti's 1928 recording of the work.\textsuperscript{88} In his 1964 edition (and in his 1948\textsuperscript{89} and 1959\textsuperscript{90} recordings), however, Szigeti's use of finger extensions and even-number positions eliminates the need to slide.

Fingerings given in editions of Mendelssohn's Violin Concerto Op. 64, 3/14-16 (ex. 1.8) similarly illustrate the differences of approach between the 'traditional' nineteenth-century solution to this passage and that suggested by Szigeti. In his edition of the work (1875), David recommends shifting from first to third position to avoid the stretch from the c-sharp\textsuperscript{2} semiquaver to the f-sharp\textsuperscript{2} quaver in 3/14-15. The change in thinking is clarified by comparing the suggestions of Joachim, Hubay and Szigeti in this bar. All

\textsuperscript{87} Szigeti, J., \textit{Notebook}, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{88} Discography item 137.
\textsuperscript{89} Discography item 140.
\textsuperscript{90} Discography item 143.
three suggest a fourth finger extension rather than a complete change of position\(^91\) as is recommended in David's version (although this type of fingering is the exception rather than the rule for Joachim and Hubay). Furthermore, Szigeti's fingering on the first beat of 3/16 is contracted so that the figure can be played in half position, unlike that suggested in the other editions considered which each recommend a 1-1 shift at the very beginning of the bar between a-sharp\(^1\) and b\(^1\). In addition, the shift using the first finger at the end of 3/16 used in editions by David, Joachim and Hubay is avoided in Szigeti's version by an earlier shift to third position on the a-string. Szigeti's use of extensions and contractions should be viewed as an exemplar of a general trend in string fingering at this time rather than as a development applicable only to him or to players of the Hungarian School.\(^92\) The use of deliberately expressive fingering is considered in detail in chapter two.

Aside from issues of portamento, Szigeti's motivation for questioning the principles of traditional fingering was two-fold: for the alleviation of technical difficulties; and for an increased variety of tone colour. In each case, Szigeti's solutions aimed to challenge traditional approaches.

Thus, his suggestion for facilitating Bartók's *First Rhapsody, Seconda Parte* ("Friss")/100-4 (ex. 1.9) exploits a stretched in-between position (actually in two positions: the first and second simultaneously). Similarly, the 'traditional' approach to

\(^{91}\) In his 1975 edition, Szigeti also gives the option of starting and remaining in second position.

\(^{92}\) In his 1927 edition (Peters), Flesch provides identical fingering to Szigeti in 3/16.
the fingering of Bach’s *Chaconne* 133-7 (ex. 1.10) (and that used in editions by David, Joachim and Hubay) was to play entirely in first position. But Szigeti, in common with Szeryng,\(^9\) recommends the avoidance of lifting the fourth finger from a\(^1\) to d\(^1\) in bb. 136-137 to alleviate the possibility of an unintended intermediary note (either e\(^1\) or an open d-string) by using an ‘in-between’ position; in b. 137 f-sharp\(^1\) is played in first position and d\(^1\) in second position.\(^9\) In terms of fingering, the approach of Szigeti and Szeryng in these bars illustrates a departure from the thinking of the previous generation as exemplified by Sevcik’s *Schule der Violintechnik* Op. 1 (1881). Sevcik devotes an entire study (No. 26) to practicing the smooth execution of successive double stops using the same finger for consecutive notes on neighbouring strings (as in David’s, Joachim’s and Hubay’s editions of Bach’s *Chaconne* 136) rather than advising fingering which obviates the need for such motions. Similarly, in their edition of Corelli’s *La Folia* Op. 5 No. 12/85 (1916) (ex. 1.11), Léonard and Sauret recommend swapping the second finger from b on the g-string to f\(^1\) on the d-string, possibly risking in execution an inadvertent intermediary note (g).

Again in pursuit of a less precarious execution, Szigeti criticises Joachim’s ‘unreasonable’ fingering suggestions in Mozart’s Violin Concerto K. 218, 1/205 (ex. 1.12), rather proposing a series of extensions backwards in order to move ‘comfortably and safely down to the third position.’\(^9\) Likewise, in Brahms’ Sonata Op. 78, 1/20 (ex.

---


1.13) Szigeti advises reaching back with the first finger from third position for b-flat to avoid Hubay’s suggested shift from third to first position.

Szigeti’s second reason for changing his approach to fingering concerns timbre. He writes ‘questions of tone colour should lead us to re-examine fingerings which we may find to have been accepted traditionally.’ In this way he advises to ‘keep apart the different segments of a theme by confining, whenever possible, each one to one of the four strings.’ His 1975 edition of Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, 1/226-235 (ex. 1.14) illustrates this idea, Szigeti varying the tone colour of each ‘segment’ by playing each on a different string. His only recording of the work (1933) anticipates this proposal, although 1/226-7 is played on the d-string (as recommended in editions by Hubay and Joachim) as opposed to his later suggestion of confining it to the g-string.

Szigeti used a similar strategy to create timbral differences between identically repeated figures. In his 1964 edition of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77, 1/479 (ex. 1.15) he recommends that d³-a² should be played on the a-string to avoid repetition of the timbre of the same figure in 1/477 (where the two notes are distributed across the e and a-strings). In Joachim’s edition both statements of the figure are distributed across the e- and a-strings. Szigeti’s recommended fingering is not used in his 1928 recording of the work but it is employed in his 1948 and 1959 versions, suggesting that this approach may
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96 Szigeti, J., Notebook, p. 96.
97 Szigeti, J., SoV, p. 87.
98 Discography item 170.
99 Discography item 137.
100 Discography items 140 and 143.
have been a later development. Szigeti’s 1962 edition of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61 3/165 (ex. 1.16) is another case in point. Here, he suggests that two identical statements of the same figure should be avoided by playing 3/165 on the e-string and by executing the same figure in the following bar on the a- and d-strings. His solution provides a different tone colour for the second statement, a choice of fingering, claims Szigeti, ‘that was taken for granted when I first studied the Beethoven Concerto.’\(^{101}\) It appears contradictory to Szigeti’s claim that such fingerings were previously ‘taken for granted,’ however, that editions by Wilhelmj, Joachim and Hubay each recommend the use of third position for both bars with no tone colour differentiation implied through fingering. Furthermore, in Szigeti’s 1932 recording\(^{102}\) both bars are executed entirely in this position.\(^{103}\) At the least, therefore, Szigeti’s remark that the previous generation had selected fingerings specifically to create timbral differences between identical statements of the same material is unreliable in this case (as in ex. 1.15).

Part of Szigeti’s reappraisal of fingering choices for the sake of timbre involved his avoidance of open-strings; these are rarely suggested, except ‘when a naïve tune demands precisely the simplicity that an extended phrase played on one string gives,’\(^{104}\) illustrated by his suggestions in his edition of Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, 2/17-22 (ex. 1.17). The direction to employ the open a-string here also appears in editions by Joachim and Hubay. Editions by Hubay and Szigeti seldom agree, however, in these terms. They

\(^{101}\) Szigeti, J., SoV, p. 112.
\(^{102}\) Discography item 131.
\(^{103}\) Szigeti initially studied the work with Hubay in 1905, using Wilhelmj’s edition (1896).
\(^{104}\) Szigeti, J., SoV, p. 168.
show that Hubay frequently recommended the use of open-strings both in expressive melodic material and in passagework, as in his edition of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 3/151-152 (ex. 1.18). At the corresponding place in Szigeti’s edition, Szigeti suggests remaining in second position so as to avoid the open a-string in 3/152 and the two position changes in 3/151.

Bowing

Szigeti’s reappraisal of traditional approaches to bowing practice aimed to facilitate the execution of awkward passages and to vary the articulation or timbre of the music.

Facilitating Awkward Passages

Szigeti’s criticism of the ‘uncomfortable and illogical bowing’ used in the printed editions of his forebears is typical of his experimental attitude to finding new solutions for technically problematic passages. His consequent advocacy of fingerings that allow clockwise bow movements, that is from left to right (especially in fast détaché or spiccato figurations) instead of right to left (counter-clockwise), was central to Szigeti’s planned elimination of the difficulties of these passages. For example, neither Joachim’s nor Hubay’s editions of Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, 3/81-82 (ex. 1.19) suggest fingerning that would avoid a counter-clockwise bow motion, whereas Szigeti’s fingerling avoids this through a series of finger extensions and contractions. Similarly, in

his 1962 edition of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 3/83 (ex. 1.20), Szigeti avoids the counter-clockwise bow action of returning to the a-string on the fourth semiquaver, rather playing this note as a finger extension on the d-string. Despite Szigeti’s insistence that ‘the usual fingering’¹⁰⁶ (playing the entire bar in first position and consequently necessitating a crossing back to the a-string for the fourth semiquaver) had been traditionally observed, he neglects to mention that Hubay’s edition already eliminates such a counter-clockwise movement. Hubay advises that the bar be played completely on the d-string, starting the bar on a d¹ harmonic with the fourth finger before descending via the third and first positions. In his 1932 recording of the concerto,¹⁰⁷ Szigeti audibly uses Hubay’s fingering here but in his 1947 version¹⁰⁸ he appears to use his own ‘extension’ solution. In the same way, Szigeti’s approach to the up-bow descending figure (marked ‘x’) in Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, 3/15 (ex. 1.21) avoids the awkward bow movement from the a- to the d-string that occurs when the figure is played in the traditional first position recommended in editions by Hubay and Joachim. Szigeti’s solution of playing the figure in the second position distributes the notes more evenly across the two strings, as previously noted. Furthermore, Szigeti adjusts the bowing so that the first half of 3/15 comprises two up-bows and the second half of two down-bows, borrowing the idea from beats 2-3 of b. 15 in Joachim’s 1905 edition.

¹⁰⁷ Discography item 131.
¹⁰⁸ Discography item 134.
Articulation and Timbre

Szigeti frequently criticised a tendency in the playing of younger players for the ‘regression in the subtle use of the bow for effects that are beyond the ordinary.’\textsuperscript{109}

Sharing his view that the use of the bow had become restricted, d'Arányi also comments that ‘it is safety first in violin playing today – especially in bowing… the older way was perilous and for that it is avoided.’\textsuperscript{110} Likewise, in a review of a concert given by Adila Fachiri, a critic notes as early as 1900 that ‘a special feature of her playing is her bowing, so important and alas! neglected by many of today’s players.’\textsuperscript{111}

In a similar way to his claim that his predecessors had taken for granted certain approaches to fingering, Szigeti provides a specific example; he states ‘the swift down bow after a long up-bow was done as a matter of course… passed down through the playing of Joachim, Sarasate and Hubay.’\textsuperscript{112} In his 1884 edition of his own \textit{Sonata Romantique} Op. 22, 2/10 (ex. 1.22), for example, Hubay’s printed bowing implies a fast down-bow for the $g^1$ quaver. Likewise, in David’s, Joachim’s and Hubay’s editions of Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, 3/107-112 (ex. 1.23) the absence of bowing markings (implying that the passage be played ‘as it comes’) suggests the bowing practice described by Szigeti as having been typical. Indeed, in the corresponding place in his own edition, Szigeti specifies this articulation so that the up-bow dotted crotchet is

\textsuperscript{109} Szigeti, J., \textit{SoV}, p. 197.
\textsuperscript{110} Macleod, J., \textit{The Sisters}, p. 265.
\textsuperscript{111} Unsigned review, \textit{The Times}, 16\textsuperscript{th} November 1900, cited in Macleod, J., \textit{The Sisters}, p. 42.
\textsuperscript{112} Szigeti, J., \textit{SoV}, p. 197.
followed by a down-bow quaver. He also observes this practice in his 1933 recording.\textsuperscript{113} Similarly, he recommends a swift down-bow in Brahms’ Violin Sonata Op. 108, 1/10 (ex. 1.24), describing the effect of such bowing as ‘gasp-like.’\textsuperscript{114} Szigeti abides by this practice in his 1937 recording of the work.\textsuperscript{115}

Szigeti criticises the tendency of younger players to play repeated semiquavers ‘with the upper part of the bow and with [a] sostenuto legato-détaché [stroke].’\textsuperscript{116} As a result of this predilection for using the upper half he notes a reluctance in modern practice for using the lower half of the bow, ‘too often neglected in the pursuit of smoothness,’\textsuperscript{117} and again claims that the previous generations had ‘taken for granted the use of the lower half.’\textsuperscript{118} Hubay’s own editions concur with this assertion, often advising the use of the heel and lower half of the bow, usually denoted by the symbol \( \rightarrow \) to indicate bow movement towards the heel and \( \square \) to denote that a figure or note should begin or be played at the heel.\textsuperscript{119} For example, Hubay’s editorial markings in his edition of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 2/20 (ex. 1.25) explicitly direct the player to articulate these notes at the heel of the bow, indicated by his usual \( \square \) marking and by an arrow to use a full up-bow during the final beat of 2/19. Although Joachim’s edition provides no specific bow markings here, the up-bow during the fourth beat of 2/19 suggests that 2/20 might be played at the heel or in the lower half of the bow.

\textsuperscript{113} Discography item 170.
\textsuperscript{114} Szigeti, J., \textit{SoV}, p. 197.
\textsuperscript{115} Discography item 138.
\textsuperscript{117} \textit{Ibid}, p. 139.
\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Ibid}.
\textsuperscript{119} The symbol \( \rightarrow \) in Hubay’s editions indicates that a passage should be played at the point of the bow.
Despite his objections to the neglect of the heel and lower half, Szigeti rejects Hubay’s advice in this bar in his 1962 edition of the work. Instead, he recommends that the figure should be played with a legato-détaché stroke, either with the first two semiquavers joined together so that the remainder of the bar is played in the middle of the bow, or with each note being played separately but starting the figure on an up bow at the point. This effect is achieved in all three of his recordings of the work. Szigeti’s suggestion to begin 2/20 on an up-bow produces precisely the legato-détaché stroke in the upper half of the bow that he cautions against in his 1964 A Violinist’s Notebook! In this instance, at least, Szigeti’s self-proclaimed reliance on the bowing style of his predecessors may be disproved. Similarly, Hubay suggests that the semiquavers beginning on beat two of 2/83 (ex. 1.26) should be played at the heel, and confirms this by inserting a comma between the down-bow b and up-bow d, thereby implying a small break to allow for a bow retake back to the heel. Szigeti’s reluctance to follow Hubay’s practice at this point is demonstrated both by the absence of any editorial marks to suggest playing the semiquavers at the heel and by his practice in his three recordings of the work; the bow audibly remains on the string in the upper half of the bow between the tied b and the following up-bow semiquavers. Thus, despite his indictment that the lower half of the bow had become ‘neglected,’ Szigeti actually recommends the specific use of the heel infrequently when compared with some of Hubay’s suggestions, aligning him more with modern trends than with the practice of his teacher and exemplifying Flesch’s ‘gap’ between theory and practice.
Furthering his assessment of bowing practices, Szigeti describes *sons filés* as 'a cardinal exercise of our art which was held in high esteem by players of the Franco-Belgian school.' He states that Hubay's 1909 edition of Rode's 24 *Caprices* 'conjures up vivid memories of the lessons in which Hubay tried to transmit to us the *cantilena* and *fioritura* style of the slow introductions... in them a multitude of ... and this helps us to imagine a playing style very different to our own, which is based on a more uniform pressure of the bow.' Léonard and Sauret's 1916 edition of Corelli's *La Folia* Op. 5, No. 12/150-161 (ex. 1.27) includes such indications, observed by Szigeti in his 1940 recording of the work. But Szigeti fails to acknowledge the change in meaning of *sons filés* which occurred sometime in the late nineteenth century. From the beginning of the twentieth century the term describes a sustained bow stroke maintaining the same dynamic, whereas Rode would have understood it as meaning a 'swell,' as Baillot describes, achieved by a combination of changes to bow pressure and bow speed.

Flesch warns that an exaggerated use of *sons filés* results in a 'sluggish, too uniform bow stroke,' an observation which clearly refers to the modern meaning of the term.

Szigeti's criticism of 'our own' playing style 'which is based on a more uniform pressure of the bow,' therefore, implies that his understanding of the term is in line with the older tradition, since he recognises that the 'multitude of ... helps us to imagine a style of playing very different to our own.' Furthermore, Szigeti comments
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120 Szigeti, J., *Notebook*, p. 84.
121 *Ibid*.
122 Discography item 145.
The practice of *sons filés* and of *cantilena-recitative* exercises was of course essential to the eloquent expression of Vieuxtemps' works and others of the period; it is inevitable that with the passing of much of this repertoire from our concert halls and classrooms, this multitude of and other 'expression' signs seem to us *de trop* and indicative of an obsolete past. The concept of the violin as an instrument that most nearly approximates to the human voice was not then an empty phrase.\(^{125}\)

Szigeti recalls hearing Hubay and Brahms play Brahms' Violin Sonata Op. 108, and comments that Hubay 'understood the full meaning of typical contrary emphasis dynamics like the \(\begin{array}{c} \text{\textless} \\ \text{\textgreater} \end{array}\) in the third and fourth bars of the opening (see ex. 2.117/3-4).\(^ {126}\) Szigeti's comments reveal both that Hubay had considered *sons filés* (in its original meaning) as appropriate to conveying expression in the performance of certain repertoire and that this tradition had been transmitted to him by his teacher, despite the presence of the more modern practice of maintaining a uniform pressure of the bow.

As this case study of Szigeti's attitudes to technical aspects of violin playing indicates, the period surveyed saw significant shifts in the approach to fingering and bowing practices. This, in turn, affected how expression was conveyed on the instrument. Szigeti's out-and-out criticism of relying on tradition in such matters supports his previously noted distrust of 'genealogies' of violin playing. Likewise, his early

\(^{125}\) Szigeti, J., *Notebook*, p. 84.
recognition that Joachim’s playing was ‘already so much part of the past’ and his perception of a ‘dividing line’ separating his training from the performance style of those whose approach to playing he then emulated showed a preparedness to develop stylistically. Indeed, Szigeti seems actively to have sought to distance himself from many of the practices of his teachers. For example, his refusal to accept that ‘imitativeness’ should play any part in interpreting a work, his conscious rejection of older fingerings which he deemed to be ‘awkward’ (and his replacing of such fingerings with extensions and contractions), his dismissal of using open-strings too frequently and his review of the ‘illogical’ bowing practices of his predecessors shows that he did not merely accept the principles of his schooling without question but, rather, that he reacted to wider aesthetic trends (as with other of his contemporaries) to modernise his approach to such technical matters.

In contrast to his denunciation of the importance of tradition in some areas of violin technique, Szigeti’s attitudes to ‘traditional’ approaches often point towards significant resemblances with the practices of his predecessors. His upholding of the nineteenth-century practice of using a swift down-bow after a long up-bow, his insistence that the lower half of the bow had become neglected, his continued advocacy of the nineteenth century’s understanding of the term *sons filés* (as well its application) and his remark (mirrored in his practice) that using a variety of fingerings to generate timbral differences between identical or like material was ‘taken for granted’ by his teachers’ generation align him with the practices of Hubay and Joachim, even if his actual practice sometimes suggests otherwise. Indeed, his preservation of Hubay’s and Joachim’s fast down-bow in
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ex. 1.23 and his comment that such bowing was ‘passed down through the playing of Joachim, Sarasate and Hubay’ clearly suggest that he saw himself as a successor to the legacy of these players. Likewise, Szigeti’s proud observation that in terms of solo Bach playing Hubay was linked to a tradition ‘that goes back to the executions of Ferdinand David and Joachim’ sees Szigeti placing himself at the head of this lineage as with his implication that Vieuxtemps’ use of *sons filés* continued in his own executions while being dropped from use by most other players. As this case study shows, therefore, Szigeti, as with others of his generation, displayed both an anxiety of being linked to the past and a need to embrace it.
Chapter 2

Fingering

The Nineteenth Century

The convention of comparing violin slides to similar tendencies in vocal practice was commonplace in pedagogical literature in the early nineteenth century. Spohr comments that 'the violin possesses, among other advantages, the power of closely imitating the human voice in the peculiar sliding from one note to another.'\(^1\) Similarly, Bériot writes that 'the fingering employed by various masters for singing a melody is a powerful way of obtaining expression; it joins sounds together and imitates the inflections of the human voice.'\(^2\) Bériot's remark makes clear that the effect was intended to enhance the expression of cantabile passages or figurations with the implication that it was to be employed within a slur. Joachim and Moser also write that it is 'borrowed from the human voice, occurring between two notes in the same bow stroke, corresponding in singing to when the slur is placed over two notes which are meant to be sung on one
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syllable. The shared use of a vocal analogy attests to an agreement between the Franco-Belgian and German schools concerning a fitting application of this device.

Slide Type

Spohr makes a distinction between the use of technical slides and those employed to enhance expression. He writes 'artificial shifts... are not used merely as accompaniment of an easier mode of playing, but for expression and tone.' Similarly, Flesch describes two different reasons for employing a slide; for technical facility (glissando) and for a deliberately expressive effect (portamento).

Glissando

Written sources show that frequent glissandi were used by players at the end of the nineteenth century. In their editions of Beethoven's Violin Concerto Op. 61, 1/91-99 (ex. 2.1), Wilhelmj (1896) and Joachim (1905) provide fingering which is implicit of such glissandi; in 1/93 both advise descending slides (2-2) and in 1/99 Wilhelmj recommends ascending slides (2-2). That Joachim opts in 1/99 for fingering that instead negates the possibility of slides suggests a more selective use of the device than is implied by other player-editors; Huber and Auer, for example, imply that slides of this type should be used more frequently (shown in ex. 2.2, ex. 2.3, ex. 2.4 and ex. 2.5).
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4 Spohr, L., *Violin School*, p. 179.
Portamento

Flesch distinguishes between three types of portamento on the violin; the single-finger slide (fig. 2.1), where the same finger stops both the departing and destination notes - sliding between the two; the B-slide (fig. 2.2), where the destination note is reached by a slide starting from the departing note to an intermediate note before stopping the destination note with a higher number finger; and the L-slide (fig. 2.3), in which case the slide begins from an intermediate note. The reverse applies in each case for descending slides.

![Fig. 2.1: Single-finger slide.](image1)

![Fig. 2.2: B-slide.](image2)

![Fig. 2.3: L-slide.](image3)

The application of deliberately expressive single-finger slides was an important expressive tool for nineteenth-century players. Fingerings given in editions tend frequently to imply this type of slide especially where *espressivo, dolce* or *cantabile* is marked and where the melodic line ascends or descends by thirds or coincides with either an intensifying or a lessening of the dynamic level. Flesch recalls specifically that it had been a feature of Joachim’s playing. He writes ‘whosoever remembers Joachim’s quartet
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6 *Ibid.* Hereafter, Flesch’s terms will be used.
playing, when he was at his best, will never forget the poetic quality he achieved by the portamento in the following example (fig. 2.4). Unfortunately the crescendo and decrescendo on the portamento... a favourite mannerism of that period, detracted somewhat from the beauty of the passage.\textsuperscript{7}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{fig24.png}
\end{center}

Fig. 2.4: Schubert, String Quartet in D minor (\textit{Death and the Maiden}) D. 810, 1/22-24.

Flesch's comment is telling; it provides evidence about performing style in the nineteenth century but also clarifies that, whilst such sliding was typical when Joachim was 'at his best,' for Flesch's musical taste some forty years later it was stylistically anachronistic. Flesch thus illustrates his own contention, cited earlier in this thesis, that 'in each and every generation the need of expression is a different one, to say nothing at all of the difference of expressional means.'\textsuperscript{8}

Joachim's recordings confirm his use of expressive single-finger portamenti in loci such as that recalled by Flesch (shown in ex. 2.6 and ex. 2.7) and examples taken from


\textsuperscript{8} Flesch, C., \textit{The Art}, Vol. 2, p. 3.
performing editions by a selection of authors (including Joachim) illustrate that this type of slide was indeed 'a favourite mannerism of the period' common to both the Franco-
Belgian and German schools at the end of the nineteenth century (exemplified by exx. 2.8 - 2.14 inclusive).

Nineteenth-century writers and editors agreed that the B-slide was also an acceptable portamento type. For instance, Huber and Joachim clearly imply its application in their separate editions of Viotti's Violin Concerto in A minor No. 22, 1/80-86 (ex. 2.15). In addition to the implied descending slide from e³ (1/84) to f², the succeeding recommended ascending shift from first to fifth position suggests that an audible slide was intended; the direction to change position here otherwise serves no practical purpose. Furthermore, the decision from both players to shift to fifth position, where the third position would be just as serviceable, implies that a long and audible slide was their aim. That Joachim advised for this portamento type to be used especially between larger intervals, viewing its potential to create expression as proportional to the distance covered by the slide, is also clarified by its employment in his recordings (as shown in ex. 2.7 and ex. 2.16).

Nineteenth-century theorists frequently insisted that the L-slide should be discouraged, and few writers recognised its expressive suitability. John Dunn (1898) comments that such a slide was 'a striking mannerism common to many players of the French school' but that 'to violinists taught in the German school such a mannerism is at first
disagreeably striking. The identification of the L-slide as having a particular stylistic association with the French school is corroborated by the fact that Kreisler and Sarasate (taught by Massart and Alard respectively) are credited by most sources to have popularised it. Gradually, writers began to concede to its occasional application; Wessely (1913) describes this type of slide as being acceptable after a change of bow (as opposed to within a slur); Joachim and Moser advise that it may be used to slide upwards to a natural harmonic; and Flesch acknowledges that 'among the great violinists of our time, there is not one who fails to use [the L-slide] with more or less frequency.' Dunn's observation that German players found the L-slide 'at first' disagreeable implies that after initial reticence the device was adopted by German players. Indeed, Joachim's recordings illustrate that he used it in 'less serious' repertoire such as his Romanze/15 (ex. 2.17) but that he did not consider it appropriate to introduce it in the solo works of Bach.

In addition to the three main types of portamento, players also used special applications of the device. In his recording of his Romanze/14 (see ex. 2.17), Joachim slides downwards to an open a-string using a kind of light B-slide (the sliding finger is the same
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14 Discography item 60.
15 Discography item 60.
as that used for the departing note). Also, nineteenth-century editions often
recommended an ascending single-finger slide to a natural harmonic. Joachim’s
suggestion that such a slide might be used in his edition of Mendelssohn’s Violin
Concerto Op. 64, 2/35 (ex. 2.18), for example, follows his teacher David’s
recommendation in the same context. The frequency of use of this type of slide was
increased especially where a work had a Hungarian character, as in the case of Joachim’s
transcriptions of Brahms’ Hungarian Dance No. 3/14 (ex. 2.19) and No. 2/31 (ex. 2.20),
his Konzert in Ungarischer Weise Op. 11, 2/19 and 24 and Huber’s Deuxième Fantasie
sur les Motifs Hongroises (ex. 2.21).

Frequency of Application and Location

As with other expressive means, nineteenth-century writers frequently prescribed caution
against an excessive application of portamento. Baillot writes, ‘since the port de voix is a
means of tender expression, it would lose its effectiveness if used too often.’ Bériot
sympathised with this attitude, noting that ‘a danger... is that of thinking that the
fingering of the passage of which the portamento is the effect should be arbitrary.’
Similarly, Vieuxtemps (Bériot’s pupil) advised against the ‘arbitrary’ or excessive
application of expressive slides. In an account of a lesson with Vieuxtemps, Auer writes

---

16 Joachim also slides to an open-string in b. 101, b. 108 and b. 145 in the same piece.
18 Bériot, C. de, Méthode, p. 236.
Mme Vieuxtemps sat down at the piano... I began to play the *Fantasie Caprice*... Then at the very moment when I was in the midst of a *cantabile* phrase which I was playing all too sentimentally, Mme Vieuxtemps... began to walk precipitately around the room...

Vieuxtemps... asked her what she was looking for. “One or more cats must be hidden in this room,” said she, “miaowing in every key!” She was alluding to my over-sentimental slides in the *cantabile* phrase.19

Schindler also remarks on Vieuxtemps’ apparent rejection of an excessive frequency of portamento, commenting that ‘he does not slide up and down à la Paganini.’20 Clearly sharing Vieuxtemps’ view, Auer himself writes that ‘the violinist who is tempted to make careless use of the portamento will find that it is the easiest thing in the world to turn this simplest of expressive means into caricature,’21 and certainly this resonates with Joachim and Moser’s warnings of the artistic pitfalls of overusing the effect. Flesch agrees, commenting that ‘portamenti are more convincing if less frequently used.’22 Recordings and editions show that the frequency of portamento use was relative to the character of the music being played. For example, Huber was explicit in how he approached playing

19 Auer, L., *Violin Playing*, p. 35.
works in a Hungarian style; in his *Prèmiere Fantasie sur les Motifs Hongroises* (1875) he suggests the use of more single-finger slides than in other repertoire.

Writers agreed that discretion should be employed in the location of slides. Auer states in 1921 that slides should only be used ‘when the melody is descending, save for very exceptional cases of ascending melody.’ But Auer’s view, while clearly influenced by his proximity to Joachim, is not wholly supported by his own or Joachim’s actual practice in recordings. Although not exclusively, Joachim’s portamenti most often occur between larger leaps either ascending or descending, irrespective of an approaching climax, and Auer finds ‘very exceptional cases’ for at least ten ascending slides in his 1920 recording of Tchaikovsky’s *Mélodie* Op. 42 No. 3, showing a conspicuous disparity between his written theory and practice at this time.

An important factor in the location of Joachim’s slides was his varying of the expression of similar or identical figures; for example, he may use a slide in the first statement of a figure or phrase and then omit it from the repeat. Alternatively, slides were used in different places each time. In his edition of Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, 2/35 (see ex. 2.18), for instance, Joachim’s fingering implies a single-finger slide (3-3) from c⁴ to the neighbouring e⁴ harmonic. In the following bar the expression is varied by an implied B-slide (1-2) from g² to c⁴. The fingering for the descent in this bar consequently suggests a downward single-finger slide whereas in the previous bar no slide is implied. Joachim’s decision to slide in a different place in each of these identical bars appears to

---

24 Discography item 1.
be his own development, since David makes no such concession to variety of fingering in the corresponding places in his own edition. As with David, Spohr seems to have used slides in the same loci in repeated material rather than change his fingering, as exemplified in his *Violinschule.* Spohr and David may well have changed the expression in such passages by varying the audibility or character of their slides in performances, although no written evidence supports this hypothesis.

Joachim’s recordings confirm his ploy of using the location of slides to generate differences in like figures. In his 1903 recording of his *Romanze* (see ex. 2.17) the slide to the open a-string in b. 14 is omitted from the first presentation of this figure in b. 10. Similarly, Joachim uses no slide in b. 125 (ex. 2.22) between a-flat¹ and f¹ (the shift of position instead occurs between d-flat¹ and a-flat¹) whereas when the same material is repeated an octave higher in b. 133 he employs a descending single-finger slide. Also, Joachim varied the expression in sequential material either by omitting a slide on one statement or by using it in a different place each time so that the location of a slide was not duplicated. He suggests, for example, a single-finger slide in his edition of Mozart’s Violin Concerto in D major K. 218, 2/32 (ex. 2.23) but remains in third position for the sequential repeat of the same figure in the following bar.

A similar strategy was used by members of the French school. In the sixth of his *Six Études de Concert* Op. 16 (ex. 2.24), for example, Vieuxtemps’ fingering for the

---

²⁶ Discography item 60.
anacrusis figure implies an ascending B-slide from b¹ to g² whereas when the material is repeated (in b. 24) the player is advised to remain in first position for the sake of variety. Léonard and Sauret's 1916 edition of Corelli's *La Folia* Op. 5 No. 12/1-16 (ex. 2.25) exemplifies the same strategy; a slide is implied in b. 3 between c² and d² whereas in the repeat of this material (in b. 11) no shift of position is recommended. A further aspect of Joachim's approach to the location of his slides was occasionally to use successive slides - often in opposite directions (as shown in ex. 2.18/37 and ex. 2.26) - corresponding to a similar tendency in examples given in Spohr's *Violinschule*.

**Slide Character**

Nineteenth-century writers maintained that the slide itself should be as quiet and as quick as possible, regardless of the tempo of the music. Joachim's recordings confirm this and show that the slide almost always started at the last moment, allowing the departing note as much of its own value as possible. A similar discretion was intended to control the audibility of the intermediate note. Baillot writes 'the violinist should avoid at all costs slides or *glissandi* that let the intermediate note be heard... they have a very bad effect.' Joachim and Moser also note that a shift of position should be executed 'in as perfect a

---

27 In his edition, Hubay insists that he 'retained the original fingerings and directions... to interpret Vieuxtemps' music in the style to which he himself desired that it should be played' (Vieuxtemps, H., *Six Etudes de Concert* Op. 16, ed. Hubay, J., Harmonia (Budapest, 1909), p. 3). The fingerling used in the edition would appear, therefore, to be Vieuxtemps' rather than Hubay's.

28 Hubert Léonard (1819-1890) studied first with François Prume in Brussels and then with François Habeneck in Paris. Emile Sauret (1852-1929) studied with Vieuxtemps and Wieniawski in Paris.

29 See example reproduced in Milsom, D., *Theory and Practice*, p. 231.

manner as possible so that the proceeding will be imperceptible.\textsuperscript{31} In agreement with such views, Courvoisier (1873) writes that 'the slide should sound as a continuous movement, so that the intermediate note cannot be heard.'\textsuperscript{32} However, Honeyman (1892) concedes that 'this injunction is ignored by many of our greatest players. The leading note of their slides is heard; and though the effect, like that of the close shake [vibrato], may be much abused and overdone, very powerful and thrilling is the weird intensity of expression produced.'\textsuperscript{33} Likewise, Flesch acknowledges that Ysaïe developed a B-slide with a prominent intermediate note.\textsuperscript{34} Joachim's use of audible intermediate notes in his \textit{Romanze}\textsuperscript{87} (ex. 2.27) and Brahms' \textit{Hungarian Dances}\textsuperscript{36} (ex. 2.28) as opposed to his performances of unaccompanied music by Bach further demonstrates that the character of a slide was influenced (for Joachim at least) by the type of music being played; the B-slides in his Bach recordings have no audible intermediate notes.

Manner of Execution

Despite the recommended normal practice of slides taking place within the same bow direction, as advised by Spohr, Bériot and Joachim and Moser, slides occasionally occurred between notes unconnected by a slur. In such a case, Baillot suggests two possible manners of execution: either the destination note was to be stated briefly at the

\textsuperscript{34} Flesch, C., \textit{Violin Fingering}, p. 365.
\textsuperscript{35} Discography item 60.
\textsuperscript{36} Discography items 58 and 59.
end of the slide (before the actual destination note was played); or the slide was to begin from a restatement of the departing note at the start of the new bow direction.\textsuperscript{37} But the previously observed ideal expressed in Joachim and Moser’s treatise that a slide was only to be used ‘between two notes in the same bow stroke’\textsuperscript{38} is contradicted by Joachim’s practice in his recordings. Thus, the sliding process usually begins during the change of bow so that only the ensuing slide is audible. The use of such slides in Joachim’s recordings of his Romanze\textsuperscript{39} and Brahms’ Hungarian Dances\textsuperscript{40} again confirms that the type of music being played was a crucial determining factor in the character and manner of execution of his slides.

As will be explored in the remaining sections of this chapter, the twentieth century saw significant changes in the use of slides. An apposite comparison between nineteenth-century practice and that of the younger generation of players at the start of the next century may be observed in recordings of Auer and his pupil, Mischa Elman (1891-1967), playing Tchaikovsky’s Mélodie Op. 42 No. 3.\textsuperscript{41} While Elman\textsuperscript{42} does use more slides than his teacher (especially successively in opposite directions in b. 2, b. 11, b. 24, b. 28, b. 51, bb. 65-66, b. 72, and b. 74), the main difference between the approaches of Auer\textsuperscript{43} and his pupil occurs in the audibility of their slides, intermediate notes and

\textsuperscript{37} Baillot, P., The Art, pp. 126-127.
\textsuperscript{39} Discography item 60.
\textsuperscript{40} Discography items 58 and 59.
\textsuperscript{41} This is especially pertinent in a discussion of leading younger protagonists of the Hungarian School at the beginning of the twentieth century since Elman’s playing was an important stylistic influence for players of Szigeti’s generation (see Chapter 1, p. 30).
\textsuperscript{42} Discography item 27.
\textsuperscript{43} Discography item 1.
restated departing notes (especially in descending slides); in all three cases Elman’s are more pronounced.

Hubay

Hubay’s recordings and editions provide an opportunity to assess those aspects of Joachim’s and the Franco-Belgians’ approach to using slides that he adopted as a player and teacher and those that he dismissed as being either technically unnecessary or outmoded as conveyors of expression. An additional examination of the first recorded performances of Hubay’s young pupils at the beginning of the century allows for an appraisal of his possible pedagogical approach concerning the use of this device.

Slide Type

Glissando

Hubay’s suggested fingering for figures such as those in his editions of Saint-Lubin’s *Caprice* No. 5/1-3 (ex. 2.29), Gaviniès’ *Matinée* No. 23/2 (ex. 2.30), the fifth of his own *Six Études*… Op. 64/17 (ex. 2.31) and his edition of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 1/91-99 (see ex. 2.1) exemplify that he began shifts of position in this type of figuration (broken thirds) on the second finger, as in examples from Joachim and Huber. Furthermore, sources show that Hubay’s use of single-finger glissandi between small
intervals was more frequent than Joachim’s, suggesting a change in approach on Hubay’s part. Thus, Hubay recommends repeating 2-2 slides in his edition of Beethoven’s Concerto, 1/99 (see ex. 2.1) rather than Joachim’s change of position on the first finger.

As a teacher, too, Hubay appears to have advocated the use of glissandi in such passages; in his 1911 recording of Beethoven’s Kreutzer Sonata Op. 47, 2/Var. IV/15\(^44\) (ex. 2.32) and in his 1908 performance of Hubay’s Scène... No. 5/18\(^45\) (ex. 2.33)\(^46\) Szigeti uses audible single-finger slides.

Portamento

Sources show that Hubay frequently used melodically expressive single-finger slides especially between notes separated by a major or minor third and other small intervals, as Joachim had done. He preferred for such slides to occur between odd-number positions in both ascending and descending figurations (as shown by his fingering in exx. 2.34 - 2.42 inclusive), confirming Szigeti’s summary of the fingering practices of his predecessors (see chapter 1, pp. 34-35). In addition, the implication of a single-finger slide typically coincided with musical circumstances where heightened expression might be employed: between two important melody notes especially at the top of a phrase (concurring with Flesch’s view that ‘portamenti should coincide with a climax’\(^47\)); to enhance the expressive effect of printed crescendo or diminuendo markings; or with

\(^{44}\) Discography item 128.

\(^{45}\) Discography item 155.

\(^{46}\) Szigeti’s use of single-finger slides in this bar is shared by Hubay in his 1928 recording (discography item 42).

performance directions such as *espressivo, cantabile or dolce*, as in examples from Joachim’s recordings and editions. Hubay’s practice thus shows some consistency with that of the late nineteenth century in these terms.

That Hubay regarded this type of sliding as pedagogically important is clarified by his insistence in his 1909 edition of Rode’s 24 *Caprices* that ‘my fingering for the Mozart-style *Arioso* section [of No. 19] conveys the noble simplicity of the music.’ Recordings and performing editions made by his pupils in the first years of the century also illustrate that Hubay’s use of single-finger portamenti was transmitted to those he taught. Such sources show that, as with their teacher, Hubay’s pupils at this time tended to employ slides between ascending and descending thirds, especially during dynamic changes. In Stefi Geyer’s 1906 transcription of *Minuet* by C. P. E. Bach (ex. 2.43/7 and 9) and Nandor Zsolt’s 1909 edition of his own *Andante* (ex. 2.44) slides are used in this way. Similarly, Szigeti employs prominent single-finger slides in his 1908 recording of Rubinstein’s *Romance* Op. 44 No. 1/3-6⁴⁹ (ex. 2.45) and in his 1908 and 1913 recordings of Hubay’s *Zephir* 33-50⁵⁰ (ex. 2.46), and Vecsey does likewise in his 1904 and 1910 recordings of Schumann’s *Träumerei* 16-24⁵¹ (ex. 2.47). Players occasionally used single-finger slides between larger distances, as in Vecsey’s 1916 edition of his own *Valse Triste* 35 (ex. 2.48) and Szigeti’s 1908 recording of Hubay’s *Scène*… No. 5/11 and

---

⁴⁹ Discography item 185.
⁵⁰ Discography items 157 and 159.
⁵¹ Discography items 225 and 226.
21 (see ex. 2.35). In terms of the latter, Szigeti's execution concurs with Hubay's practice in his recording of the piece.

Hubay's editions imply an infrequent usage of B-slides. Rather, like Joachim, he appears to have favoured single-finger slides. Moreover, fingering implying B-slides generally appears in Hubay's editions with similar frequency (or occasionally less often) than it does in Joachim's. In his edition of Mendelssohn's Violin Concerto Op. 64, 1/152 (ex. 2.49), Joachim implies a descending B-slide from f-sharp² to b¹ whereas Hubay's edition suggests remaining in first position for the entire bar, playing the e² quaver on the open e-string and thereby avoiding any consequent necessity to slide. In other sources, however, Hubay's fingerings do imply an occasional use of B-slides, especially where espressivo is marked. This is exemplified by the suggestion in his edition of Beethoven's Violin Concerto Op. 61, 3/142-143 (ex. 2.50).

The theory that Hubay's printed fingering may be suggestive of audible B-slides is confirmed by the fact that such figures are often playable without changing position. In his 1909 edition of Paganini's Violin Concerto No. 1 Op. 6, 1/139 (ex. 2.51), for example, Hubay implies a slide downwards from c-sharp³ in third position to g-sharp² in first position followed by a shift back up to third position and another slide down to first position at the start of 1/140. 1/139 is playable without a position change if second position is used. The use of slides in locations where no change of position is practically necessary is also shown in examples 2.52, 2.53 and 2.54. As in editions by Huber and

---

²² Discography item 155.
Joachim, Hubay’s publications imply more frequent B-slides in music of a Hungarian character than in other types of repertoire.

But while Hubay usually implied B-slides with discretion in his editions, his recordings show that he was more liberal in their application in practice, especially where a crescendo was marked (see ex. 2.55). Hubay’s approach had clearly changed in the intervening years; recordings from the beginning of the century show that Hubay’s pupils’ frugal use of B-slides was in line with his editions of the period, suggesting that Hubay had indeed advised and practised an economical approach to their application at this time. But in his recordings Hubay uses more B-slides than his pupils in the same repertoire, exemplifying the practice of the 1920s. In Handel’s Larghetto/9-12 (ex. 2.57), for example, Hubay’s 1908 edition implies only one B-slide (b. 10). Szigeti\(^{53}\) (1913) uses no B-slides and Vecsey\(^{54}\) (1909) employs two whereas Hubay uses four slides of this type in his 1929 version.\(^{55}\)

Hubay’s recordings illustrate that he used L-slides with much less frequency than he employed B-portamenti, corresponding to contemporaneous written theory. Where he did use such slides, the distance between the two notes was mostly small and typically no greater than a fourth (exemplified by examples 2.34/4 and 2.58) as in Joachim’s Romanze/15 (see ex. 2.17). Hubay’s use of the most overtly ‘expressive’ type of slide between small intervals thus challenges Flesch’s contention that ‘the intensity of the

\(^{53}\) Discography item 154.
\(^{54}\) Discography item 214.
\(^{55}\) Discography item 49.
portamento is in direct relationship to the length of the distance. Such an inconsistency highlights a potential contradiction between theory and practice at this time (assuming, that is, if Hubay and Flesch were actually in accord on this subject). In addition, recordings illustrate that Hubay used more L-slides in his recordings of his own Hungarian character-pieces than in other repertoire, sharing with Joachim an awareness of the necessary stylistic differences to be made in performances of this type of music (as shown in ex. 2.59). His application of L-slides in such repertoire also allowed for subsequent opportunities to use other slides. In his recording of his Scène... No. 5/30 (see ex. 2.59), for example, Hubay’s ascending L-slide between b-flat and d thus makes available the third finger (d) to make a descending single-finger slide to a, and similarly in the following bar and b. 34.

Sources show that Hubay occasionally used an L-slide in his recordings in the same location as he earlier suggested a single-finger slide (or no slide at all) in his printed editions. This is shown by a comparison of his recording (1929) and edition (1910) of Bach-Wilhelmj’s Air on the G-String/4 (see ex 2.34) and a comparison of his recording (1929) and edition (1908) of Handel’s Larghetto/23 (ex. 2.60). Such inconsistencies between sources confirm that the use of L-slides had grown in popularity over the first three decades of the century.

---

57 Discography item 52.
58 Discography item 48.
59 Discography item 49.
Early recordings from Hubay’s pupils suggest that Hubay did not discourage the employment of L-slides (as exemplified in ex. 2.61 and ex. 2.62). However, Hubay’s L-slide in his 1929 recording of Bach-Wilhelmj’s Air... /4 (see ex. 2.34) does not appear in Vecsey’s c. 1909 recording⁶⁰ of the same piece and his L-slide in Handel’s Larghetto/23⁶¹ (see ex. 2.60) is not used in recordings of the piece by either Vecsey⁶² (c. 1909) or Szigeti⁶³ (1913).

Hubay’s editions demonstrate that frequent single-finger slides upwards from a stopped note to a natural-harmonic were an important stylistic feature of his playing, as they had been for Joachim. Most usually such slides occurred between larger intervals and involved the second or third fingers (as illustrated by exx. 2.63 - 2.68 inclusive). As Zipernovszky recalls, Hubay advised that ‘the final quaver [f²] of the first triplet group and the first quaver [a² harmonic] of the second triplet group [in Tchaikovsky’s Violin Concerto Op. 35, 1/75] should be joined together in one action with a slide’⁶⁴ (ex. 2.69). Moreover, Hubay recommended the application of this effect more frequently than Joachim. Thus, Joachim suggests that a harmonic should be used for a² in his edition of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 1/517 (ex. 2.70) but does not recommend that it should be reached using a slide in the manner implied by Hubay. This apparent opposition to the approach of Joachim illustrates that Hubay was not shackled by his teacher’s influence. In works of a specifically Hungarian character, Hubay, like his

---

⁶⁰ Discography item 209.
⁶¹ Discography item 49.
⁶² Discography item 214.
⁶³ Discography item 154.
father and Joachim, advised such slides with greater frequency, typified by his direction *glissez* in his arrangement of Brahms' *Hungarian Dance* No. 10/80-81 (ex. 2.71) (showing parallels with Joachim's transcription of the same piece) and his own *Magyar notárok* Op. 67 No. 1/36 (ex. 2.72).  

Recordings and printed editions illustrate that the tendency to slide to a harmonic had been conveyed by Hubay to his pupils. Szigeti shares with Hubay the ascending single-finger slide (3-3) to $d^2$ (harmonic) in his 1908 recording of Hubay's *Scène...* No. 5/19 (see ex. 2.35). Similarly, in her 1906 transcription of C. P. E. Bach's *Minuet/8* (see ex. 2.43), Geyer's printed fingering implies an ascending single-finger slide (4-4) to $a^2$ before returning to first position for the following $e^2$, and Vecsey advises a slide between $d^1$ and $g^1$ in his 1916 edition of his *Valse Triste/14* (ex. 2.73) and again uses the effect in his 1904, 1910 and 1925 recordings of Schumann's *Träumerei/31-32* (see ex. 2.86).

Occasionally Hubay's editions imply a type of portamento that begins the slide on a lower string before playing a destination note on the string above, especially where *crescendo* or *diminuendo* is marked, in practice creating the aural illusion that a longer shift has taken place. Joachim rarely implied or used such a fingering, but Auer intimates that this was indeed occasionally acceptable, offering a general description of portamento as 'the connecting of two tones distant one from the other, whether produced on the same

---

65 See also, Brahms, J., (arr. Hubay), *Hungarian Dance* No. 2/31, No. 3/16, No. 5/15, No. 7/7, 11 and 24, No. 8/48 and 96 and No. 9/53.
66 Discography item 155.
67 Discography items 225, 226 and 227.
or different strings.\textsuperscript{68} Thus, Joachim's edition of Mendelssohn's Violin Concerto Op. 64, 1/361-363 (ex. 2.74) suggests playing entirely on the a-string whereas Hubay implies a slide across adjacent strings between b\textsuperscript{1} and b\textsuperscript{2} before shifting back to first position for g\textsuperscript{2}. If Hubay did not intend for a slide between these notes to be audible, the decision to move to third position to play only b\textsuperscript{2} would seem to have been unnecessary. His recordings and other editions also illustrate the use of this effect (as in ex. 2.75 and ex. 2.76/6-7). There is no apparent evidence that Hubay's pupils at the start of the century employed this effect.

In addition to other special applications of portamenti, Hubay occasionally used a descending portamento to an open-string. In his edition of Vieuxtemps' Rêve Op. 53 No. 5/46 (ex. 2.77), he recommends that a-flat\textsuperscript{1} should be executed in third position before playing the following d\textsuperscript{1} as an open-string, thereafter remaining in first position. If Hubay's aim was not that the player should employ an audible slide here, his insistence that a-flat\textsuperscript{1} alone should be played in third position would again seem to be have been superfluous. Recordings also show that Hubay very occasionally used an ascending slide departing from an open-string. In such a case the slide began from an audible intermediate note, as shown in his performances of his own Scène... No. 5/14-15 (see ex. 2.35) and Intermezzo\textsuperscript{69} (ex. 2.78). Sources show this effect not to have been used by his pupils at the beginning of the century.

\textsuperscript{68} Auer, L., Violin Playing, p. 24.  
\textsuperscript{69} Discography item 51.
Frequency of Application and Location

In his editions and recordings Hubay tended frequently to use successive slides, as was observed in the case of Joachim. Indeed, the occurrence of slides in this proximity was more prevalent in Hubay’s recordings than in Joachim’s, exemplified by Hubay’s performances of Bach-Wilhelmj’s Air.../470 (see ex. 2.34/4) and his Intermezzo/43-571 (ex. 2.79). In addition, sources show that Hubay’s pupils at the beginning of the period surveyed imitated their teacher in their use of successive slides (or at the least that Hubay had not opposed the application of slides in this proximity), as exemplified by examples 2.34/4 (Vecsey c. 1909), 2.48/38-40, 2.80, 2.81, 2.82 and 2.83 (Vecsey 1910).

Furthermore, Hubay’s pupils were inclined to use successive slides more often than their teacher in the same repertoire. In Szigeti’s 1913 recording of Handel’s Largo/672 (see ex. 2.57) and in Brown’s 1920 transcription of the same piece, for instance, an ascending single-finger slide between c-sharp and d-sharp is added to those in Hubay’s own recording and arrangement. From Joachim’s practice to that of Hubay’s pupils, therefore, an increase in how often slides were used may be observed.

In his recordings and editions, Hubay often varied the location of slides in repeated statements of a same or similar figure or phrase by sliding in a different place each time the material was presented, as has been observed in the case of Joachim and Vieuxtemps.

70 Discography item 48.
71 Discography item 51.
72 Discography item 154.
In his recording of his *Intermezzo* 45\(^73\) (see ex. 2.79), for example, Hubay uses a slide between e-flat\(^2\) and g\(^2\) whereas his playing of the same material in b. 41 does not use a slide between these notes. As an alternative to omitting slides on one or other limb of a repeated figure, Hubay sometimes slid in a different place in each statement. Thus, in his recording of his *Scène*... No. 12/21\(^74\) (see ex. 2.56), Hubay uses a B-slide between the first two notes of the bar. But when the figure is repeated an octave lower in b. 23 he employs a single-finger slide between the third and fourth notes of the bar, and similarly in b. 24 where the slide changes position from its location in b. 22. Likewise, Hubay directs the player to alternate the location of shifts in his edition of Paganini’s Violin Concerto No. 1 Op. 6, 1/245-246 (ex. 2.84); a descending slide (4-4) is implied between a\(^1\) and f\(^4\) in 1/245 and then between f\(^4\) and d\(^1\) (2-2) in the same figure during the following bar. Hubay also varied the expression of sequentially repeated material in this manner; the first statement of a figure almost always included a slide and the second was played without a slide, as examples from his recordings (ex. 2.59/bb. 25-26 compared to bb. 27-28) and editions (ex. 2.9/b. 15 compared to b. 16 and ex. 2.85) show. Most frequently in recordings, however, Hubay’s choice of where to slide in sequences was demonstrably not based on these principles, and certainly much less so than in the performances of his pupils. Rather, Hubay often retained the same slides in identical locations during repeated or sequential figures. Variety of expression was then achieved by varying the character of the slide in each case.

\(^{73}\) Discography item 51. 
\(^{74}\) Discography item 53.
Hubay’s tendency to vary the expression of repeated material in this way was employed more rigorously by his pupils at the beginning of the century than it was by Hubay himself, suggesting that the strategy was indeed pedagogically important. In his 1904, 1910 and 1925 recordings of Schumann’s Träumerei/31 (ex. 2.86), for instance, Vecsey slides between g^1 and a^1 in the second statement (marked ‘y’) of the g^1/a^1/b-flat/d^2 figure but does not slide between these notes in the first (marked ‘x’). Similarly, in his 1908 recording of Hubay’s Scène... No. 5/25-28^76 (see ex. 2.59) the location of Szigeti’s slides closely resembles his teacher’s: bb. 25-26 includes slides and the sequential repeat of the same material in bb. 27-28 contains no slides. Likewise, in his transcription of Handel’s Larghetto/3-5 (see ex. 2.57), Brown recommends that the g^2 and f-sharp^2 semiquavers in b. 5 should be linked by slide but that the corresponding notes in the first statement in the sequence (b. 3) should not be played with a slide. In his earliest recordings, Szigeti occasionally used a slide between different notes on each statement of like material (rather than removing slides altogether) so that the location of a portamento was not duplicated. In his 1908 performance of Hubay’s Scène... No. 5/30^78 (see ex. 2.59), for example, Szigeti slides downwards between d^3 and a^3 whereas in the following bar a slide occurs between b^2 and g^2 (unlike the same sequence-like passage in Hubay’s performance and printed edition where the slides are maintained in identical locations). Similarly, the L-slide used in Szigeti’s performance of Rubinstein’s Romance Op. 44 No. 1/13^79 (ex.
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75 Discography items 225, 226 and 227.
76 Discography item 155.
77 The same pattern may be observed with the quaver pairs in b. 2 and b. 4 in Brown’s edition, the pair in b. 2 receiving a slide. Hubay makes no such distinction in the same bars in his own arrangement of the piece.
78 Discography item 155.
79 Discography item 185.
2.87) is omitted from the repeat of the same figure in b. 17 (although the B-slide in b. 14 is maintained in the corresponding location in b. 18), and in his 1911 recording of Beethoven’s *Kreutzer* Sonata Op. 47, 2/45\(^80\) (ex. 2.88) he employs a descending single-finger slide during the first beat whereas in the repeat of the same figure on the second beat the shift is executed silently. Likewise, in his 1908 and 1913 recordings of Hubay’s *Zephyr* Op. 30 No. 5/33-37\(^81\) (ex. 2.46), Szigeti uses slides whereas in the repeat (one octave lower) of this passage (bb. 40-44) these slides are omitted. Such examples again confirm that Hubay’s pattern of sliding on the first appearance of sequential, repeated or similar material but not on a subsequent statement had been successfully conveyed to his pupils.

**Slide Character**

Joachim had, doubtless, impressed on Hubay the notion that in the normal course of playing slides and their intermediate notes should be as quiet and as quick as possible. Recordings show, however, that by the 1920s Hubay’s slides were most often audible and characterised by prominent intermediate notes, by variations in the speed of the slide and by peculiarities in the execution of slides unconnected by a slur. In addition, where Hubay maintained the location of a slide in repeated material, variations in expression were often achieved by modifying aspects of its character rather than by changing its position. His recordings also confirm that slides implied by fingering in editions were

---

\(^{80}\) Discography item 128.

\(^{81}\) Discography items 157 and 159.
executed with prominence (at least in the late 1920s) and recordings of his pupils at the
beginning of the century illustrate that such aspects were transmitted to those he taught.

Slide speed

Hubay’s recordings show that he typically began his slides earlier from the departing note
than in Joachim’s performances, making the actual slide longer. The destination note
was always given its full value. In most cases Hubay’s slides were initially slow for the
first semitone or so during the final third of the departing note before quickening towards
the intermediate note. The speed of the slide itself was proportional to the speed of the
music, the intervallic distance between the departing and destination notes and the time
value of the departing note. Single-finger slides were, however, generally much quicker
than B- or L-slides and Hubay’s slow start to slides was most obviously apparent in his
recordings of Hungarian-character pieces. Very occasionally, the speed of the slide itself
contributed to tempo or rhythmic flux. In his recording of Bach-Wilhelmj’s Air.../19\(^{82}\)
(ex. 2.89), for example, Hubay’s slide is quick and begins early from the departing note
causing the final two semiquavers of the bar to arrive slightly before time and
subsequently for his b. 20 to start just in advance of the steady orchestral accompaniment.

Similarly, Hubay occasionally used the speed of a slide to contribute to the effect of
small-scale ‘compensation’ rubato (whereby time ‘borrowed’ is made-up within the
figure – see chapter 4). In his recording of Handel’s Larghetto/6\(^{83}\) (see ex. 2.57), for
instance, Hubay quickens his descending B-slide before compensating with a slower

---

\(^{82}\) Discography item 48.
\(^{83}\) Discography item 49.
ascending B-slide. Likewise, Hubay uses this device in his recording of Bach-Wilhelmj’s Air…/17-18\textsuperscript{84} (ex. 2.89); the quick B-slide and slight move forward in tempo in b. 17 is compensated by a slow slide at the beginning of b. 18.

Recordings of Hubay’s pupils show that the speed of their slides was predominantly fast, regardless of both the intervallic distance between the departing and destination notes and the tempo of the music. This suggests that Hubay had promoted the practice of fast slides to those he taught at the beginning of the century. Typically, Hubay’s pupils at this time began a slide more or less after completion of the full value of the departing note and arrived at the destination note ‘on time.’ But Hubay’s practice of using a slower slide to contribute to a temporary slackening of the tempo and a faster slide to quicken the tempo seems to have been transmitted to his pupils. As with Hubay, when the tempo was temporarily slowed in this way, the slide usually began earlier and with a slower initial speed. Thus, Szigeti delays his arrival on the fourth quaver beat of his 1911 recording of Beethoven’s Kreutzer Sonata Op. 47, 2/12\textsuperscript{85} (ex. 2.90) by using a slow single-finger slide between $g^2$ and $g$-sharp\textsuperscript{2}. Similarly, in his 1904 and 1910 recordings of Schumann’s Träumerei/24\textsuperscript{86} (see ex. 2.47), Vecsey’s slide is slow, leaving the a\textsuperscript{1} departing note earlier than normal to contribute to the marked ritardando.

Hubay’s recordings illustrate that where he retained the same slide in an identical location in a repeated statement of a figure, he varied the speed of the slide so that a

\textsuperscript{84} Discography item 48.
\textsuperscript{85} Discography item 128.
\textsuperscript{86} Discography items 225 and 226.
degree of expressive contrast was achieved, most often with the effect that the second statement contained a slower slide than the first. Hubay’s descending single-finger slide in his performance of his Scène… No. 12/18\(^{87}\) (see ex. 2.56), for example, is much slower than in its first appearance in b. 12. Similarly, in his recording of his Scène… No. 5/30\(^{88}\) (see ex. 2.59) Hubay’s descending single-finger slide is significantly quicker than when the material is repeated in b. 34, the latter sounding almost like a single-finger chromatic scale. The practice of adjusting the speed of slides to create expressive differences is not apparent in recordings of Hubay’s pupils at the start of the century.

Intermediate Notes

Especially where a slide occurred within the same bow direction, Hubay’s recordings show that its intermediate note was generally made audible. Most usually, the durations of such intermediate notes were in proportion to the tempo of the music and the length of the slide; slides in faster music employed proportionately quicker intermediate notes than those in slower music. In most of his recordings, Hubay’s slides begin from the final third or so of the departing note so that the intermediate note occupies up to 12.5% of the total time available for the slide.\(^{89}\) Where Hubay did not vary the expression of identical or similar material by changing the location of a slide, he occasionally varied the character of its intermediate note on a second statement so that it was accordingly more prominent than on a first appearance, as for his treatment of slide speed. In his recording

\(^{87}\) Discography item 53.
\(^{88}\) Discography item 52.
\(^{89}\) Percentage calculated from an average taken from a sample of Hubay’s recordings.
of his Scène... No. 12/590 (see ex. 2.56), for example, Hubay’s B-slide contains a barely audible intermediate note (d¹) whereas the intermediate note in the repeat of the figure two bars later is given more prominence. The same pattern of varying expression may be observed with his B-slides in b. 13 and b. 19 of the same work, the slide in b. 19 having the more prominent intermediate note (see ex. 2.56). Similarly, the B-slide in his recording of Handel’s Larghetto2191 (see ex. 2.60) is executed with less prominence than in the corresponding location in b. 22.

The earliest available recordings of Vecsey and Szigeti show that their intermediate notes were typically less prominent than Hubay’s. Also, variety of expression in repeated material was not achieved by modifying the prominence of such notes in their performances. This suggests that such practices were not advised by Hubay at the beginning of the century. But recordings show that the prominence of intermediate notes increased in the years following Vecsey’s and Szigeti’s lessons with Hubay. The intermediate notes used in Vecsey’s 1904 recording of Schumann’s Traumerei92 are thus less audible than those in his 1910 version.93 Similarly, Szigeti’s intermediate notes in his 1908 Rubinstein Romance Op. 44 No. 194 are less prominent than in his 1911 recording of Beethoven’s Kreutzer Sonata Op. 47, 2,95 and likewise with his 1908 and 1913 recordings of Hubay’s Zephir Op. 30 No. 5.96 Hubay’s tendency to exaggerate the

90 Discography item 53.
91 Discography item 49.
92 Discography item 225.
93 Discography item 226.
94 Discography item 185.
95 Discography item 128.
96 Discography items 157 and 159.
audibility of intermediate notes in performances of his own Hungarian-character pieces
was demonstrably not transmitted to his pupils. Rather, for Szigeti (the only Hubay pupil
to record works of this type at the beginning of the century), the difference in expression
between this musical style and others was achieved by the type of slide used and by the
frequency with which slides were employed.

Manner of Execution

Dismissing Joachim’s prescription that an expressive slide should ‘occur between two
notes in the same bow stroke,’97 Hubay occasionally used a portamento between two
notes unconnected by a slur. Hubay’s recordings show that where this was the case, he
frequently began a slide from a very quick restatement of the departing note in the new
bow direction, creating an audible ‘crushed note’ effect. This practice, writes Flesch,
‘offends against basic musical integrity and, therefore, should be rejected.’98 That this
was part of Hubay’s approach in each of his recordings illustrates, nonetheless, that he
viewed its application as appropriate regardless of the style of repertoire being played, as
exemplified in ex. 2.79/44 and 45 and ex. 2.59/32-33.99 Hubay used this effect most
prominently in his Hungarian-character pieces, as shown in his recording of Scène… No.
12/7 and 17 (see ex. 2.56). In addition, its occasional use in the recordings of his pupils
at the beginning of the century indicates that he may have advocated it in the classroom

---

99 See also Hubay’s recordings of Bach-Wilhelmj’s Air… /2, 8, 11, 17-19 and 21
(discography item 48); and Handel’s Larghetto/11, 17, 37-38, 48-50 and 55 (discography
item 49).
(illustrated by ex. 2.91 and ex. 2.92). Alternatively, although less frequently, recordings show that Hubay began a slide in the bow direction of the departing note so that only the end of the slide was audible at the start of the new bow, in agreement with Flesch’s preferred execution.100 Where a slide between bow directions involved an intermediate note, Hubay’s practice may be similarly summarised as occurring in two possible ways: the change of bow was either just after the intermediate note so that only the final portion of the slide was audible at the start of the new bow direction; or he began to slide on the new bow direction itself from a brief but audible statement of the intermediate note.

As with other modifications to the character of his slides, Hubay occasionally varied the prominence with which departing notes were restated where a slide was maintained in an identical location in repeated figures. The single-finger slide his recording of his Scène... No. 12/11101 (see ex. 2.56), for example, begins within a change of bow (only the end of the slide is audible) whereas when the figure is repeated in b. 17 the slide begins from a prominent ‘crushed-note’ restatement of the departing note (b3). Similarly, the L-slide in his Scène... No. 5/31 (see ex. 2.59) begins within a bow change but when the figure is repeated in b. 35 the slide commences from an audible a3 intermediate note. As elsewhere, therefore, Hubay’s approach to varying expression in repeated material was to alter the second appearance of a slide so that its character had more emphasis than in the first. Recordings indicate that Hubay’s pupils at the beginning of the century did not vary material in this way, suggesting that the ploy had not figured in his teaching.

101 Discography item 53.
In summary, recordings show similarities between Hubay’s use of slides and that of his pupils at the beginning of the century. Such congruities of technique and style provide evidence to support the idea that ‘familial’ resemblances can be observed between a teacher and his pupils. For example, Hubay’s editions and his pupils’ recordings in the early 1900s share a frequent use of single-finger glissandi in common figurations as well as single-finger and B-portamenti. Similarly, Hubay’s pupils’ use at this time of some L-slides between small intervals and frequent sliding to a natural-harmonic corresponds to Hubay’s practices in the same period. Sources illustrate that Hubay’s strategy of introducing slides in different locations during a repeat of a figure for the sake of variety was often meticulously adopted by his pupils. Such rigour in the application of this tactic by a number of young players during or following their mutual apprenticeship with Hubay suggests that it had been taught to them rather than casually appropriated from elsewhere. An explanation for a litany of similarities as this may be assumed from Zipernovszky’s observation that ‘the playing of Hubay’s pupils mirrored the playing of their teacher because he demonstrated.’

But in recordings of Hubay’s pupils at the beginning of the century there is also evidence of other influences. Recordings of Vecsey made when he was still under Hubay’s tutelage thus show very discreet intermediate notes, suggesting that such a practice was advised by Hubay. In recordings made only a few years later, however, the prominence of Vecsey’s intermediate notes, as with

---

102 Halmy, F., and Zipernovszky, M., *Hubay Jenö*, p. 165
Szigeti’s and Hubay’s in the same period, potentially signify other (‘environmental’) influences and trends. 103

Fingering in Performances by Hubay’s Pupils

Slide Type

Glissando

The Hubay-like tendency to rely primarily on single-finger slides to move small distances in technical shifts was preserved in some common figurations, albeit with a gradually reduced frequency throughout the period surveyed. In his 1930 recording of Sarasate’s Malagueña Op. 21/49 104 (ex. 2.93), for example, Szentgyörgyi uses glissandi in ascending scalar passages. Similarly, Szigeti remains faithful to all of Hubay’s slides in his 1932 recording of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 1/91-99 105 (see ex. 2.1).

Comparatively, in his 1947 recording 106 he avoids these slides by using extension fingerings, preserving only one single-finger slide (2-2) in b. 93. In his 1961 recording 107 and 1954 television broadcast Szigeti omits all slides in this passage, further modifying his performance to leave out the slide in b. 93 by using contracted fingering. That this

103 Such stimuli may have been experienced on an individual or a general level. The material presented in this chapter (and in the thesis as a whole) provides valuable data for research investigating these influences.
104 Discography item 109.
105 Discography item 131.
106 Discography item 134.
107 Discography item 135.
was representative of his practice is clarified by the same fingering in his 1962 edition. Similarly, the traditionally observed 2-2 shifts in Beethoven’s *Romance* in F major Op. 50/77-78 (exemplified in Auer’s edition - see ex. 2.5) may be avoided if Szigeti’s 1964 *Notebook* solution is used.108

Portamento

A challenge to the selective use of expressive single-finger slides and a growing tendency to use more B- and L-slides, especially between smaller intervals, emerged by the 1920s. In general, this was due to an increasing predilection for what Szigeti describes as ‘schmaltz’109 in performances at this time; B- and L-slides contained the extra aspect of intermediate notes. Szigeti’s use of a descending B-slide (3-2) rather than Hubay’s single-finger slide (3-3) in his 1932 recording of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 1/515110 (ex. 2.94) illustrates the change in attitude. Similarly, in recordings of Drdla’s *Souvenir*111 (ex. 2.95) made by Ormandy112 (1928) and d’Arányi113 (1929), each use a prominent descending B-slide (3-1) whereas Drdla himself uses a single-finger slide (1-1) in his 1920 recording114 and 1913 printed edition. In the same way, in her 1929 recording of Vitali’s *Chaconne*115 (ex. 2.96), d’Arányi uses a descending B-slide (3-2) whereas Charlier, d’Arányi’s senior by thirty six years, suggests a single-finger slide (3-
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110 Discography item 131.
111 As with bb. 26-27 and bb. 87-88.
112 Discography item 94.
113 Discography item 15.
114 Discography item 26.
115 Discography item 25.
3) in his 1922 edition, and in her 1923 recording of Joachim’s *Romanze*\(^{116}\) (ex. 2.97) she uses a B-slide (2-1) where Joachim employs a single-finger slide (2-2) in the corresponding place in his 1903 performance.\(^ {117}\) Likewise, Szigeti uses a prominent descending B-slide (4-3) in his 1932 recording of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 2/43 (beat 4)\(^ {118}\) (see ex. 2.36) whereas Hubay’s fingering entirely obviates the need to slide. In this way, too, Brown\(^ {119}\) (1924) and Szigeti\(^ {120}\) (1933) each use an audible descending B-slide (4-3) in Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, 1/10 (ex. 2.98) whereas Hubay advises remaining in third position until the final quaver of the bar.

The use of L-slides also increased from their selective application at the beginning of the twentieth century. But its advocates do not appear to have used it as an alternative to the single-finger slide (as with the B-type). Rather, they regarded it as a super-expressive device and often employed it where there was no necessity to change position, especially where *espressivo, agitato* or similar markings were indicated. Indeed, the introduction of L-slides between small intervals suggests that this slide type was occasionally wholly expressive regardless of the fact that a change of position was neither technically necessary nor traditionally observed at the same locus. Szentgyorgyi’s c. 1930 recording of Paganini’s Violin Concerto No. 1 Op. 6, 1/242-243\(^ {121}\) (ex. 2.99) is a case in point; he uses a prominent L-slide where Hubay’s 1909 edition suggests no such slide. Similarly,
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\(^{116}\) Discography item 18.

\(^{117}\) Discography item 60.

\(^{118}\) Discography item 131.

\(^{119}\) Discography item 3.

\(^{120}\) Discography item 170.

\(^{121}\) Discography item 108.
d’Arányi uses an L-slide in her recording of Vitali’s *Chaconne*/30-31\(^{122}\) (ex. 2.100) whereas Charlier’s edition implies no slide and Ormandy, in Drdla’s *Souvenir*/19\(^{123}\) (ex. 2.101), and Geyer, in Dvorák-Kreisler’s *Slavonic Dance* No. 2/83-84 (ex. 102) and 126 and 128\(^{124}\) (ex. 103), each use such a slide in locations where older editors advised that no slide should be used. The L-slide was gradually dropped from frequent use by the 1950s, epitomised by Lionel Tertis’ preference for single-finger and B-slides. He states ‘a more or less general rule to be observed… between two notes *in the same bow* is that the finger that is on the string operates the… slide, not the finger that is off the string.’\(^{125}\)

Hubay’s special applications of portamento were used liberally in performances from his pupils in the 1920s and 30s. D’Arányi and Ormandy, for example, both made frequent use of slides to an open-string (as shown in examples 2.101/17 and 2.104) and to a harmonic (exemplified by ex. 2.105/77-78) and their recordings illustrate that players began increasingly to use audible slides across adjacent strings, especially in ascending figures accompanied by a *crescendo* (as shown in ex. 2.106). Comparatively, recordings show that the incidences of players using such effects became gradually reduced by the 1940s. Such a change of attitude is exemplified in Flesch’s indictment as early as 1923 that a slide to an open-string ‘is not particularly recommended… [it] suggests a questionable coquettishness and, used frequently, an acute lack of refinement.’\(^{126}\) This thinking had longevity; Lionel Tertis insists that ‘[portamento] must never be employed

\(^{122}\) Discography item 25.
\(^{123}\) Discography item 94.
\(^{124}\) Discography item 42.
from a note to an open string – a more unhealthy sound could not be imagined.\textsuperscript{127}

Recorded sources typify this shift in opinion. In his 1932 recording of Hubay’s Scène… No. 3/7-8\textsuperscript{128} (ex. 2.107), Szigeti uses a prominent descending slide to the open g-string whereas in his 1941 version\textsuperscript{129} the slide is absent. Recordings illustrate that by the 1960s the device was used almost exclusively only by the older generation of Hubay’s pupils. Thus, in his 1955\textsuperscript{130} and 1962\textsuperscript{131} recordings of Bartók’s String Quartet No. 5, Adagio Molto/21 (ex. 2.108), Székely does not use a slide whereas Végh (the elder of the two players) slides audibly to the open e-string in his 1972 version.\textsuperscript{132} Similarly, the frequent occurrence of sliding to a harmonic became limited to performances from the older generation of players, as exemplified by d’Arányi’s implications in her 1934 edition of F. S. Kelly’s Serenade, 1/55 (ex. 2.109) and 1/105 (ex. 2.110) and by a variety of recordings.\textsuperscript{133} The growing tendency for players to exclude this effect (or at least to limit its use) is illustrated by a comparison of Szigeti’s 1964 edition of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77, 1/208 (ex. 2.111) and his three recordings of the work. In recordings made in 1928\textsuperscript{134} and 1948\textsuperscript{135} Szigeti slides upwards to a\textsuperscript{2} (harmonic) using a single-finger

\textsuperscript{127} Tertis, L., My Viola, p. 149.
\textsuperscript{128} Discography item 161.
\textsuperscript{129} Discography item 162.
\textsuperscript{130} Discography item 101.
\textsuperscript{131} Discography item 103.
\textsuperscript{132} Discography item 237.
\textsuperscript{133} For example: Telmányi’s 1959 recording of Hubay’s Scène… No. 4/19 (discography item 206); Szigeti’s 1951 recording of Brahms’ Piano Trio Op. 87, 1/46 (discography item 141); Szigeti’s 1948 and 1959 recordings of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77, 2/116 (discography items 140 and 143); d’Arányi’s 1935 recording of Brahms Piano Trio Op. 87, 2/143 and 150 (discography item 12); Zathureczky’s c. 1950 recording of Corelli’s La Folia Op. 5 No. 12/40-42 and 57 (discography item 243); and d’Arányi’s 1934 edition of F. S. Kelly’s Serenade, 2/112.
\textsuperscript{134} Discography item 137.
\textsuperscript{135} Discography item 140.
slide (4-4). In his 1959 performance,\textsuperscript{136} however, this slide is omitted and his 1964 edition suggests moving to fourth position on e\textsuperscript{2} to avoid a slide in this location.

Similarly, the traditionally observed slide (2-2) to e\textsuperscript{3} (harmonic) in Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 1/141 (ex. 2.112) used in Szigeti’s 1932\textsuperscript{137} and 1947\textsuperscript{138} recordings and implied in editions by Wilhelmj, Joachim and Hubay is missing from Szigeti’s 1954 television broadcast, 1961 recording\textsuperscript{139} and 1962 edition. Instead, Szigeti advises that the harmonic can be executed in third position with no previous slide.

The incidence of players sliding across adjacent strings was similarly restricted to the older generation of players. In her 1938 recording of Schumann’s Violin Concerto, 2/21\textsuperscript{140} (ex. 2.113), for example, d’Arányi slides downwards from f\textsuperscript{2} to e-flat\textsuperscript{2} on the a-string before playing the printed f\textsuperscript{4} on the d-string. She then slides upwards from f\textsuperscript{4} on the d-string to an audible intermediate note a tone higher before crossing strings to play f\textsuperscript{2} (b. 22) on the a-string in third position. Likewise, in her 1935 recording of Brahms’ Piano Trio Op. 87, 2/72-73\textsuperscript{141} (ex. 2.114), d’Arányi uses this effect. Her 1934 edition of F. S. Kelly’s \textit{Serenade} provides further evidence for the application of slides across adjacent strings by players of her generation. Elsewhere in the edition she typically prescribes to which string her fingering applies, but in 2/24-25 (ex. 2.116) d’Arányi makes no suggestion that this phrase should be played entirely on the a-string. Indeed, the absence of a specific \textit{sul LA} direction implies that each of b-flat\textsuperscript{1} to c\textsuperscript{3} (marked ‘x’ ) and f-sharp\textsuperscript{1} to

\textsuperscript{136} Discography item 143.
\textsuperscript{137} Discography item 131.
\textsuperscript{138} Discography item 134.
\textsuperscript{139} Discography item 135.
\textsuperscript{140} Discography item 23.
\textsuperscript{141} Discography item 12.
e-flat\textsuperscript{2} (marked 'y') are to be executed using a short slide on the lower string. This hypothesis is supported by her printed \textit{espressivo} marking on the second beat of 2/25 and by the previously noted tendency to slide between the notes of one statement of a figure but not between the notes of a neighbouring repeat; d'Arányi indicates that f-sharp\textsuperscript{1} to e-flat\textsuperscript{2} in the first beat of 2/25 should remain in second position. Examples from recordings by Geyer made in the late 1940s illustrate the same tendency (exemplified by ex. 2.115).

Frequency of Application and Location

In parallel to the increasing frequency of use of portamento in the 1910s - 1930s, some players adopted strategies to avoid an over-sentimentalised reading; either omitting slides altogether or controlling their application. In her recordings from the mid-1920s, Fachiri uses a simpler performing style than many of her contemporaries.\textsuperscript{142}Szegedi's three available recordings of Hubay's \textit{Zephir} Op. 30 No. 5/33-40\textsuperscript{143} (see ex. 2.46) also illustrate the trend to avoid slides. In his 1908 and 1913 versions he employs frequent single-finger slides on descending thirds and ascending tones as well as a B-slide in b. 39. In his 1926 recording, however, all but two single-finger slides (in bb. 33-34) are absent. Szegedi's changing approach to Brahms' Violin Sonata Op. 108, 1/3 (ex. 2.117) also

\textsuperscript{142} Fachiri's 1928 recordings of Beethoven's Violin Sonata in G major Op. 96 (discography item 35) and J. S. Bach's Violin Sonata in A major BWV 1015, 2, (discography item 32) have a notable absence of portamento. Similarly, her 1925 recording of J. S. Bach's Partita for Solo Violin in B minor BWV 1002/\textit{Sarabande} (discography item 28) uses virtually no slides (except on larger distances covering harmonically important intervals such as b. 26 and b. 30).

\textsuperscript{143} Discography items 157, 159 and 161.
illustrates this tendency. In his 1937 recording\textsuperscript{144} he uses a prominent descending single-finger slide (1-1) but in 1964 writes that this figure should be played 'without a slide… so the full meaning of the typical contrary motion hairpins can be understood.'\textsuperscript{145} Similarly, in his 1961 recording\textsuperscript{146} and 1962 edition of Beethoven's Violin Concerto Op. 61, 2/45 (see ex. 2.10), Szigeti omits the slow ascending single-finger slide (3-3) used in his 1932 and 1947 recordings,\textsuperscript{147} rather playing the two notes in third position. Likewise, the single-finger slide (1-1) in 2/65 and the B-slide (3-2) in 2/66 (ex. 2.37) which Szigeti introduces in 1932 and 1947 are omitted in his later performance and edition. In addition, the prominent ascending B-slide (1-2) Szigeti uses in 1932 and 1947 in 3/142-143 (see ex. 2.50) (where Hubay, Wilmelmj and Joachim each mark \textit{espressivo}) is absent from his later performances. His 1962 edition provides specific \textit{sul LA} and \textit{sul MI} directions here for f\textsuperscript{2} and d\textsuperscript{3} respectively, indicating that the player should execute both notes in fifth position and obviating the need to slide between them. Similarly, recordings of Brown (1924)\textsuperscript{148} and Szigeti (1933)\textsuperscript{149} playing Mendelssohn's Violin Concerto Op. 64, 1/147-160 (ex. 2.118) show the two approaches to the frequency of using slides; Brown, representing the 'schmaltzy' style, uses six slides in this passage whereas Szigeti employs only two.

Recordings also show that by the end of the period surveyed, slides were used more frequently by older players than by their younger contemporaries. In his 1959 recording

\textsuperscript{144} Discography item 138.
\textsuperscript{145} Szigeti, J., \textit{Notebook}, p. 151.
\textsuperscript{146} Discography item 135.
\textsuperscript{147} Discography item 131 and 134.
\textsuperscript{148} Discography item 3.
\textsuperscript{149} Discography item 170.
of Franck's Sonata in A major, 3/13 and 16\textsuperscript{150} (ex. 2.119), for example, Zathureczky uses ascending single-finger slides. Playing this material in the same year, however, Johanna Martzy\textsuperscript{151} (Zathureczky's junior by twenty one years) does not use a slide in either figure. Similarly, in his 1941 performance of Schubert's Sonatina Op. 137 No. 1, 1/38-43\textsuperscript{152} (ex. 2.120) Szigeti uses five slides compared to Martzy's two in 1957.\textsuperscript{153} Likewise, Végh\textsuperscript{154} uses five slides in the opening four bars of Bartók's String Quartet No. 1 (ex. 2.121) compared to Székely's\textsuperscript{155} one discreet single-finger slide at the end of b. 4. The two players clearly viewed Bartók's \textit{moto espressivo} marking differently, Székely seeing less of a relationship between \textit{espressivo} and portamento than his older colleague. A similar comparison may be made between Végh's and Székely's playing in their respective recordings of Bartók's String Quartet No. 3, 1/9-12 (ex. 2.122).

In addition to the practice of omitting slides, a more controlled approach to their introduction emerged by the middle of the century. The incidence of players using successive slides, for example, gradually reduced so that by around 1940 only a few of Hubay's older pupils regularly located slides in this proximity, following Flesch's prescription that 'two portamenti in a row definitely do not have a beautiful effect.'\textsuperscript{156} In his 1904 and 1910 recordings of Schumann's \textit{Träumerei}\textsuperscript{22-23}\textsuperscript{157} (see ex. 2.47), for example, Vecsey slides downwards from g\textsuperscript{2} to f\textsuperscript{2} before immediately using an ascending

\textsuperscript{150} Discography item 244.
\textsuperscript{151} Discography item 79.
\textsuperscript{152} Discography item 189.
\textsuperscript{153} Discography item 90.
\textsuperscript{154} Discography item 237.
\textsuperscript{155} Discography item 103.
\textsuperscript{156} Flesch, C., \textit{The Art}, Vol. 1, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{157} Discography item 225 and 226.
single-finger slide to reach a² (harmonic). Comparatively, in his 1925 performance of the piece, 158 the slide between g² and f² is omitted. Similarly, in his c. 1909 recording of Bach-Wilhelmj’s Air.../4159 (see ex. 2.34), Vecsey uses a single-finger slide succeeded immediately by a B-slide whereas in his c. 1933 performance160 the first slide is left out. In the same way, in his 1925 recording of Schubert-Wilhelmj’s Ave Maria/3-4161 (see ex. 2.83), Vecsey removes the ascending L-slide between a and e¹ (in the final beat of b. 3) and the slide between e¹ and d-sharp¹ (at the start of b. 4) he had used in 1910 so as to avoid successive slides. Similarly, in his 1975 edition of Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, 2/37 (see ex. 2.18), Szigeti removes the B-slide used in his 1933 recording, and in his 1940 and 1944 recordings of Beethoven’s Kreutzer Sonata Op. 47, 2/38 (see ex. 2.80) and 53162 (see ex. 2.81), he omits the successive slides he had used in his 1911 version. But this approach to controlling the use of successive slides was not universally adopted and most recordings by older players in the 1950-60s demonstrate little consistency in this respect; rather, the younger generation adhered more stringently to an economical approach. In her 1954 recording of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77, 3/267163 (ex. 2.123), for example, Martzy uses only one ascending slide (in the final triplet figure) and no slides in the penultimate triplet group, other shifts of position being navigated silently. Comparatively, in all three of Szigeti’s recordings,164 successive slides are used in each of the two triplet groups.

158 Discography item 227.
159 Discography item 209.
160 Discography item 210.
161 Discography item 224.
162 Discography items 132 and 133.
163 Discography item 74.
164 Discography items 137, 140 and 143.
While the occurrence of successive slides was reduced by the 1940s, the regularity with
which two or more slides were used in succession in Hungarian-style repertoire
increased. In his 1932 recording of Hubay’s Scène... No. 3/11-12\(^{165}\) (ex. 2.124), for
instance, Szigeti uses a prominent descending single-finger slide (2-2) followed
immediately by an ascending B-slide (2-4), succeeding these with the same slide types in
this proximity in bb. 12-13. Similarly, the ascending slide in bb. 36-37 (ex. 2.128) from
g\(^2\) to g\(^3\) is followed immediately by a descending slide between g\(^3\) and c\(^2\) and the
succession of three slides in bb. 61-63 (ex. 2.125) clarifies that Szigeti had viewed slides
in such closeness as appropriate in this style of repertoire. Indeed, in his 1941 recording
of the same piece\(^{166}\) these slides remain in their 1932 locations whereas in other repertoire
the positioning of slides was demonstrably reviewed to avoid such a close density of
portamenti. Similarly, in Telmányi’s 1942 recording of Hubay’s Scène... No. 2/20-21\(^{167}\)
and his 1959 performance of Scène... No. 4/5-14\(^{168}\) a more exaggerated application of
successive slides may be observed than in other of his performances from the same time.

As part of the trend to control the location and frequency of slides, players in the 1930s
typically used a strategy reminiscent of Joachim’s and Hubay’s own rather than randomly
situating their slides. This approach was clearest in sequential material and in repeated or
similar figures. Thus, in his 1933 recording Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64,

\(^{165}\) Discography item 161.
\(^{166}\) Discography item 162.
\(^{167}\) Discography item 205.
\(^{168}\) Discography item 206.
2/11\(^{169}\) (ex. 2.126), Szigeti uses no slide between \(f^2\) and \(e^2\) but when the same material is played again in 2/19 he introduces a prominent descending single-finger slide (2-2) between these two notes. Likewise, Szigeti uses no slides in 2/13 whereas in the same material in the following bar two slides are used. Furthermore, Szigeti’s descending slide to \(d^1\) (open-string) in his 1932 and 1941 recordings of Hubay’s _Scène_... No. 3/34\(^{170}\) (see ex. 2.128) is absent from the repeat of this material in b. 42; he instead uses a slide between the preceding \(f^1\) and b-flat\(^1\). In this way, too, in his 1926 edition of his own Sonata for Solo Violin Op. 1, 3/8 (ex. 2.127), Székely implies a slide between c-sharp\(^3\) and a\(^2\) whereas in the sequential repeat of this figure in 3/10 his fingering suggests no slide, rather remaining in first position. In 3/11 (in the corresponding location of the final statement in the sequence) Székely again recommends a descending slide for the sake of expressive variety.\(^{171}\)

This approach persisted, clarified by Szigeti’s explanation of how extension fingering can remove an excess of unwanted slides in sequences. He writes ‘a succession of slides can be avoided, something that is especially desirable in phrases such as this (fig. 2.5).’\(^{172}\)

Charlier’s 1922 edition of the work provides an apposite example of the older manner of fingering in this passage.

\(^{169}\) Discography item 170.

\(^{170}\) Discography items 161 and 162.

\(^{171}\) This strategy was not observed by all of Hubay’s pupils, however, despite its apparent importance in Hubay’s teaching; Szentgyörgyi uses a single-finger slide (4-4) in 1/245 as 1/246 in his c. 1930 recording of Paganini’s Violin Concerto No. 1 Op. 6, (discography item 108) (see ex. 2.84), contrary to his teacher’s editorial suggestion to vary the location of slides in these two bars.

\(^{172}\) Szigeti, J., _SoV_, p. 89.
Recordings show this strategy to have been manifest. For example, showing this idea on a larger scale, Szigeti uses a prominent descending B-slide (3-2) between $a^2$ and $c^2$ in his 1961 recording\(^{173}\) and 1962 edition of Beethoven's Violin Concerto Op. 61, 2/80 whereas in the same material in b. 66 (see ex. 2.37) no slide is audible. He does not make this difference in his 1932 or 1947 versions;\(^{174}\) rather, a B-slide is used in b. 66 as well as b. 80. Similarly, Zathureczky uses a single-finger slide in his 1957 recording of Franck's Violin Sonata, 2/109 (ex. 2.129),\(^{175}\) whereas the same material in b. 110 is played without a slide. Examples 2.130 - 2.132 inclusive also show the same pattern of positioning slides in different locations in repeated or similar material.

\(^{173}\) Discography item 135.
\(^{174}\) Discography items 141 and 134.
\(^{175}\) Discography item 244.
Sources illustrate that within the context of changes to the type, location and frequency of use of portamento, players' awareness that a variety of expressive means should be used for differing musical styles increasingly influenced their application of the device. In his 1937 recording of Tchaikovsky’s String Quartet No. 1/Andante Cantabile\textsuperscript{176} and in his 1937 performance of Juan Manén’s Chanson Adagietto Op. A-8 No. 1,\textsuperscript{177} for instance, Székely uses slides more liberally than in his Porpora Sonata of the same year.\textsuperscript{178}

However, even within the context of 'Romantic' repertoire most younger players remained reluctant to overdo the frequency of their slides; in the \textit{molto espressivo} section (bb. 138-144) of the Hungarian Quartet's recording of Tchaikovsky’s Andante Cantabile (where Tchaikovsky’s performance directions suggest an intensification of the expression), for example, Székely uses no more slides than in previous appearances of the same material.

Slide Character

The sentimental style of performance typified by recordings from the 1920s was achieved, in part, by modifications to the character of slides as well as by the increased frequency of use of all three types of portamento.

\textsuperscript{176} Discography item 107.  
\textsuperscript{177} Discography item 105.  
\textsuperscript{178} Discography item 106.
Slide Speed

As previously observed in the earliest recordings surveyed, slides were generally quick regardless of the speed of the music. However, by the 1920s they were typically slower and more pronounced and their speed not usually dependent on the overall tempo (except in the case of slides in fast tempi). Indeed, Flesch concedes in 1923 that slides need not always be fast, writing '[portamento] can be executed either slowly or rapidly, according to personal taste and feeling.' In addition, recordings from this time indicate that slides tended to leave the departing note earlier so that the slide itself lasted longer, especially in B- and L-slides, as in Hubay's performances. This is illustrated by Vecsey's 1904, 1910 and 1925 recordings of Träumerei, in his 1925 version the initial part of most B-slides is much slower and more pronounced than in his two earlier recordings. Furthermore, Vecsey begins his slides earlier in 1925 than in 1904 or 1910. Similarly, in her 1923 recording of Joachim's Romanza, d'Arányi's slides tend to remain on the departing note for longer than Joachim's. In b. 91 (see ex. 2.16), for example, Joachim's B-slide moves from the departing note much later than d'Arányi's so that the slide is quicker and the process of moving from one note to the next is rhythmically more even. But the use of late-starting slides occasionally interfered with the steady tempo of a figure, as in Hubay's recordings. In her recording of Schubert's Piano Trio D. 898, 2/96 (ex. 2.133), for instance, d'Arányi disrupts the evenness of a group of four semiquavers, beginning her descending single-finger slide (2-2) slowly so that d-sharp is effectively
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180 Discography items 225, 226 and 227.
181 Discography item 18.
182 Discography item 22.
lengthened and the time ‘made up’ by shortening the following c-sharp. In 2/106 (ex. 2.134) she again slows down the first two semiquavers of the bar by using a slow slide and compensates for the slight tempo distortion by using a fast slide between the final two notes of the group. Likewise, Brown’s acceleration in tempo in his 1924 recording of Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, 1/156-7 \( ^{183} \) (see ex. 2.118) is compensated by a slight ritardando in b. 159, Brown using a slow descending B-slide to exaggerate the change in speed. By the 1950s, however, recordings show that players generally agreed that the slide should be quick and that it should begin from the end of the departing note regardless of the tempo of the music. Thus, in Szigeti’s 1948 and 1959 recordings of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77, \( ^{184} \) the speed of each slide is typically quicker than in his 1928 performance. \( ^{185} \) Recordings show, however, that the speed of slides from the older generation was generally slower than those used by younger players recorded in the same period.

As with other aspects of portamento character, the speed of a slide was increasingly used to make stylistic differences between different types of repertoire. In this way, in his 1932 and 1941 recordings of Hubay’s Scène... No. 3, \( ^{186} \) the speed of Szigeti’s slides is slow, beginning from a somewhat sluggish initial slide as in recordings from earlier in his career. Furthermore, in the 1941 version he uses slower slides than in the 1932 recording; Szigeti progressively exaggerated the slowness of a slide in this type of piece, therefore, while concurrently quickening its speed in other repertoire. His decision to use

\[ ^{183} \text{Discography item 3.} \]
\[ ^{184} \text{Discography items 140 and 143.} \]
\[ ^{185} \text{Discography item 137.} \]
\[ ^{186} \text{Discography items 161 and 162.} \]
a slower slide in these pieces than in other repertoire recorded at the same time, purposefully referencing, it seems, the style of twenty years previously, is shared by Telmányi. Also, in both players’ recordings, slides are occasionally used either to quicken the tempo following a *ritardando* (using a fast slide) or to slacken the speed of part of a figure to compensate for a previous *accelerando* (using a slow slide), as previously described. Similarly, in her 1966 recording of Kreisler’s *Rondino/53* (ex. 2.135) Martzy’s slide is initially slow. The time ‘lost’ in her previous *accelerando* is made up. In other recordings Martzy does not use slides in this way, rather her slides are mostly quick, suggesting that she had modified the character of her slides to suit this type of music.

Intermediate Notes

With the increase in the use of B- and L-slides in the first three decades of the twentieth century came the consequent stylistic tendency for players to exaggerate the prominence of intermediate notes. This was achieved by prolonging the time given to the intermediate note itself and by maintaining an audible dynamic during the slide. Szigeti recalls that this had been a common practice in the 1920s. He writes in 1964 ‘when I first started playing the Brahms Concerto (some forty five years ago) I could always anticipate with an acute distaste the orchestral passage which invariably sounded like this;’
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187 Discography items 205 and 206.
188 Discography item 83.
Recordings clarify that the adoption of frequent audible intermediate notes was an accepted stylistic feature regardless of the type of repertoire at this time. In their separate recordings of Joachim’s *Romanze*91 (see ex. 2.27), Joachim (1903)90 and d’Arányi (1923)91 each use a descending B-slide (3-1) from third to first position. The character of d’Arányi’s slide differs from Joachim’s not only in its slower speed and earlier point of departure but also in the prominence of its g¹ intermediate note. The intermediate note of Joachim’s slide is inaudible. Vecsey’s three recordings of Schumann’s *Träumerei* (1904, 1910 and 192592) also illustrate the change in approach; the duration and strong dynamic of the intermediate notes is most exaggerated in the 1925 version (as is also the case with his c.1909 and c. 1933 recordings of Bach-Wilhelmj’s *Air*...93). But a few players began to reject the routine use of prominent intermediate notes. In Szügetti’s 1933 recording of Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, 1/231 and 23394 (ex. 2.136), for example, the intermediate notes are fairly discreet (in line with his recollections of
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90 Discography item 60.
91 Discography item 18.
92 Discography items 225, 226 and 227.
93 Discography items 209 and 210.
94 Discography item 170.
distaste at the audibility of such notes) whereas in Brown’s 1924 recording\textsuperscript{195} these are more prominent. The trend to emphasise intermediate notes less is also made clear in Szigeti’s 1927 and 1937 performances of Brahms’ Violin Sonata Op. 108/\textit{Adagio}.\textsuperscript{196} Szigeti’s intermediate notes in 1927 are longer and more audible than they are ten years later, even though each slide in the earlier version is maintained in location and type in the 1937 recording. In the same way, d’Arányi’s slides in her 1938 recording of Schumann’s Violin Concerto\textsuperscript{197} are used in the same kinds of locations and with the same frequency as those of ten or fifteen years previously, yet, as with Szigeti, the audibility of the intermediate notes themselves is diminished.

As with other aspects of changes to slide character, the reduction in the prominence of intermediate notes was most consistent in performances from younger players. In his 1959 recording of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77, 2/42\textsuperscript{198} (ex. 2.137), for example, Szigeti uses an audible $e^2$ intermediate note (albeit more discreetly than in his 1928 and 1947 versions) whereas Martzy’s slide in the corresponding place in her 1954 recording\textsuperscript{199} is executed silently. Similarly, in 1/205-207 (see ex. 2.111), the intermediate notes of Marzty’s B-slides are inaudible whereas Szigeti executes the same slides with prominent intermediate notes in each of his three recordings, despite his self-proclaimed ‘distaste’ of the use of this effect by others in this material, illustrating a conspicuous disparity between theory and practice. The same comparison may be noted in recordings

\textsuperscript{195} Discography item 3.
\textsuperscript{196} Discography items 136 and 138.
\textsuperscript{197} Discography item 23.
\textsuperscript{198} Discography item 143.
\textsuperscript{199} Discography item 74.
of Schubert’s Sonatina Op. 137, 2/7 (ex. 2.138); Szigeti\textsuperscript{202} (1941) uses pronounced intermediate notes whereas Martzy\textsuperscript{201} (1957) does not.

The gradual reduction in the audibility of the mechanics of a slide by the 1950s may be viewed within the wider context of a tendency for players to make greater distinctions between various styles of music; in character-pieces or ‘Romantic’ repertoire the intermediate note was typically more exaggerated than in earlier repertoire. For example, Szigeti’s B-slide (4-1) in his 1932 recording of Hubay’s \textit{Scène}... No. 3/3\textsuperscript{202} (see ex. 2.128) contains a loud intermediate note (f\textsuperscript{3}) (and even more so in his 1941 performance of the same piece), whereas in other repertoire recorded in the same period the intermediate notes are more discreet. Similarly, in his recordings of Hubay’s \textit{Scène}... No. 2/5\textsuperscript{203} (1942) and \textit{Scène}... No. 4/13\textsuperscript{204} (1959), Telmányi increases the length of his intermediate notes from their shorter duration in other repertoire. Furthermore, recordings show that the intermediate notes in younger players’ performances of character-pieces were actually louder and longer than those of the previous generation playing the same repertoire, the style of whose playing younger players seem to have been consciously referencing in this manner. In Martzy’s 1966 recording of Kreisler’s \textit{Rondino},\textsuperscript{205} for instance, the intermediate notes are more prominent than in d’Arányi’s 1929 performance\textsuperscript{206} and Kreisler’s own 1928 version,\textsuperscript{207} both recorded when this effect

\textsuperscript{200} Discography item 189.
\textsuperscript{201} Discography item 90.
\textsuperscript{202} Discography item 161.
\textsuperscript{203} Discography item 205.
\textsuperscript{204} Discography item 206.
\textsuperscript{205} Discography item 83.
\textsuperscript{206} Discography item 19.
was not reserved for certain repertoire (as it is by Martzy) but used routinely as an expressive device. In the same way, Szigeti’s and Telmányi’s exaggeration of the intermediate notes in their later recordings of Hubay’s Hungarian-character pieces seems to stylistically reference the playing of their teacher.

Manner of Execution

Recordings from the first decades of the twentieth century show that where a slide occurred between separate bows the departing note was often restated at the start of the new bow direction, most often regardless of the style of repertoire and type of slide. Indeed, Tertis’ description of portamento (applicable to this period) fails to mention that which Joachim had considered crucial; that slides should only ‘occur between two notes in the same bow stroke.’ Tertis writes, ‘portamento is used for dovetailing the distance between two notes which are not in the same position.’ The use of slides between bow directions with ‘crushed notes’ is exemplified by examples 2.139, 2.140 and 2.141. Likewise, an L-slide coming between two notes unconnected by a slur could begin from an audible intermediate note. Szentgyorgyi’s L-slide in his c. 1930 recording of Paganini’s Violin Concerto No. 1 Op. 6, 1/242-3 (see ex. 2.99) occurs between bow directions so that its intermediate note (f') is heard before a semitone slide (3-3) to f-sharp. Similarly, Brown uses a prominent L-slide on a bow change in his 1924

---

207 Discography item 61.
209 Tertis, L., My Viola, p. 149.
210 Discography item 108.
recording of Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, 1/147\footnote{\textit{Discography item 3}.} (see ex. 2.118), audibly beginning the slide from a d\textsuperscript{2} intermediate note on the new bow direction.

This practice gradually changed during the period surveyed so that by the 1950s the move from the departing note (or the intermediate note in an L-slide) usually began during the bow change as recommended by Flesch.\footnote{See Flesch, C., \textit{The Art}, Vol. 1, p. 18.} Indeed, Tertis recommends for an L-slide to be used where a slide occurs between bows so as to avoid the sliding from a departing note, actually concurring with Wessely’s (1913) single concession to using this type of slide. Tertis writes, ‘in the case of a portamento between two notes, \textit{each having a separate bow} the finger that is off the string generally does the sliding.’\footnote{Tertis, L., \textit{My Viola}, p. 149.} In performances from the older generation of players, however, recordings show that the ‘crushed-note’ effect was maintained and used often regardless of the kind of repertoire played and the type of slide used.\footnote{For example: Szigt\'{e}i’s 1951 recording of Brahms’ Piano Trio Op. 87, 1/1 and 22 (discography item 141); his 1947 recording of Schubert’s Piano Trio D. 898, 2/90-1 (discography item 191); Geyer’s 1947 performance of Schoeck’s Violin Concerto Op. 21, 1/12-13 and 13-14 and 2/25-26, 46-47 and 50-51 (discography item 47); her c. 1927 recording of Dvořák-Kreisler’s \textit{Slavonic Dance} No. 2/84 and 125-8 (discography item 42); and her 1946 recording of Mozart’s \textit{Adagio} K. 261/45-46 (discography item 46).} As with other aspects of portamento character, the use of restated departing notes was maintained with greater frequency and prominence in the performance of Hubay’s Hungarian-character pieces. In his 1942 recording of Hubay’s \textit{Scène... No. 2/18-65}\footnote{Discography item 205.}, for example, Telmányi uses just one slide within the same bow direction while twenty-three slides occur with ‘crushed-notes’ between notes unconnected by a slur. Example 2.142 shows the actual effect of his execution in bb. 64-
5. Similarly, Martzy’s B-slide in her recording of Kreisler’s *Rondino* 27-8 (ex. 2.143) uses a restatement of the departing note at the start of the new bow direction, whereas in other repertoire that she recorded in the same year such slides are seldom audible. As with Telmányi’s application of the effect in a specific stylistic context, the prominence of Martzy’s ‘crushed-note’ here is more exaggerated than in recordings of her forebears made up to forty years previously. As the use of restated departing notes generally declined in frequency and prominence, therefore, the application of the same effect gradually increased in regularity and loudness in the performance of character-pieces.

In summary, recordings reveal that those violinists trained by Hubay in the 1910s retained some aspects of their teacher’s approach to sliding throughout their careers – even in the midst of the major stylistic changes occurring during the period in focus. For example, the occasional use in such performances of a slide to a harmonic may also be observed in Hubay’s own recordings and in the first recordings of his pupils at the beginning of the century, suggesting some stylistic consistency. Similarly, the habit of generating expressive differences in repeated or similar material by varying the location of slides was clearly ingrained in these players’ interpretative strategies. That such tendencies can be traced through a wide sample of performances of Hubay’s pupils from their earliest to their final recordings (as well as in Hubay’s own performances) suggests a continuity of approach. But later recordings of Hubay’s pupils trained at the beginning of the century also show a clear rejection of some of the fingering principles disseminated by their teacher. By the 1940s most players thus tended to avoid an excess of single-
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216 Discography item 83.
finger glissandi. Similarly, single-finger portamenti were replaced by a greater 
preponderance of B- and L-slides (regardless of the type of repertoire) and such 
‘Hubayisms’ as slides to an open-string and those across adjacent strings were mostly 
abandoned. This suggests that players were influenced by general trends in performance 
rather than having obeyed their teacher's instructions throughout their adult careers. In 
addition, the trend to simplify performance style by avoiding slides altogether, 
exemplified by recordings of Hubay's younger pupils, shows that such performers were 
not bound by their teacher's influence. Hubay's own recordings illustrate that he, too, 
was influenced by modern trends. His slow slides, prominent intermediate notes, audible 
restated departing notes and his variation of the character of slides to produce differences 
between similar melodic material bear more resemblance to aspects of his pupils’ 
performances in the 1930s (and, therefore, to trends of that period) than to his earlier 
practices.
Chapter 3

Vibrato

The Nineteenth Century

By the mid-nineteenth century two main techniques to create vibrato on the violin were in use: left-hand vibrato and bow-vibrato. Spohr limits his survey to left-hand vibrato whereas Baillot provides a more comprehensive account, listing three possible types: left-hand vibrato; portato (bow-vibrato); and a combination of both these effects. Writers agreed that vibrato on the violin assisted the player in emulating the human voice when singing. Spohr writes ‘if a singer sings with passionate emotion… a quivering of the voice becomes noticeable. This quivering the violinist can imitate closely.’¹ Baillot uses the same metaphor, recommending that ‘vibrato gives to the sound of the instrument a likeness to a voice strongly affected by emotion.’² Similarly, Joseph Bloch (a pupil of Károly Huber) also observed that singing and violin playing were analogous in respect of vibrato, writing that ‘vibrato is an imitation of the human voice in moments of passion.’³ Most writers qualified their suggestions for using vibrato with typically cautious remarks

on controlling its application. Spohr states ‘vibrato should neither be used too often nor in the wrong place’⁴ and Baillot concedes that ‘this means of expression is very powerful, but if used too often would soon lose its power to move the listener.’⁵ The opinions of Baillot and Spohr attest to an agreement between the French and German schools in the nineteenth century on the selective application of vibrato.

Left-hand Vibrato

Spohr’s guidelines for the tasteful application of left-hand vibrato are not very specific. He suggests that vibrato may be used in ‘passionate passages’ and for the emphasis of all notes marked $f$ or $>$.⁶ He distinguishes between fast and slow vibrato; fast (owment) ‘for intensifying passionate expression and adding vehemence to accented notes’ and more slowly (owment) ‘for imparting tenderness to sustained and pathetic melody.’⁷ He adds that vibrato may also be used to enhance the effect of a crescendo so that the vibrato begins slowly and accelerates in frequency (owment). The reverse is recommended for bars indicating a diminuendo (owment), Spohr insisting, however, that ‘no sudden transition from slow to fast or vice-versa in the vibrato is advisable.’⁸ Baillot proposes that on each vibrated note ‘the violinist must begin and end by producing a tone with pure intonation’⁹ suggesting a kind of
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⁷ Ibid.
⁸ Ibid. Hereafter, Spohr’s wavy lines will be used to depict speeds of vibrato. A straight line means that no vibrato is used.
⁹ Baillot, P., *The Art*, p. 240
‘blossoming’ effect. Baillot recommends ‘about four rocking movements, one for each demisemiquaver,’ although he stresses that they should not be rhythmically measured. His examples, as with the advice given by Spohr, imply that the effect is to be used for melodically expressive notes.

The following generation contributed little to the pedagogical literature on vibrato. Joachim and Moser, for example, devote only a small section of their expansive treatise to it, typically quoting Spohr verbatim in their text. As with Spohr, too, and unlike Baillot, Joachim and Moser do not quantify a preferred number of oscillations and Spohr’s ethos of judicious abstinence prevails. Joachim and Moser write

the pupil cannot be too emphatically warned against its habitual use, particularly in the wrong place. A violinist whose taste is refined will always recognise the steady tone as the ruling (normal) one, and will use vibrato only where the expression seems to demand it.\(^{11}\)

Similarly, Auer echoes his teacher Joachim’s claim that a player’s good taste was essential in assessing where to vibrate. He comments

\(^{10}\) Ibid.
vibrato is an effect, an embellishment... only effective if the player has cultivated a delicate sense of proportion in the use of it... those who are convinced that an eternal vibrato is the secret of soulful playing... are misguided.\textsuperscript{12}

Auer singles out Joachim’s \textit{Konzert in Ungarischer Weise} Op.11 as a work ‘to be played in a style in keeping with its character, as indicated by the composer;’\textsuperscript{13} the specific direction of vibrato appears in the 1881 edition of the work (1/211) (ex. 3.1). Similarly, in his 1871 transcriptions of Brahms’ \textit{Ungarischer Tänze}, Joachim introduces \textit{ma vibrato} (in No. 4/68 (ex. 3.2) and No. 9/17) or simply \textit{vibrato} (in No. 6/45) to his printed performance directions. These isolated markings suggest that vibrato was to be selectively employed and provide useful clues as to the kind of situation where, in Joachim’s terms, ‘expression seems to demand’ the use of vibrato, that is especially during double stopped notes and in quiet passages. Furthermore (in ex. 3.2), that Joachim should add to Brahms’ \textit{pp sempre} marking, \textit{ma vibrato}, as well as a wavy line under each main melody note suggests that the inclination of players in the final quarter of the nineteenth century may have been to neglect the use of vibrato during such soft or quiet passages. Thus, his markings both prescribe a practice and hint at that which he thought to be lacking in performances of the time.

Sources indicate that Joachim’s use of vibrato was influenced by the style of the music he played. Sam Franko recalls that Joachim’s vibrato in a performance of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77 ‘did not dazzle and flatter by means of penetrating sensuousness. It was

\textsuperscript{12} Auer, L., \textit{Violin Playing}, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Ibid}, p. 18.
a tone whose limpid beauty had a transcendental quality." Comparative, Otto
Klemperer observes that in a performance of the final movement of Beethoven’s String
Quartet Op. 131 'Joachim] played like a fiery Hungarian fiddler, not at all in the
classical manner." Similarly, the judicious application of vibrato in his solo Bach
recordings (in his Adagio from BWV 1001 vibrato is used only on fermatas in b. 13, b.
16 and b. 21) and its less restrained use in his own Romanze and Brahms' Hungarian
Dances accordingly suggests that the stylistic context of the music being played was
regarded by Joachim as decisive in gauging appropriate locations to vibrate. The
classic of Joachim’s fast and narrow vibrato is more or less indistinguishable in his
solo Bach recordings as opposed to the other pieces, the difference occurring in the
frequency of use and the location of his vibrato in each case.

Bow-vibrato

Seemingly exclusive to players of the Franco-Belgian schools in the nineteenth century,
vibrato created by bow movement (as opposed to left-hand activity) was considered a
valuable expressive tool. Baillot advises that 'the portato undulation' of the bow may be
used for slow and moderate tempi and on an open-string and suggests that it may be
achieved by 'varying the pressure of the bow, slowly and softly at first then more

14 Franko, S., Chords and Discords, p. 46.
16 Discography item 56.
17 Discography item 60.
18 Discography items 58 and 59.
strongly before gently diminishing the pressure,'\textsuperscript{19} describing a similar ‘blossoming’
effect as he recommends for left-hand vibrato. But his explanation is somewhat vague,
Baillot giving no account of how the ‘pressure’ itself is to be exerted. Göthel comments
that ‘this tremulo of the bow was achieved by a movement of the arm, with only the
slightest passive movements of the wrist, performing – as it were – the motions of several
bow changes between two strings, but on one string only,'\textsuperscript{20} thereby implying a sort of
bariolage action of the right arm. Its effect, as prescribed by Baillot, is shown in ex. 3.3.
Baillot’s suggestion that a minim in \textit{Andante} should comprise only four undulations
implies that a vibration produced by this method was intended to be slow compared to
left-hand vibrato. Unlike Baillot, Lucien Capet\textsuperscript{21} (1916) explains how the alternation of
bow pressure might be achieved. Capet comments that bow pressure by itself is
insufficient and that ‘horizontal suppleness’ is important in sustaining the quality of
‘vertical pressure.'\textsuperscript{22} Capet’s advocacy of the device attests to its continued association
with the French School. Although Spohr does not mention the technique in his treatise,
Göthel writes ‘there is no doubt that Spohr knew this style of bowing.'\textsuperscript{23} But whether
Spohr or his followers approved of it as an expressive device is unlikely, it receiving no
mention in either his \textit{Violinschule} or in Jochim and Moser’s treatise.

\textsuperscript{19} Baillot, P., \textit{The Art}, p. 239.
\textsuperscript{20} Göthel, F., \textit{Das Violinspiel Spohrs unter Berücksichtigung geigentechnischer Probleme
\textsuperscript{21} A pupil of J. P. Maurin, himself a student of Baillot.
\textsuperscript{22} Capet, L., \textit{La Technique Supérieure de L’Archest}, (Paris, 1916), cited in Hauck, W.,
\textit{Vibrato}, p. 29.
The Twentieth Century

Writers agree that by the first decade of the twentieth century the concept of vibrato on the violin had changed. The judicious attitudes of Spohr, Baillot and Joachim to a special and selective application of the device gave way to a more general use, raising the stylistic profile of vibrato above that of other expressive means on the instrument. Indeed, Flesch concedes in 1930 that vibrato was the clearest indication that 'in each and every generation the need of expression is a different one,' writing,

the most striking confirmatory evidence of this change is that in the breadth of the oscillatory arc in the vibrato, which has occurred during the last thirty or forty years. It cannot be denied that half a century ago the vibrato of the great artists of our own day would have been felt to be lacking in good taste and exaggerated, while today, again, the vibrato of the artists who then lived would strike us as being cold and inexpressive.25

This same shift in attitude is summarised by the Hungarian theorist (and pupil of Hubay and Joseph Bloch) Béla Szigety's assessment that 'the selective use of vibrato no longer corresponds to the artistic taste of our time.' Describing the 'normal practice' from the 1920s onwards, Szigety prescribes that the player should use 'a firm finger with constant contact to the string' and that 'constant vibrato should be employed... without

---

25 *Ibid*.
interruption during finger changes.\textsuperscript{27} Such thinking was ubiquitous throughout the most part of the period surveyed in this thesis. Lionel Tertis urges his readers that 'the vital factor about vibrato is that it should be continuous; there must be no break in it whatsoever, especially at the moment of proceeding from one note to another.'\textsuperscript{28} But Tertis goes even further, suggesting that rather than beginning a vibrato instantly as the note is sounded, a player should start to vibrate 'infinitesimally before the bow touches the string.'\textsuperscript{29}

The acceptance of continuous vibrato was neither immediate nor universal. In 1908 The Strad likened the effect to '[a] trembling jelly on a plate in the hand of a nervous waiter.'\textsuperscript{30} With similar disapproval, Auer describes those who used it as 'misguided'\textsuperscript{31} in 1921, and Moser writes two years later of the 'chronical [sic] application... [of] this fashionable violinistic disease,'\textsuperscript{32} an opposition reflected by Kreisler's remark that 'Joachim distained [continuous vibrato].'\textsuperscript{33} As a teacher, too, Joachim preached caution in the application of this device. Jelly d'Arányi recalls that 'Oncle Jo' admonished her when she played for him part of Spohr's Seventh Violin Concerto (after she had begun lessons with Hubay), Joachim insisting that she should 'never use too much vibrato! That's circus music.'\textsuperscript{34} Similarly, Vecsey recalls that Joachim advised him in 1904

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid, p. 44.
\textsuperscript{28} Tertis, L., My Viola, p. 147.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid, p. 148.
\textsuperscript{30} Unsigned article, The Strad, (London, 1908) cited in Hauck, W., Vibrato, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{31} Auer, L., Violin Playing, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{34} MacLeod, J., The Sisters, p. 48.
following his training with Hubay to 'get rid of that excessive vibrato and slow wobble with the fingers; it... reminds me of a dirge of old women.'

That d'Arányi and Vecsey should have used an 'excessive' amount of vibrato by Joachim's standards, both players having already received instruction from Hubay, suggests that Hubay taught a more continuous form of vibrato than Joachim had advocated.

Players at the turn of the century moved towards using a continuous vibrato for two reasons: tonal individuality and musical expression. Eberhardt (1910) writes 'vibrato acts as the main function of the entire technical equipment of a violinist. The great importance of vibrato is to give the tone individuality... it is the difference in the vibrato which determines the character of tone production.'

Taking his lead from Eberhardt, Roger Leviste also comments that using vibrato conveys 'a characteristic of personality.' Comparatively, Auer's approach to vibrato represents an overlap from the thinking of the nineteenth century. He writes explicitly that the purpose of vibrato was 'to lend more expressive quality to a musical phrase, and even to a single note of a phrase.' He does not deny, however, that vibrato helped to define the individuality of a player. Indeed, elsewhere in his treatise Auer concedes that 'the playing of a violinist expresses his own individuality.' But Auer's economical Joachim-like approach to using vibrato for expressive reasons does not represent the general practice of the 1920s;

---

35 Kolneder, W., Das Buch der Violine, Atlantis (Zurich, 1972), p. 491.
38 Auer, L., Violin Playing, p. 22.
39 Ibid, p. 76.
rather, as summarised by Hauck, by this time 'a beautiful and expressive tone was a vibrated tone.'

Hauck acknowledges that from the beginning of the twentieth century 'vibrato was recognised as the most important means for realising a new ideal of sound.' This corresponds with Szigeti's previously noted observation of 'a new ideal of beauty' emerging after the First World War, and certainly it seems no coincidence that Szigeti's teenage idols, Kreisler, Ysaÿe and Elman, were the first prominent recorded violinists to make use of continuous vibrato. In addition, Szigeti's mentioning of Henri Marteau as having 'failed to develop towards this trend' provides a useful guide as what he considered outdated in terms of vibrato. Flesch describes Marteau's vibrato as having been 'somewhat slow and slack' but insists that his tone was characterised by 'purity, fullness and modulation.' This final remark implies that vibrato was certainly employed as a constituent part of his tone, albeit selectively. Marteau's recordings show this to have been the case, Marteau, as Joachim, typically vibrating only on longer held melody notes, as in his recording of Sarasate's Carmen Fantasy Op. 25, Introduction/34-38 (ex. 3.4). Henry Wood also suggested his preference for the modern approach to vibrato. He recalls that '[Joachim's playing] lacked the emotional depth of Ysaÿe's [playing],'
describing Ysaÿe's continuous vibrato at the beginning of the century as 'ravishingly

---

40 Hauck, W., Vibrato, p. 21.
41 Ibid, p. 25.
42 Szigeti, J., With Strings, p. 91.
43 Ibid.
44 Furthermore, Joachim appears to have endorsed Marteau's style of playing, inviting him to join the teaching staff at the Berlin Hochschule in 1908.
45 Flesch, C., Memoirs, p. 91
46 Discography item 63.
beautiful' and 'sensitive and refined.' Thus, for Wood and others a continuous vibrato had come to represent a more convincing and appropriate expression of 'emotional depth' than was offered by the practice of the previous century. Such thinking persisted; Tertis writes 'a supreme quality of [continuous] vibrato is an indispensible element towards expressing your innermost feelings... [it] affords the essence of beauty, of tone and expression.'

Published assessments of why and how vibrato became more liberally applied when it did are most often vague. Hauck, offering a somewhat limited explanation, notes

the main tendency [of the 1930s] was to strive for means of expression which take the mentality of modern life into account... In the chain of violent changes in modern society, ideals of expression could not remain constant. The unimpaired ability of violin playing to remain up to date is shown by the way in which it has taken part in these changes, preserving a close relationship to the present.

Likewise, Hartnack perceives that modern continuous vibrato originated in response to changes in society and wider cultural-aesthetic trends. He writes

[continuous vibrato] is the consummate expression of a widely accepted... ideal of beauty, fulfilled in the pure aestheticism from which all impurities, but also all

47 Wood, H., My Life, p. 130.
48 Tertis, L., My Viola, pp. 147-148.
problems have been eliminated. The norm of this ideal corresponds to the average of the modern consumer society... shaped by pretty and boring advertising models who woo the consumer with their sterile smile to buy Coca-Cola or toothpaste.\textsuperscript{50}

Hartnack's view also fails to answer the question of how continuous vibrato had become the new tone ideal. Most writers agree that Ysaÿe first used a continuous vibrato and that Kreisler extended this approach to use it in passagework. But the idea that a stylistic trend can begin this suddenly, purely as a result of the influence of an individual, is potentially misleading. As noted previously in this thesis, Szigeti acknowledges that changes in style may be more associated with 'environmental' influences (as Hauck and Hartnack each suggest) rather than the innovation of one player. Kreisler summarises this kind of gradual developmental process. He writes

Wieniawski intensified the vibrato and brought it to heights never before achieved so that it became known as the 'French vibrato.' Vieuxtemps also took it up, and after him Ysaÿe, who became its greatest exponent, and I.\textsuperscript{51}

In Paris, Henryk Wieniawski (1835-1880) was a pupil of Lambert Massart (1811-1892). While contemporary accounts of Wieniawski's vibrato often lacked any detailed descriptions, commentators generally agreed that his style was different from other

\textsuperscript{51} Cited in Lochner, L., \textit{Fritz Kreisler}, p. 21.
violinists of the period. Auer notes that ‘Wieniawski’s manner of playing was entirely different from any other violinist of his day’\textsuperscript{52} and Sam Franko writes ‘I had never before heard anyone play the violin as he did… [he had a] particularly warm tone, rich in modulation.’\textsuperscript{53} But Wieniawski’s vibrato was unlikely to have been continuous in the sense that it was perpetually carried from note to note as in the case of Ysaÿe and Kreisler; Joachim was impressed with Wieniawski’s performances and the two regularly played chamber music together. It is possible, therefore, that Ysaÿe had been encouraged in his use of a more continuous vibrato during his two years of lessons with Wieniawski in Brussels (1874-76), possibly emulating his teacher in this respect. Vieuxtemps, apparently sympathising with Wieniawski’s use of vibrato, later taught Ysaÿe for three years (1876-1879). On completion of his studies with Vieuxtemps, Ysaÿe visited Berlin where his playing had such a positive impact that Joachim insisted his Hochschule class attend Ysaÿe’s concerts.\textsuperscript{54} Clearly, Ysaÿe’s vibrato at this stage in his career was not continuous, Joachim approving of his style. In his earliest recordings\textsuperscript{55} (1903), however, Ysaÿe’s vibrato is predominantly continuous.

Like Wieniawski, Kreisler was a pupil of Massart. Kreisler states ‘I believe Massart liked me because I played in the style of Wieniawski.’\textsuperscript{56} Indeed, some writers have made comparisons between the role each played in their own time in popularising a more

\textsuperscript{52} Auer, L., \textit{My Long Life}, p. 242.
\textsuperscript{53} Franko, S., \textit{Chords and Discords}, p. 46.
\textsuperscript{54} See Schwarz, B., \textit{Great Masters}, p. 280.
\textsuperscript{55} Discography item 240.
\textsuperscript{56} Lochner, L., \textit{Fritz Kreisler}, p. 20.
modern form of vibrato.57 But Kreisler was too young to have heard Wieniawski, his
introduction to this kind of vibrato more likely coming from hearing Ysaye or maybe
even from Massart’s instruction.58

Oscillation Speed

The attitude that a continuous vibrato was ‘spontaneous’ and ‘beautiful’ and that by using
it a player might perform with ‘emotional depth’ contrasts with the reality of twentieth-
century pedagogy’s separation of vibrato from artistic spontaneity. By the 1920s vibrato
was invariably analysed and taught as an oscillation per second technical process.
Theorists in the first half of the twentieth century generally recommended that vibrato
should be both continuous and rhythmically measured and that creating a variety of
expression should be achieved by varying the speed and intensity of the vibrato rather
than modifying its frequency of use and location as Joachim had advised. Fritz Rau
proposes that ‘variations in pitch of vibrato express an inner feeling.’59 Similarly, Béla
Szigety advises that ‘the vibrato speed be accelerated during a crescendo and slowed

57 See Schwarz, B., Great Masters, p. 296.
58 The origin of continuous vibrato has, to the author’s best knowledge, yet to be fully
explored, and certainly there seems to be some ambiguity as to the role Kreisler played in
its development. David Millsom writes that Kreisler’s influence on vibrato ‘was not as
exceptional as one might imagine’ (p. 143) but elsewhere in his study acknowledges that
he had introduced ‘decisive changes’ (p. 127) and that he had been a ‘principal
moderniser’ (p. 11) in this area (Millsom, D., Theory and Practice). A study investigating
Kreisler’s influence on vibrato in the twentieth century would be a valuable addition to
the field, and one which might well benefit from the material presented in this chapter.
59 Rau, F., Das Vibrato auf der Violine und die Grundlagen einer natürlichen
Entwicklung der Technik für die linke Hand, (Leipzig, 1922), cited in Hauck, W.,
Vibrato, p. 40.
down with a *diminuendo*. In common with other writers on the subject, Leviste proposes a quantitatively precise rhythmic measurement for players in the 1930s of between 6-10 oscillations per crotchet = 120 depending on the 'expressive quality' of the music being played. Similarly, Rau (1922) prescribes 'between four and twelve regular oscillations per second' and Szigety suggests 10 oscillations per second in 1940. These measurements correspond approximately to the vibrato speeds of prominent violinists of the first half of the century. The fastest appear to be that of Kreisler and Ysaÿe, followed by Elman and Heifetz.

Hubay

Hubay's selective approach to vibrato during the early part of his performing career followed the judicious prescriptions of Joachim. In the 1884 edition of his *Sonata Romantique* Op. 22, 1/92 (ex. 3.5), for example, he provides (as Joachim does in his *Konzert in Ungarischer Weise* Op. 11, 1/211) a written performance instruction when vibrato is to be introduced. Similarly, in his 1911 transcriptions of Brahms' *Ungarsicher Tänze* No. 4/68 and No. 9/17, Hubay advises that passages in a soft dynamic should not omit vibrato, displaying parallels with Joachim's practice in his transcriptions of the same pieces. But his participation in the arena of Franco-Belgian teaching in the final decades of the nineteenth century seems to have encouraged a less selective employment of the device.
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stopped notes." In addition, in his 1909 edition of Rode's 24 Caprices, No. 4, Hubay asserts that 'all notes need vibrato.' Zipernovszky writes that Hubay used Károly Huber's twentieth study from his Hegedűiskola and first of Mazas' 75 Etudes Op. 36 as material to teach a continuous vibrato. Each note, reports Zipernovszky, Hubay advised 'should be played eight times very slowly with a steady, constant and equal vibrato, especially at bow and finger changes.' This shows continuity with Hubay's pupil Béla Szigety's advice that vibrato should be used 'without interruption especially during finger changes.' Accordingly, Hubay's insistence by the beginning of the second decade of the twentieth century that vibrato should be continuous provides a suitable time from which to date his advocacy of the device, chronologically corresponding to Eberhardt's writing on the subject. As with other modern-thinkers of his time, Hubay clearly viewed continuous vibrato as being consistent with an aesthetically beautiful and tasteful musical interpretation of a work - the antithesis of Joachim's and Auer's shared philosophy. As Zipernovszky recalls, 'Hubay required his pupils to use vibrato to produce an artistic performance of the highest standard.'

Hubay's recordings show that he tended to exaggerate a crescendo with a 'blossoming' effect, using no vibrato for as much as 40-50% of a note. Similarly, satisfying Baillot's recommended execution, Hubay occasionally began a crescendo on a long note with no

---

68 Szigety, B., Das Vibrato, cited in Hauck, W., Vibrato, p. 45. Béla Szigety studied with Hubay from 1909 to 1913.
vibrato before ‘blossoming’ into vibrato and concluding the note *senza* vibrato, as
exemplified in his 1929 recording of Bach-Wilhemj’s *Air.../1-2* (ex. 3.6). In passages of
notes (as opposed to a single note) with a *crescendo* the notes also received vibrato as the
dynamic level was increased, as shown in his recording of Handel’s *Larghetto/16* (ex.
3.7) and 27-28. Where a *diminuendo* was either marked or added in performance by
Hubay, a ‘de-blossoming’ effect was used, the note beginning with vibrato and either
gradually lessening as the dynamic decayed or more usually ceasing suddenly towards
the conclusion of the *diminuendo* (as illustrated by ex. 3.8/3, 5 and 8). But Hubay’s
application of such effects was not limited only to notes coinciding with a gradual change
in dynamic; rather, he typically began some notes without vibrato before beginning to
vibrate irrespective of *crescendo* markings, especially where *dolce* was marked, as
exemplified by his playing of Bach-Wilhemj’s *Air.../17* (ex. 3.9). Szigeti recalls that
this effect was also reminiscent of Ysaÿe’s mode of expression; he describes ‘a
*vibrato*less beginning of a long note that gradually blossoms forth *through* the vibrato.”

In his String Quartet No. 4, 3/13-14 (ex. 3.10) and 21, Bartók (whose relationship with
Hubay was always somewhat cool[71]) seems almost to parody this nuance, marking *non
vibrato* followed immediately with directions suddenly to vibrate during the same long-


[71] Although the two had played together when Bartók was a student at the Budapest
Academy, Bartók confessed in 1934 that ‘my relations with Hubay [are] utterly
bad,’ (letter from Bartók to Walter Frey, 28th April 1934), Demény. J., ed., *Bartók Béla
levelei*, 5th edn, Zeneműkiadó (Budapest, 1976); Eng. trans. Balabán, P., and Farkas, M.,
as *Béla Bartók’s Letters*, trans. rev. West, E., and Mason C., Faber and Faber (London,
held note.\textsuperscript{72} Indeed, in Hubay’s recordings, either where a \textit{diminuendo} or a \textit{crescendo} coincided with Hubay’s ‘blossoming’ or ‘de-blossoming’ effects or where a note had no dynamic fluctuations, the change from vibrato to non-vibrato (or the reverse) was most usually somewhat abrupt, disagreeing with the advice of Joachim and Spohr that ‘no sudden transition... is advisable.’\textsuperscript{73} Vecsey’s similar though less pronounced use of a ‘blossoming’ effect in his c. 1909 recording of Bach-Wilhelmj’s \textit{Air... /1} (see ex. 3.6) suggests that Hubay transmitted its application to his pupils at this time.

Oscillation Speed

Hubay’s recordings show that by the 1920s his vibrato was slow compared to the contemporaneous recommendations of Rau or Leviste, with as few as 4–5 oscillations per second. Zipernovszky writes ‘Hubay was completely without arm vibrato... if he wanted to vary his vibrato he straightened the vibrating finger.’\textsuperscript{74} Such a description concurs with Flesch’s observation that ‘the cause for an all-too-wide and slow oscillation is an exclusion of any finger or forearm motion.’\textsuperscript{75}

Recordings indicate that Hubay’s pupils at the beginning of the century often used a slower vibrato than their counterparts in other schools, corroborating Flesch’s view that ‘every student at first acquires the type of vibrato used by his teacher.’\textsuperscript{76} Zipernovszky

\textsuperscript{72} Bartók knew the playing of Hubay and his pupils well (see footnote 88).
\textsuperscript{73} Spohr, L., \textit{Violin School}, p. 157.
\textsuperscript{74} Halmy, F., and Zipernovszky, M., \textit{Hubay Jenő}, p. 146.
\textsuperscript{75} Flesch, C., \textit{The Art}, Vol. 1, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{76} Ib\textit{id}. 
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notes that ‘Hubay never dealt with those who needed to be taught vibrato, but if he
wasn’t happy with it he always changed it,” 77 supporting Geyer’s previously noted
comment that Hubay’s pupils bore telltale ‘hallmarks’ of his approach. Indeed, in his
1903 recording of Hubay’s Carmen Fantasy Op. 3, 78 Vecsey shares with his teacher a
slow oscillation speed. This substantiates Joachim’s remark that Vecsey possessed a
‘slow wobble’ 79 in 1904. Similarly, in recordings made in the 1920s, 80 Geyer uses a
slower vibrato than was typically applied at the time, again supporting her view that there
was discernible evidence of her teacher’s intervention present in the playing of his
students. Recordings show, however, that Hubay’s young pupils at this time did not
emulate their mentor’s variation of vibrato speed.

Hubay’s approach to teaching a slower left-hand vibrato than was usual for the period is
revealed in his 1909 edition of Saint-Lubin’s Six Grands Caprices pour Violon. In the
commentary to the fourth Caprice he states that vibrato should be added ‘slowly and in
time, almost like a trill.’ 81 Indeed, Hubay’s further suggestion that the speed of vibrato in
this Caprice should measure ‘four semiquavers in a speed of crotchet = 80’ corresponds
roughly to the rate of Vecsey’s and Geyer’s vibrato in their first recordings, as well as to
his own. Zipernovszky writes, however, that ‘Hubay occasionally found his pupils’
vibrato too slow,’ 82 implying that this vibrato style may sometimes have become

---

77 Halmy, F., and Zipernovszky, M., Hubay Jenő, p. 145.
78 Discography item 215.
79 Kolneder, W., Das Buch, p. 491.
80 Discography items 42, 43 and 45.
81 Saint-Lubin, L., de, Six Grand Caprices Pour Violin, ed. Hubay, J., Harmonia
82 Halmy, F., and Zipernovszky, M., Hubay Jenő, p. 146.
exaggerated when imitated by those he taught. Recordings made by Vecsey six years after his first studio sessions show a comparatively faster vibrato, indicating that he had absorbed influences and trends beyond the instruction afforded him by Hubay. This quicker speed, as well as that of Szigeti’s vibrato in his first recordings (significantly made after his self-proclaimed epiphany on first hearing Ysaÿe, Kreisler and Elman) represents the usual speed of vibrato at this time, as quantified by Leviste and Rau.

Bow-vibrato

Hubay’s colleague in Budapest, Joseph Bloch, notes that ‘some French players use a peculiar kind of vibrato, intended less as a means of expression than as a means of making the right arm and wrist independent.’ Bloch’s allusion to bow-vibrato associates the technique with an alien practice, for he provides no personal advocacy. Bloch’s teacher, Huber, as with Spohr and Joachim and Moser, also omits any discussion of this device from his Hegedüiskola. Hubay’s occasional application of the device in recordings shows, however, that this device formed part of his available expressive apparatus. Hubay reserved bow-vibrato primarily for use on open-strings (shown in ex. 3.11 and ex. 3.12), for natural-harmonics (illustrated by ex. 3.6/3) and sometimes during f or ff long-held notes, often in combination with left-hand vibrato as suggested by Baillot (exemplified by ex. 3.15/31-34 and shown as – – – – – – – – – – – – – – ). Hubay states that ‘the most distinguished characteristic of the French tradition is velvety

bowing." While it is unclear on which aspect of bow technique Hubay was referring, he appears to have regarded bow-vibrato as comparatively unimportant in pedagogical terms; his *Six Etudes (pour développer la technique de l'archet)* Op. 63 (1896) makes no reference to it.

Recordings show, however, that Hubay may have transmitted the use of this technique to his pupils at the start of the twentieth century. Vecsey clearly uses bow-vibrato on an open d-string in his 1910 recording of Schubert-Wilhelmj’s *Ave Maria* \(^{10}\) (ex. 3.13) and d’Arányi seems to apply it before continuing with left-hand vibrato in her 1938 recording of Schumann’s Violin Concerto, 2/50 \(^{11}\) (ex. 3.14). Significantly, there may be evidence that Bartók originally intended this effect to be used in his Fourth String Quartet, suggesting that the device may have carried some currency at the Budapest Academy.

Somfai writes, ‘[in Bartók’s ‘sketchy draft’ and ‘full draft’] the tied eighth-note repetition with the zigzag and the *vibrato* above it [in 3/5] in this slow tempo (quarter = 60) is an enigma (fig. 3.1)… we have no knowledge that Bartók was aware of… the technique of *Bogenvibrato*.\(^{12}\) But Bartók was undoubtedly very aware of the playing styles of Hubay and Hubay’s pupils during this period\(^{13}\) and could, indeed, have been using an aspect of their performance style in his composition.

\(^{85}\) Discography item 223.
\(^{86}\) Discography item 23.
\(^{88}\) For example, Sándor Köszegi (a pupil of Hubay and Bloch) appeared with Bartók to give the première of a movement from Bartók’s First Violin Sonata (1903) on 8th June 1903 (Stevens, H., *The Life And Music of Béla Bartók*, 3rd edn, ed. Gillies, M., Clarendon Press (Oxford, 1993), p. 324). The work was given its first full performance by Hubay
Fig. 3.1: Bartók, String Quartet No. 4, 3/1-9 in 'sketchy draft' (above) and 'full draft' (below) as shown in Somfai (1996), p. 271.

Hubay’s recordings show that by the 1920s (within the context of his vibrato on an average of about 84% of notes) some notes typically received no vibrato. Indeed, even

and Bartók on 25th January 1904 (Kenneson, C., Székely and Bartók, p. 9). Among Bartók’s later collaborators were Hubay’s pupils Adila Fachiri, Jelly d’Arányi, André Gertler, Józef Szigeti, Ferenc Vecsey, Imre Waldauer, Ede Zathureczky and Zoltán Székely (with whom Bartók appeared frequently in sonata performances during the period 1921 to 1938) as well as the Waldauer quartet (Imre Waldauer, János Temesváry, Antal Molnér (and Jenő Kerpely, a cello pupil of Popper).
where Hubay marked *molto espressivo* in his performing editions, in his recordings his vibrato was rarely completely continuous, as shown in example 3.16. Non-vibrato was used to emphasise certain notes or groups of notes much with the same aim as Joachim, Baillot and Spohr recommended using vibrato; to enhance the character of melodically important notes and figures. Capet comments that ‘the omission of vibrato is a means of discovering abstract and inexpressible beauty… it enables us to evaluate correctly all those base expressions produced by the vibrato of the left hand.’

Capet’s view mirrors Hubay’s adoption of the same approach. A non-vibrated note was thus considered a special effect within the local context of continuous vibrato. Recordings clarify that Hubay’s use of non-vibrato occurred:

- On naturally resonant notes.
- At the climax of a phrase.
- On long-held or melodically important notes, especially when concluding a *diminuendo*.
- During passages marked *pp* or *dolce*.
- To direct attention towards an ensuing vibrated note (as in the case of an upbeat).
- For repeated or sequential material where a first statement used no vibrato and a repeat was played with vibrato.
- To vary the melodic emphasis of repeated progressions sharing the same rhythm.

---

Usually two or more of these factors coincided. In his recording of Handel’s Larghetto/90 (see ex. 3.8), for instance, Hubay uses no vibrato on f-sharp\textsuperscript{1} and vibrates on the following note (d\textsuperscript{1}). In the succeeding bar the figure is repeated in sequence but with the use of vibrato reversed; e\textsuperscript{1} receives vibrato but c-sharp\textsuperscript{1} is left without. In addition, at the climax of the phrase in b. 10, a\textsuperscript{1} (a naturally resonant note on the instrument) is played with no vibrato.\textsuperscript{91} Similarly, in his recording of his own Intermezzo/31-8 (see ex 3.15),\textsuperscript{92} Hubay plays each minim in the first phrase either with no vibrato or with a very brief application of bow-vibrato late after the note begins, whereas in the answering phrase he uses left-hand vibrato on each. In his recording of Handel’s Larghetto/6\textsuperscript{93} (see ex. 3.8), he follows the same strategy to generate expressive differences. Hubay’s pattern of senza vibrato on the first appearance of a repeated figure but not on a second appearance was rarely reversed. Recordings also show that Hubay refrained from using vibrato to vary the melodic emphasis of repeated note values, especially where their intervallic progression was recurring as in the case of a chromatic scale (shown in his recording of Handel’s Larghetto/16\textsuperscript{94} (ex. 3.7) and on some upbeat notes to direct attention towards a subsequent (vibrated) note (exemplified by ex. 3.8/1, 2 and 8).

Hubay’s recordings show that he most often interpreted markings such as pp and dolce as implying that little or no vibrato should be used (shown in ex. 3.9 and ex. 3.16). Indeed, Hubay’s frequent recommendations to use natural harmonics in passages marked dolce or

\textsuperscript{90} Discography item 49.
\textsuperscript{91} And similarly, in b. 19 and b. 32.
\textsuperscript{92} Discography item 51.
\textsuperscript{93} Discography item 49.
\textsuperscript{94} Discography item 49.
*dolcissimo* in his editions negate the possibility of using left-hand vibrato. Such a response to *pp* and *dolce* markings contradicts the evidence of his practice with similar dynamic indications in his earlier transcriptions of Brahms' *Ungarischer Tänze* and his own *Sonata Romantique* Op. 22, 1/92 (see ex. 3.5), illustrating a conspicuous change in his approach to matters of expression and timbre.

Comparisons between the location of Hubay's vibrato and that used by his pupils (with the exception of those influenced by trends to vibrate continuously by the time they began to record) at the beginning of the century reveal some similarities, suggesting possible pedagogical principles. In his earliest recordings, Vecsey vibrates on an average of about 85% of notes (compared to Hubay's 84%) and shares with his teacher the occasional use of no vibrato to enhance dynamics or phrasing. The absence of vibrato for the 'up-beat' in Vecsey's 1904 and 1910 recordings of Schumann's *Träumerei* 16 (ex. 3.17), for example, and the use of *senza vibrato* to provide melodic emphasis in his c. 1909 recording of Handel's *Larghetto* 16 (see ex. 3.7) are particularly reminiscent of Hubay's own approach.

In summary, recordings illustrate that Hubay's pupils at the beginning of the century used a mostly continuous vibrato, in line both with their teacher's advice in editions of the time and with Zipernovszky's recollections. In addition, the slow oscillation speed in

---

96 Discography items 225 and 226.
97 Discography item 214.
these recordings corresponds to that used in Hubay’s own recordings and his 1909 published recommendation. In this regard, Eberhardt’s assessment that the importance of vibrato in the 1910s was to define the individuality of a player might be extended; a specific character of vibrato discernible in the playing of a teacher and his pupils may also be said to have defined their ‘school’s’ individuality. This theory satisfies Geyer’s observation that ‘a full and resounding sound’ was the main hallmark of Hubay’s pupils trained at the beginning of the century. Likewise, bow-vibrato is detectable in recordings of Hubay’s pupils at this time and the location of vibrato and non-vibrato to enhance dynamics and phrasing and to generate expressive variety in like material are shared tendencies which potentially show ‘familial’ resemblances between Hubay and his students. But Hubay’s pupils’ exposure to wider aesthetic trends is also evident in their recordings, showing that ‘environmental’ influences also contributed to their attitudes towards vibrato, as suggested by Hartnack and Hauck. For example, unlike their teacher, Vecsey, Szigeti and Geyer neither modified the speed of their vibrato for the sake of dynamic variety, nor, for the most part, did they use ‘blossoming’ effects. Rather, soon after the completion of their lessons with Hubay, most adopted a Kreisler-like continuous vibrato that was typically faster than that used by their teacher.

---

Vibrato Use in Performances by Hubay's Pupils

To the end of the period surveyed, the vibrato speed of Hubay’s pupils typically remained slower than for players trained in other schools (although it was rarely as slow as Hubay’s own). With the exception of those examples already noted, the use of bow-vibrato became obsolete by the 1930s. Continuous vibrato was the accepted norm. That this was regarded as the ideal in violin performance by the 1920s is illustrated by a critic’s description of Székely (in whose recordings from this time a continuous vibrato is used) as having ‘played with the beauty of sunshine.’99 But sources illustrate that factors bearing on the character and location of Hubay’s pupils’ vibrato had their origins in Hubay’s approach. These can be summarised in three areas: dynamics and mood; melodic and harmonic emphasis; and to assist in making stylistic differences between varying repertoire. In each case, the older generation of Hubay’s pupils was less rigidly attached to using a continuous vibrato than their younger colleagues.

Dynamics and Mood

Recordings show that for the older generation of Hubay’s pupils the relationship between dynamics or mood and vibrato was closely observed. However, players did not allow their vibrato to stop suddenly during a *diminuendo* or to begin suddenly during a long-held note with a *crescendo* as Hubay did. Rather, the intensity of the vibrato itself was modified, as recommended by Béla Szigety. In his c. 1933 recording of Bach-Wilhelmj’s

---

Air.../1-2\textsuperscript{100} (see ex. 3.6), for example, Vecsey uses vibrato from the beginning of the note compared to the ‘blossoming’ effect achieved in his c. 1909 recording and Hubay’s 1929 version. Similarly, in her recording of Mozart’s Adagio K. 261/16-17 (ex. 3.18),\textsuperscript{101} Geyer maintains the continuity of her vibrato from the start of the note, her crescendo, as with Vecsey’s in his c. 1933 Bach Air..., emphasised by an increase in bow pressure and vibrato intensity. Whereas Hubay tended suddenly to stop vibrating altogether during a printed diminuendo, his pupils graduated the amount of vibrato until a note or notes were still. Thus, in her recording of Mozart’s Adagio K. 261/6 (ex. 3.19),\textsuperscript{102} Geyer’s final note has no vibrato following a gradual reduction in the prominence of the effect during the previous beat or so. Lengyel’s c. 1950 recording of Hubay’s Sonata Romantique Op. 21, 2/33-35\textsuperscript{103} (ex. 3.20), Szigeti’s 1928, 1947 and 1959 recordings of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77, 2/44-49\textsuperscript{104} (ex. 3.21), his three recordings of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 2/84-86\textsuperscript{105} (ex. 3.22) and his 1937 performance of Brahms’ Violin Sonata Op. 108, 1/20-21\textsuperscript{106} (ex. 3.23) provide similar examples. Alternatively, players sometimes used no vibrato for the entire diminuendo note or figure, especially where dolce was also marked, showing agreement with Hubay’s practice in his recordings. In her 1946 recording of Bach’s Partita for Solo Violin in E major BWV 1006, Loure/4\textsuperscript{107} (ex. 3.24), for instance, Geyer interprets the quaver passing-note figure as requiring no

\textsuperscript{100} Discography item 210.
\textsuperscript{101} Discography item 46.
\textsuperscript{102} Discography item 46.
\textsuperscript{103} Discography item 62.
\textsuperscript{104} Discography items 137, 140 and 143.
\textsuperscript{105} Discography items 131, 134 and 135.
\textsuperscript{106} Discography item 138.
\textsuperscript{107} Discography item 41.
vibrato, an effect also observed by Végh (1971) and Szigeti (1949 and 1955) in the same bar. Likewise, in his c. 1950 performance of Corelli’s *La Folia* Op. 5 No. 12/141 (ex. 3.25), Zathureczky momentarily stops vibrating to enhance the *diminuendo* on a passing note figure. D’Arányi’s 1938 recording of Schumann’s Violin Concerto, 2/1112 (ex. 3.26) provides a similar example and Fachiri also exaggerates the effect of *dolce diminuendo* figures in her 1928 recording of Beethoven’s Sonata Op. 96, 2/18-20 (ex. 3.27)113 by using no vibrato. Such a tendency illustrates the contemporaneous opinion that Fachiri’s performances had been characterised by ‘flexibility of dynamics.’114 The omission of vibrato in *dolce* passages was typically complemented by a reduction in bow pressure (and consequent acceleration of bow speed) or occasionally by *sul tasto* playing so that the timbre was differentiated from surrounding areas. This is exemplified in all three of Szigeti’s recordings of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 1/101-102 (ex. 3.28) and 2/72-73 (ex. 3.29).

In contrast, recordings show that the younger generation of Hubay’s pupils did not generally allow a lessening of dynamic level or a change in mood to influence the continuity or speed of their vibrato; unlike Szigeti’s vibrato, Martzy’s is maintained to the end of each *diminuendo* in example 3.21, and she vibrates throughout the *diminuendo*
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108 Discography item 236.
109 Discography items 120 and 122.
110 In his 1909 edition of Bach’s Sonatas and Partitas for Solo Violin BWV 1001-1006 Hubay marks a *diminuendo* hairpin underneath this figure whereas Joachim does not.
111 Discography item 243.
112 Discography item 23.
113 Discography item 35.
figure in ex. 3.24. Rather, the vibrato of younger players was intensified at *dolce* markings and changes in bow pressure or speed were largely underrated, supporting Szigeti’s assertion that by the 1960s the playing of younger violinists showed a ‘regression in the subtle use of the bow for effects that are beyond the ordinary.’\(^{115}\)

Despite the previously noted reluctance of Hubay’s pupils to employ a ‘blossoming’ effect to enhance *crescendi*, recordings show, nonetheless, that where a melody had a printed performance direction of *cantabile*, *espressivo* or *dolce* players sometimes began briefly with no vibrato before ‘blossoming’ into vibrato. In Szigeti’s 1932 recording of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 2/7\(^{116}\) (ex. 3.29) and his 1928 recording of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77, 1/392\(^{117}\) (ex. 3.30), such an effect is employed independently of a *crescendo*.\(^{118}\) But in his recordings of these works made in the 1940s this vibrato ‘blossoming’ is absent, suggesting that by this time he regarded it as stylistically unsuitable.

Melodic and Harmonic Emphasis

Recordings indicate that the youngest generation of players examined tended not to modify the location of their vibrato to produce expressive differences or to vary the melodic or harmonic emphasis of a note or figure but that their vibrato was typically

\(^{116}\) Discography item 131.
\(^{117}\) Discography item 137.
\(^{118}\) Also see Vitali, *Chaconne*39-40 as played by d’Arányi in 1929 (ex. 3.31), discography item 25.
continuous. Although Lionel Tertis was himself part of the older generation of players and teachers, his thinking nonetheless exemplifies such an approach. He writes 'there is no sound so deadly or ruinous to an expressive phrase as the sound of a cantabile slow passage in which one or two notes are partly or wholly devoid of vibrato.'\(^{119}\) But for the older generation of Hubay's pupils, sources show that non-vibrato was often used to emphasise a note or figure within a local context of continuous vibrato (as it was for Hubay and Capet) in five principal situations:

- To emphasise melodically important notes.
- To characterise differently one of a pair of notes.
- To vary the character of repeated or sequentially presented material.
- To deflect emphasis away from a note so as to exaggerate the importance of the following note (as in the case of an upbeat).
- For harmonic emphasis.

For example, in her 1927 recording of Dvorák-Kreisler's *Slavonic Dance* No. 2/1-3 (ex. 3.32),\(^ {120}\) Geyer plays b. 2 without vibrato each time it occurs in the work, the first and third bars using a continuous vibrato. Similarly, in his c. 1950 recording of Corelli's *La Folia* Op. 5 No. 12/15\(^ {121}\) (ex. 3.33) Zathureczky emphasises the melodic arrival at the cadence by refraining from vibrating only on the first beat of the bar. Later in the same piece he does not vibrate f\(^ {2}\) in b. 156, perhaps emphasising the closeness between this and

---


\(^{120}\) Discography item 42.

\(^{121}\) Discography item 243.
the following note (e\textsuperscript{5}) or possibly accentuating the melodic descent to the subsequent imperfect cadence (ex. 3.34). Likewise, Lengyel’s recording of Hubay’s Sonata Romantique Op. 22, 1/193-208 (ex. 3.35) and 1/84-88\textsuperscript{122} (ex. 3.36) provides further examples. As has been described in the case of other players including Hubay, Lengyel’s response to the performance direction \textit{pp espressivo} was to avoid vibrato rather than to intensify it. In addition, for repeated pairs of notes players tended to vibrate only the second of each pair, especially where the performance direction was \textit{dolce}, illustrated by Szigeti’s 1937 recording of Brahms’ Violin Sonata Op. 108, 1/75-80\textsuperscript{123} (ex. 3.37) and recordings of Corelli’s \textit{La Folia} Op. 5 No. 12/17-22 (ex. 3.38) by Szigeti\textsuperscript{124} (1940) and Zathureczky\textsuperscript{125} (c. 1950). In each case, the first note of a pair is not vibrated, as in Hubay’s recordings.

Similarly, players occasionally allowed some notes to receive no vibrato to change the character of repeated or sequential figures, also as with Hubay’s practice. In her recording of Hubay’s Sonata Romantique Op. 22, 2/119-122\textsuperscript{126} (ex. 3.39), Lengyel varies the character of notes in this way. In 2/120 she draws attention to c\textsuperscript{1} by playing it with no vibrato, the other notes in the bar receiving a continuous oscillation. But in the following bar she alters the melodic emphasis of the figure, this time isolating f\textsuperscript{1} by not vibrating, observing the Hubay-like pattern of using vibrato on the second appearance of a figure rather than the first. Szigeti uses the same strategy in his 1934 recording of Mozart’s

\textsuperscript{122} Discography item 62.
\textsuperscript{123} Discography item 136.
\textsuperscript{124} Discography item 145.
\textsuperscript{125} Discography item 243.
\textsuperscript{126} Discography item 62.
Violin Concerto in D major K. 218, 2/21-26 (ex. 3.40). The semiquaver group in 2/21 is played without vibrato but the sequential repeat of the figure in 2/22 is played using vibrato on each semiquaver, as for the repeat of this material one octave lower in 2/25-26. Likewise, Vecsey keeps to this practice in his 1925 recording of Schubert-Wilhelmj’s *Ave Maria*4 (ex. 3.41); b is not vibrated whereas the same note in a similar figure in b. 5 receives vibrato. Occasionally the reverse effect was applied so that the first statement of a figure or note was vibrated and the second not. Thus, in her 1937 recording of Schumann’s Violin Concerto, 2/42-3 (ex. 3.42), d’Arányi provides a contrast between sequentially repeated figures; the first statement of the descending semiquaver group in 2/42 receives vibrato while the corresponding figure in 2/43 is played without vibrato. Similarly, in his 1930 recording of Bartók’s *Six Romanian Dances*, No. 4/333 (ex. 3.43), Szigeti varies his final phrase by not vibrating f, ensuring that the character of this phrase is different from the previous identical statement where the note receives vibrato. This practice was, however, observed almost exclusively only by older players, such as Szigeti; recordings of the piece made by Martzy3 (1951 and 1960) and Székely3 (1937) reveal that both players used a continuous vibrato throughout these two phrases.

Non-vibrato was also employed by older players to deflect attention away from a note, emulating Hubay’s practice. In her 1946 recording of Bach’s Partita for Solo Violin in E
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127 Discography item 176.  
128 Discography item 224.  
129 Discography item 23.  
130 Discography item 123.  
131 Discography items 68 and 69.  
132 Discography item 99.
major BWV 1006, *Loure*\textsuperscript{133} (ex. 3.44), for example, Geyer emphasises the second (vibrated) note (b\textsuperscript{2}) by not vibrating on the previous note (b\textsuperscript{1}), a practice also observed in recordings of the piece by Szigeti \textsuperscript{134} (1949 and 1955) and Végh \textsuperscript{135} (1971). In contrast, Martzy \textsuperscript{136} (1955) and Telmányi \textsuperscript{137} (1954) both use vibrato on the first note in their recordings of the same work, again suggesting a different approach taken by the younger generation of players considered.

In addition, non-vibrato was used by the older generation of Hubay’s pupils to emphasise harmonic activity. In his 1937 recording of Brahms’ Violin Sonata Op. 108, 1/231\textsuperscript{138} (ex. 3.45), Szigeti changes the character of d\textsuperscript{3} by using no vibrato (as the harmonic change of colour suggests a different timbre for this note) before returning to a continuous vibrato. Similarly, in her 1929 recording of Vitali’s *Chaconne*\textsuperscript{139} (ex. 3.46), d’Arányi does not vibrate a-flat\textsuperscript{2}. Geyer also accentuates prominent harmonic movement in this way; in her 1946 recording of Mozart’s *Adagio* K. 261/28\textsuperscript{140} (ex 3.47), the d\textsuperscript{3} semiquaver on the third beat receives no vibrato in order to characterise it differently from d\textsuperscript{2} immediately before it, emphasising the suspension in the music.

\textsuperscript{133} Discography item 41.
\textsuperscript{134} Discography items 120 and 122.
\textsuperscript{135} Discography item 236.
\textsuperscript{136} Discography item 64.
\textsuperscript{137} Discography item 202.
\textsuperscript{138} Discography item 138.
\textsuperscript{139} Discography item 25.
\textsuperscript{140} Discography item 46.
Stylistic Context

As previously observed, a chief function of vibrato for players of Joachim’s and Hubay’s generations was to generate stylistic differences in the performance of varying repertoire. In the 1920s Auer criticised players’ use of a continuous vibrato regardless of the musical style of the piece being played. He writes ‘their musical taste does not tell them that they can reduce a programme of the most dissimilar pieces to the same dead level of monotony by peppering them all with the tabasco of a continuous vibrato.\(^{141}\) In partial agreement with Auer, d’Arányi observes that ‘variety of tone was what... Joachim and all of us stood for, [it] is ignored by many prominent violinists, who just establish a vibrato and stick to it.\(^{142}\) Such comments, while apparently in some accord, actually expose the disparity in attitude to continuous vibrato from the two generations; Auer deplored continuous vibrato because, in his opinion, it made everything sound the same while d’Arányi took for granted that modern players used a continuous vibrato but seems to suggest that the character of that vibrato should be varied. The main difference between how Joachim, Auer and Hubay adapted their vibrato to suit a given musical context and how Hubay's pupils achieved the same, therefore, is that these three primarily changed the location of vibrato. Comparatively, d’Arányi and her contemporaries tended only to vary the speed and character of their vibrato, it being almost always continuous to a greater or lesser degree, except in those situations previously outlined.

\(^{141}\) Auer, L., *Violin Playing*, p. 23.

\(^{142}\) MacLeod, J., *The Sisters*, p. 42. Perhaps d’Arányi would have agreed with Hartnack’s use of adjectives such as ‘boring’ and ‘sterile’ (cited on p. 117) in his metaphor for vibrato in the 1960s.
A review of d’Arányi playing short character-pieces in 1920 comments on her ‘striking and penetrating tone’\textsuperscript{143} whereas an account of a performance of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77 from the same period singles out her ‘full bodied sound’\textsuperscript{144} for praise.

Different again is a review from a 1931 performance of Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, her slow movement reportedly sounding ‘less sugary than most violinists, without spinning a thick vibrato... neither sentimental nor supercilious,’\textsuperscript{145} and a 1921 performance of a Vivaldi concerto elicited the response that ‘her tone quality was always apt.’\textsuperscript{146} Clarifying the idea that d’Arányi used a different character of vibrato for different types of repertoire, Macleod concedes ‘she could give the right sound to the written ideas of many types of composer... She opened a different part of herself to each different quality of music. Her recognised personality was in fact absence of personality, or withdrawal of it.’\textsuperscript{147} MacLeod distinguishes that in d’Arányi’s case at least, vibrato was intended to characterise the music and not, as Eberhardt had judged, to be first and foremost a recognisable mark of a player’s personality. D’Arányi’s recordings show this to have been the case. In her 1929 recording of Drdla’s Souvenir\textsuperscript{148} (and in other similar pieces) d’Arányi uses a noticeably faster vibrato than is used in her recording of Schumann’s Violin Concerto.\textsuperscript{149} Her stylistic choices in the performance of the latter were, claimed d’Arányi, ‘suggested in a psychic communication with the spirit of

\textsuperscript{143} Unsigned review, The Daily Express, (1920), cited in MacLeod, J., The Sisters, p.122.
\textsuperscript{144} Unsigned review, The Daily Telegraph, (3\textsuperscript{rd} June 1921) British Library Collection.
\textsuperscript{145} Unsigned review, Musical Opinion (December 1931), cited in MacLeod, J., The Sisters, p.131.
\textsuperscript{146} Unsigned review, The Morning Post (25\textsuperscript{th} November 1921), British Library Collection.
\textsuperscript{147} MacLeod, J., The Sisters, p.132.
\textsuperscript{148} Discography item 15.
\textsuperscript{149} Discography item 23.
Schumann,150 resulting in ‘Schumann’s’ suggestion to ‘broaden the tone’151 during certain passages of the slow movement. Thus, d’Arányi herself acknowledged a stylistic requirement for her vibrato to be different in this repertoire, even if the initial justification for this decision was perhaps questionable. In the same way, d’Arányi’s awareness of the need to convey stylistic differences within her performances is demonstrated by her Joachim-like fast and narrow vibrato in her 1923 recording of Joachim’s Romanze.152 Similarly, Fachiri, playing Granados’ Dance Espagnol153 uses a much faster and narrower vibrato than she uses in her recording of Beethoven’s Sonata Op. 96.154 In this way, too, playing Schubert-Friedberg’s Rondo155 in 1930, Szentgyorgyi uses a quicker vibrato than in his recording of Paganini’s Violin Concerto No. 1 Op. 6156 from the same year. Likewise, Telmányi uses a quicker vibrato in his 1936 recording of Sibelius’ Romance Op. 78 No. 2157 and in his 1935 recording of his own arrangement of Chopin’s Prélude in A flat major Op. 28 No. 17 than he uses in some of his recordings of Hubay’s Hungarian character pieces from the early 1940s.

Several violinists playing large-scale ‘Romantic’ works tended to use a slower vibrato than they used in character-pieces. The difference is made clear in some of Geyer’s earliest recordings; in her 1927 recording of Goldmark’s Air,158 for example, she uses a

150 MacLeod, J., The Sisters, p.197.  
151 Ibid.  
152 Discography item 18.  
153 Discography item 37.  
154 Discography item 35.  
155 Discography item 110.  
156 Discography item 108.  
157 Discography item 208.  
158 Discography item 43.  

significantly slower vibrato than in her recording of Dvorák-Kreisler's *Slavonic Dance* No. 2\textsuperscript{159} from the same year. Similarly, in her 1954 recording of Brahms' Violin Concerto Op. 77,\textsuperscript{160} Martzy allows herself more of a Hubay-like slow vibrato than she would normally have used, especially when compared to her faster vibrato in a recording of Mendelssohn's Violin Concerto Op. 64\textsuperscript{161} made in the following year. Likewise, Geyer's vibrato in her 1947 recording of Schoeck's Violin Concerto *Quasi una Fantasia* Op. 21\textsuperscript{162} when compared to the faster oscillation speed in her recording of Haydn's Violin Concerto Hob. VIIa: 1\textsuperscript{163} (recorded in the same year) suggests a stylistic awareness that eighteenth-century repertoire required a different character of vibrato.

For the performance of Hungarian-style character-pieces such as those by Hubay, vibrato was often slower than in other types of repertoire. Thus, in his 1932 and 1941 recordings of Hubay's *Scène*... No. 3,\textsuperscript{164} Szigeti's vibrato is significantly wider and slower than in other recordings made in the same period, demonstrating both a varied approach to vibrato in different styles of music and perhaps a nostalgic nod to Hubay's own mode of performance. Indeed, in Szigeti's 1930 recordings of Bartók's *Six Romanian Dances*\textsuperscript{165} and *Seven Hungarian Folk Tunes* (arr. Szigeti)\textsuperscript{166} he uses a much faster vibrato speed than in pieces by Hubay. Similarly, in recordings of Vecsey playing his own *Chanson*...
Nostalgique in 1925,\textsuperscript{167} d’Arányi playing Hubay’s Poème Hongrois Op. 27 No. 6 in 1928\textsuperscript{168} and Telmányi playing Hubay’s Scène... No. 2 in 1942\textsuperscript{169} and Scène... No. 4 in 1959\textsuperscript{170} each employs a slower and wider vibrato than he or she might generally use. Comparatively, with only a very small number of exceptions such as Martzy’s 1954 recording of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77,\textsuperscript{171} recordings of younger Hubay pupils support d’Arányi’s contention that such players ‘just establish a vibrato and stick to it.’

In summary, recordings show that the approach to using vibrato of Hubay’s older pupils as mature artists often bore similarities with their teacher’s playing style. For example, their relatively slow oscillation speed and their frequent omission of vibrato during passages with soft and expressive dynamic markings are particularly characteristic of Hubay’s practice in his recordings. Similarly, the factors bearing on the character of the vibrato of Hubay’s older pupils (that is, melodic and harmonic emphasis and dynamics and mood) show resemblances with their teacher’s habits. In particular, the frequent use of non-vibrato on only the first note of a repeated pair of notes and the alternate refrain from using vibrato on one or other limb of a repeated figure to establish expressive differences between like material is redolent of Hubay’s approach. As with other expressive means surveyed in this thesis, the fact that this strategy appears to have been ingrained in the approaches of Hubay’s pupils indicates a ‘familial’ similarity. However, the prescriptions of Hubay’s pupil Béla Szigety (exemplified in the performances of other

\textsuperscript{167} Discography item 233.
\textsuperscript{168} Discography item 17.
\textsuperscript{169} Discography item 205.
\textsuperscript{170} Discography item 206.
\textsuperscript{171} Discography item 74.
of Hubay’s students) for a faster vibrato speed than that advised by his teacher and for *crescendi* or *diminuendi* to be enhanced by an intensification of vibrato or a lessening of its vigour rather than by Hubay’s ‘blossoming’ and ‘de-blossoming’ effects, suggests that Hubay’s pupils were subjected to influential ‘environmental’ trends extending beyond their teacher’s advice. Thus, to re-cite Hauck’s statement, made at the end of the period under scrutiny, vibrato ‘preserv[es] a close relationship to the present.’\(^{172}\)

---

Rhythm and Tempo

The Nineteenth Century

Nineteenth-century writers stressed the importance of tempo and rhythmic flexibility in conveying expression. Spohr asserts that 'an occasional deviation from a strict tempo [is] admissible for the purpose of producing certain effects... acceleration of time in passages of a fervent or impetuous character and a slackening or lingering in episodes expressive of tenderness and pathos.' Similarly, Baillot affirms that 'altering or interrupting the beat' can produce a 'grand effect... only when the player is carried away by expression.'

Although in his writings Joachim rarely discusses rubato per se, his enthusiastic advocacy of the Spohr model suggests that he also promoted the use of rubato techniques. Levin writes 'to play with [Joachim] is damned difficult. Always different tempi, different accents.' Levin's remark reveals that Joachim typically observed a flexible approach to tempo and rhythm, with the additional implications that it may have been spontaneous or improvisatory and perhaps exploited more often than Spohr's
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1 Spohr, L., *Violin School*, p. 172.
recommended 'occasional deviation.' Similarly, accounts of Vieuxtemps' playing indicate that rubato was used to heighten expression. Hubay writes that Vieuxtemps' approach had been formulated on 'a large broad plastic style' but that '[he] hated everything ugly and exaggerated... woe to the performer who, in the master's presence, wished to make the music more beautiful through gratuitous tempi rubati or pulling phrases out of shape.' 4 But for Joachim's taste, Vieuxtemps' playing was too copy bound. He explains 'like so many violinists of the Franco-Belgian school...
[Vieuxtemps] adhered too strictly to the lifeless printed notes when playing the classics, unable to read between the lines.' 5 The approaches of Joachim and Vieuxtemps thus exemplify the differing attitudes towards what both considered an important expressive device.

Commentators at the beginning of the period surveyed agreed that there were three basic ways of creating flexibility of tempo: with rhythmic adjustment; with accelerando and rallentando; and with 'melodic' rubato. Sources show that players trained in the nineteenth century put a primary emphasis on frequent localised rubato devices and rhythmic adjustments as opposed to larger tempo distortions.

---

4 Vieuxtemps, H., ed. Hubay, J., Six Etudes, p. 3.
Rhythmic Adjustment

Towards the end of the nineteenth century rubato was often achieved by means of rhythmic manipulation. A number of sources suggest that such adjustments rarely occurred in isolation from other techniques used to vary or interrupt a steady pulse. Most often changes to printed rhythms in performance took the form of a proportional lengthening and shortening of notes of the same value. Johnstone writes in 1914 that ‘modern editors are coming to recognise it as one of the most important principles of expressive interpretation.’ He describes ‘a delicate give and take in the proportionate lengths of notes,’ adding ‘Joachim produces wonderful effects by its use.’ Similarly, Fuller-Maitland confirms that ‘all the greatest interpreters of the best music have been accustomed to lay this kind of accent on the first note of the bar, or of a phrase, as taste may suggest, but none have [sic] ever carried out the principle so far or with such fine results as Joachim has done.’ In his recording of J. S. Bach’s Sonata in G minor BWV 1001/Adagio (ex. 4.1), Joachim changes groups of semiquavers and evenly printed groups of demisemiquavers; in b. 3 and bb. 5-6 he plays dotted rhythms where the printed values are even. Also, b. 2 is slightly faster than his initial starting tempo. The rhythmic distortion in b. 3 thus emphasises a return to the starting tempo. Similarly, in his 1903 recording of his own Romanze/15,19, 32, 50, 52, 65, 66, 73, 75, 77, 82, 83, 88, 90, 102,
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7 Ibid.
9 Discography item 56.
115, 116, 117, 120, 125, 129, 137, 153, 155, 160, 161 and 163\textsuperscript{10} (exemplified by ex. 4.2/15 and 19, ex. 4.3/115, 116, 117 and 120 and ex. 4.4/78), Joachim changes printed rhythms. In addition, he occasionally used the technique to vary the expression of similar or repeated figures: in his Romanze\textsuperscript{11} (see ex. 4.2), for example, he plays the quaver pair evenly as printed but changes the rhythm of a similar figure in b. 15; and in b. 76 and b. 79 (ex. 4.4) he plays the quaver-crotchet-quaver rhythms as printed, adjusting the rhythm of this figure in b. 78 to crotchet-quaver-quaver to aid diversity of expression. In this way, too, in his recording of Sarasate's Carmen Fantasy Op. 25, Introduction/124-125 (ex. 4.5) and 3/69\textsuperscript{11} (ex. 4.6), Marteau adjusts printed quaver groups to vary the expression from like surrounding material. Recordings thus show that this device was regarded as appropriate regardless of the style of music being played.

\textit{Accelerando} and \textit{Rallentando}

Nineteenth-century writers also advocated the use of \textit{accelerando} and \textit{rallentando} to produce rubato effects. Describing his recommended practice for Rode's Violin Concerto No. 7, Spohr prescribes a specific process of rubato; 'In bar 58 and 60 [of the first movement] prolong the ninth note \([g^1]\) a trifle, and make the loss of time good again by increasing the rapidity of the following notes\textsuperscript{12} (ex. 4.7). Spohr's example clarifies that he did not, apparently, perceive a function of this type of rubato as varying the expression of repeated material. Rather, he recommends the same effect to be used in b.

\textsuperscript{10} Discography item 60.
\textsuperscript{11} Discography item 63.
\textsuperscript{12} Spohr, L., \textit{Violin School}, p. 185.
58 as b. 60. Bériot, too, recommends 'the alteration of time quickened and slackened'\textsuperscript{13} and, as with Spohr, also allows no concession to variety of expression by refraining from using rubato on one statement of a repeated figure. Joachim's remarks are few, although his general advocacy of Spohr's treatise and his dislike of 'the deadly dullness' of 'metronomic tempo'\textsuperscript{14} suggest that he aligned himself with Spohr in this respect. Indeed, Wessely comments that Joachim's performance of Bach's \textit{Chaconne} BWV 1004 'received in all phrases the most wonderful elasticity of time.'\textsuperscript{15}

Writers on the subject tended to treat tempo rubato almost as an ethical problem whereby what was taken from one place \textit{needed} to be resituated in another. Most sources agreed that a degree of compensation in tempo was needed so that the music had time to 'catch-up' with itself following acceleration, typified by the definition of 'rubato' in the 1889\textsuperscript{16} and 1908\textsuperscript{17} editions of \textit{Grove's Dictionary}. Likewise, \textit{Hamilton's Dictionary} (1885) defines 'tempo rubato' as 'a slight deviation in the measure for the sake of expression, by protracting one note and curtailing another, so that the time of each bar is not altered in the aggregate.'\textsuperscript{18} Matthay (1913) recommends two main forms of this type of rubato: first, 'the most usual [way] to emphasise a note is by giving more than the expected time-value, and then subsequently to make-up the time thus lost by accelerating the remaining

\textsuperscript{13} Bériot, C. de, \textit{Méthode}, p. 225.
\textsuperscript{15} Wessely, H., \textit{A Practical Guide}, pp. 112-113.
notes of that phrase; second, maintains Matthay, is the case of a rubato beginning with a quickening of the tempo, and so requiring a 'retarding of the subsequent notes of the phrase.'

Sir Henry Wood recalls that Ysaÿe used a 'perfect rubato... if he borrowed he faithfully paid back within four bars.' In this way, too, in their 1916 edition of Corelli's *La Folia* Op. 5 No. 12/239 (ex. 4.8), Léonard and Sauret make clear that a slackening of the tempo (*largamente*) should be balanced with a consequent quickening *accelerando*, illustrating Matthay's first theory of rubato. Similarly, the *tenuto* markings on the first note of each of bb. 48-60 (ex. 4.9) of the same work imply that the time gained on these notes should be compensated through a quickening of the remaining notes of each bar.

Drdla's directions in the 1913 edition of his *Souvenir* exemplify Matthay's second model; b. 103 is marked *very quick* followed by a compensating *rit.* in b. 104 (ex. 4.10).

Early recordings show that this way of creating rubato was commonplace. In Marteau's recording of Sarasate's *Carmen Fantasy* Op. 25, 3/27-8 (ex. 4.11), 57 and 59 (ex. 4.12) and 73 (see ex. 4.6), figures receive a localised initial slackening followed by a compensatory quickening of the speed. Furthermore, players used this device to vary the expression of sequentially presented or repeated material; in his performance of Sarasate's *Carmen Fantasy* Op. 25, 4/36-43 (ex. 4.13), for example, Marteau distorts the semiquaver group in b. 37 in the manner described but delivers the sequential repeat of the same figure in b. 39 evenly, and similarly with b. 41 and b. 43. As a less common variation of this idea, players occasionally compensated for a quickening of the notes in a

---

21 Discography item 63.
figure by following it with a brief hold-up in tempo rather than actually slackening the speed of the succeeding notes themselves. This type of compensation rubato is exemplified in Marteau’s performance of Sarasate’s *Carmen Fantasy* Op. 25, *Introduction/47-49*\(^{22}\) (ex. 4.14). The compensating ‘hold-ups’ are notated in the example as //.

Recordings show that players at the beginning of the period under scrutiny did not always compensate for time slackened or quickened as written theory of the time insists; rather, in practice, *accelerandi* or *rallentandi* were often introduced as isolated tempo adjustments, suggesting an inconsistency between theory and practice. This will, hereafter, be described as non-compensating rubato. In his recording of J. S. Bach’s Sonata for Solo Violin in B minor BWV 1002, *Bourrée/4, 5 and 7* (ex. 4.15) and *28*\(^{23}\) (ex. 4.16), for instance, Joachim uses prominent localised *accelerandi*. In each case the material following the quickening of the tempo is restored immediately to the original speed with no compensating slackening of the tempo. His use of this device occurs during small figures or parts of figures when the melodic line ascends, contains repeating or identical rhythmic values or has a *crescendo*. Similarly, a *rallentando* could also be used in isolation from a compensating *accelerando*, exemplified by Marteau’s application of this effect in his *Carmen Fantasy* Op. 25, *4/52*\(^{24}\) (ex. 4.17). The use of this type of rubato to create or contribute to a longer lasting *accelerando* or *rallentando* developed simultaneously with its localised application. Thus, in Joachim’s recording of his

\(^{22}\) Discography item 63.
\(^{23}\) Discography item 57.
\(^{24}\) Discography item 63.
Romanzel/30-37\textsuperscript{25} (ex. 4.18) he accelerates gently through some passages of similar rhythmic values (especially during a printed crescendo) without balancing the time ‘lost’ by slackening the tempo of the following bars (as well as changing the printed rhythm in b. 32).

A further approach to expression through manipulation of tempo was to begin a new speed (either faster or slower depending on the emphasis required within a passage) without any previous accelerando or rallentando, before returning again to the original speed. The effect achieved was a clear sectionalisation of the tempo. This device was used both on a small-scale (where individual motifs were sectionalised) and on a large-scale (where whole phrases or parts of phrases were affected). In this manner, Domenico Corri (1810) advises the performer to ‘[deliver] some phrases or passages in quicker or slower time than he began with, in order to give emphasis, energy or pathos.’\textsuperscript{26} In his recording of J. S. Bach’s Sonata for Solo Violin in G minor BWV 1001, Adagio/2-6\textsuperscript{27} (see ex. 4.1), Joachim segments parts of phrases using either a faster or slower tempo. For example, on the sixth quaver beat of b. 2 he plays suddenly a little faster (quaver = 63); the original tempo (quaver = 48-52) is restored on the second quaver beat of b. 3 by a distortion of the printed two semiquavers to a dotted semiquaver-demi-semiquaver pair. Likewise, following a slight accelerando, Joachim begins a new tempo on the third quaver beat of b. 5 (quaver = 56). The original tempo is restored during the third quaver beat of b. 6. Similarly, Marteau slows his speed from crotchet = 76 to crotchet = 56 to

\textsuperscript{25} Discography item 60.
\textsuperscript{27} Discography item 56.
play the duplet quavers in Sarasate’s *Carmen Fantasy* Op. 25, 1/7\(^{28}\) (ex. 4.19) before
continuing in his original speed, and repeats the process in b.11, b. 15, b. 19, b. 75, b. 79,
b. 83 and b. 87 of the same movement.

Melodic Rubato

The practice of what Philip has described as ‘melodic rubato’\(^{29}\) seems to have been
accepted by most in the late nineteenth century. The effect arose from localised
*accelerandi* and *rallentandi* and rhythmic distortions which caused the melodic line to
fluctuate in its tempo against a steady accompaniment. Spohr summarises the effect as
‘[the] tempo rubato of the solo performer, the accompaniment continuing its quiet regular
movement.’\(^{30}\) While cautionary in regard to ‘unjustifiable liberties’\(^{31}\) created by this type
of looseness of tempo in Baroque repertoire, Joachim was undoubtedly less keen on the
application of melodic rubato than other of his contemporaries. Indeed, his recordings
supply no examples. But, Ysaïe, reports Dalcroze, adhered wholeheartedly to this
approach, a fact supported by Ysaïe’s available recordings.\(^{32}\) He writes, during his time
as Ysaïe’s recital partner,

[Ysaïe] forbade me to follow him too carefully in the *accelerando* and the
*ritenuto* of the rubato passages, except when my part consisted of pure

---

\(^{28}\) Discography item 63.

\(^{29}\) Philip, R., *Early Recordings*, p. 38.


\(^{32}\) See discography item 240.
accompaniment. 'It is I alone,' he said, 'who must express... the feeling suggested by the melody. You will accompany me in strict time... Don't be afraid, for we shall come together again, for whenever I hurry a few notes I re-establish the balance by slowing up on the following notes, or by pausing for an instant on one of them.'

Ysaïe's practice of melodic rubato seems, however, to contradict the aversion of Vieuxtemps (Ysaïe's teacher) to 'pulling phrases out of shape' through 'gratuitous tempi rubati.'

Hubay

Hubay's training with Joachim had, doubtless, put significant emphasis on the importance of small-scale tempo and rhythmic flux as conveyors of expression, and most likely had stressed that such devices might also be used to vary the execution of repeated material. In the period immediately following the conclusion of his studies with Joachim, Hubay enjoyed a musical partnership with Liszt (and later with Liszt's pupil, Károly Aggházy). Liszt's thinking that 'time and rhythm must be adapted to and identified with the melody, the harmony, the accent and the poetry' suggests that the Liszt-Hubay duo had observed at the very least an elastic approach to such aspects in their

---

34 Vieuxtemps, H., ed. Hubay, J., Six Etudes, p. 3.
performances. Also, Hubay’s approach to matters of rubato may have been reviewed in
the light of his association with Vieuxtemps. But it seems equally probable, given that
Hubay’s playing attracted the affirmation of Vieuxtemps soon after his arrival in Paris in
1878, that he had already developed a less flexible style than Joachim may have advised.
Indeed, as a teacher Hubay was apparently conservative in advocating any flexibility,
although Szigeti describes an exemplar of his teacher’s practice as seemingly based on an
appreciation of large-scale tempo manipulations. He concedes ‘[Hubay] would insist that
the poco a poco più sostenuto in the development section of [Brahms’] G major sonata
[Op. 78/1] should be really più sostenuto until the recapitulation which is in the (faster)
tempo primo.’\(^{37}\) Other sources provide evidence of a stringent approach to the teaching
of small-scale disruptions to a steady beat. Zipernovszky writes that Hubay advised the
semiquaver groups in the introduction to Mozart’s Violin Concerto K. 219 ‘to be played
very evenly and in an unhurried manner’\(^{38}\) and that Tchaikovsky’s Violin Concerto Op.
35 should not be played ‘too freely.’\(^{39}\) In addition, notes Zipernovszky, Hubay insisted
that ‘the tempo in the first movement [of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77] must not slow
down or fluctuate, since Brahms provides no such indication.’\(^{40}\) At least in the case of
Brahms, therefore, Hubay clearly regarded fidelity to the composer’s supposed intention
rather than the practice of the work’s first performer, Joachim, as a reliable guide for a
stylish performance.

\(^{40}\) *Ibid.*
Hubay’s recordings confirm that his approach to tempo and rhythm was significantly more straightforward than Joachim’s; only infrequently did he exploit specific localised rubato effects and rhythmic adjustments in the way that Joachim had done, and where tempo distortions did occur the outcome was almost always very subtle. Evidently, Hubay did use some of Joachim’s rubato effects, albeit with much less frequency, prominence and freedom than appear in his teacher’s recorded performances. As in other areas of this study, Hubay’s pedagogical approach may be observed by an examination of the first recordings of his pupils at the beginning of the century.

Rhythmic Adjustment

Despite Hubay’s neglect of rhythmic adjustments in his recordings, suggesting that, for him, they had become obsolete modes of expression by this time,\(^41\) sources show that at the beginning of the century he considered the distortion of rhythms as an appropriate practice to aid expression. Szigeti recalls that Hubay’s playing of Wieniawski’s *Polonaise* in D major Op. 4 routinely included rhythmic adjustments to evenly printed figures ‘so that \[\begin{array}{c} \hline \hline \hline \hline \end{array}\] often became \[\begin{array}{c} \hline \hline \hline \hline \end{array}\].’\(^42\) In addition, Hubay recommended this practice to those he taught at the beginning of the century; Szigeti comments that Hubay transcribed these adjustments into his copy of

\(^41\) In Hubay’s Hungarian character-pieces ‘scotch-snap’-like rhythmic figures are already composed as part of the main melody in the same way that Dohnányi, in the fourth movement of his Violin Concerto, transcribes exactly the rubato he intends.

Wieniawski's *Polonaise* in 1905, refusing, it seems, to leave to his pupil's own interpretation the execution of these bars.\textsuperscript{43}

The first recordings of Szigeti and Vecsey illustrate that the device was an important part of their expressive arsenal at this time (although it is likely that both would also have been encouraged in this practice during their brief periods of study with Joachim). In his 1903 recording of Hubay's *Carmen, Fantasy Brillante* Op. 3\textsuperscript{44} (made when he was still under Hubay's tutelage), for example, Vecsey demonstrates a striking agogic treatment of rhythms that are printed evenly in Hubay's 1879 edition of the work. Similarly, in his c. 1909 recording of Bach-Wilhelmi's *Air.../13-14*\textsuperscript{45} (ex. 4.20), Vecsey distorts printed rhythms and his 1904 recording of Schumann's *Träumerei*\textsuperscript{46} he includes frequent changes to pairs of quavers so that the first quaver of a pair is typically shortened to a semiquaver and the second lengthened to a dotted-quaver (exemplified by ex. 4.21). Recordings illustrate that this often coincided with a slight acceleration in speed, as it does in examples from Joachim.\textsuperscript{47} But, in a recording of Tartini's *Devil's Trill* Sonata, 2/103-108 made in 1911\textsuperscript{48} (ex. 4.22), Vecsey's distortions occur independently of any other rubato treatment. Rather, they are used to vary the expression of a repeated figure in the manner of Joachim; Vecsey adjusts the rhythm of the two semiquavers in 2/103 but in the following identical bar he observes the actual values of the printed notes, as with a

\textsuperscript{43} *Ibid.*

\textsuperscript{44} Discography item 215.

\textsuperscript{45} Discography item 209.

\textsuperscript{46} Discography item 225.

\textsuperscript{47} In comparison, Joachim's distortions are exact so that the shortened note receives a proportional compensation in the length of its neighbour, unlike Vecsey's which are typically more approximate.

\textsuperscript{48} Discography item 230.
similar strategy to aid variety of expression with other small-scale rubato devices in Hubay’s own practice. Similarly, in his 1908 recording of Hubay’s Zephyr Op. 30 No. 5/33-36⁹ (ex. 4.23), Szigeti adjusts only the notes in the first statement in the sequence. In the successive statement (bb. 35-36) he observes the printed note values. Moreover, the repeat of this whole phrase one octave lower in bb. 40-43 is played as printed rather than with adjusted rhythms in order make an expressive distinction between it and the previous statement of this material. Likewise, in bb. 45-46, Szigeti systematically varies the location of his adjustments: first, quavers two and three in b. 45 are changed; secondly, quavers three and four in b. 46; and lastly (in the same bar) quavers five and six. Such discretion in the positioning of adjustments does not appear so obvious in recordings of other players in this period. For example, Vecsey’s adjustments in his 1904 recording of Träumerei/³ (see ex. 4.21) occur in the same location in each of the two quaver groups. In performances at this time the effect typically occurred when the printed dynamic marking was crescendo or very occasionally diminuendo and the performance direction had a cantabile association.

Accelerando and Rallentando

Hubay’s recordings show that he used compensation rubato less often than Joachim. Where he employed this type of rubato, however, the quickening and slackening of the tempo most usually took place on a small-scale. In his recording of Handel’s
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⁹ Discography item 157.
³0 Discography items 225 and 226.
Larghetto/13\(^{51}\) (ex. 4.24), for instance, Hubay shortens the final note (g\(^1\)) of the semiquaver group; the ‘lost’ time is restored through a slight rallentando in the corresponding figure in b. 14. Likewise, Hubay quickens the tempo of the second a\(^2\) in b. 6 and compensates with a slight slackening of the tempo towards the end of the bar. In this way, too, in his recording of his own Scène… No. 5/24\(^{52}\) (ex. 4.25) he lengthens the first note before compensating with a slight accelerando. In his recording of his Intermezzo…/23-9\(^{53}\) (ex. 4.26) this type of localised compensation rubato is used to vary the expression of repeated figures, as it is in Marteau’s recordings. Hubay plays bb. 23-26 as printed but applies rubato to the corresponding figures in the quasi-repeat of this material in bb. 27-29; the second semiquaver on the second beat of each of b. 27, b. 28 and b. 29 is lengthened and a compensation made by quickening the tempo of the final two semiquavers of each group. Sources show, however, that Hubay’s alternate application of the device was not always consistent in repeated figures but that where he did use rubato in this way he typically subjected a second statement of a figure to the effect and left the first exempt from such flexibility.

The earliest examined recordings of Hubay’s pupils suggest that the practice of small-scale compensation rubato was transmitted to those he taught, seemingly regardless of the style of repertoire. Thus, in his 1911 recording of Beethoven’s Kreutzer Sonata Op. 47, 2/Var. IV/39-40\(^{54}\) (ex. 4.27), Szigeti disrupts the evenness of the printed demisemiquavers using by this technique. Furthermore, as with Hubay himself, his

\(^{51}\) Discography item 49.
\(^{52}\) Discography item 52.
\(^{53}\) Discography item 51.
\(^{54}\) Discography item 128.
pupils often employed the effect to generate differences between repeated or like material and tended to be more consistent than their teacher in this respect. In his c. 1909 account of Bach-Wilhelmj’s Air…/35 (ex. 4.28), for example, Vecsey uses compensation rubato but refrains from using it in b. 4, a stylistic feature shared exactly by Hubay in his 1929 recording of the piece. Szigeti also used this approach in his first recordings; in his 1908 recording of Rubinstein’s Romance Op. 44 No. 1/3-656 (ex. 4.29) he plays the first part of the phrase in tempo but subjects the identical rhythms of the second part of the phrase to compensation rubato. Vecsey also uses the device in his recording of Handel’s Larghetto/357 (see ex. 4.24). When this phrase is repeated in sequence, the corresponding figure in b. 5 is played strictly in time. Unlike Hubay, therefore, Vecsey typically manipulated the tempo of the first appearance of a repeated figure rather than the second, whereas Szigeti, in line with his teacher’s usual practice, tended to apply rubato to the second.

While Vecsey and Szigeti may have used small-scale rubato in their performances, recordings show that this approach was often part of a longer lasting rubato affecting a whole bar or phrase. In both players’ recordings of Handel’s Larghetto/658 (see ex. 4.24), for example, the accelerando is compensated by a slackening of the speed in b. 7 (as in the case of Hubay’s own performance of the piece59) and similarly in bb. 9-10.

55 Discography item 209.
56 Discography item 185.
57 Discography item 214.
58 Discography items 154 and 214.
59 Although Hubay’s ritardando begins in b. 6.
As with examples from Marteau, Hubay’s recordings show that an *accelerando* to the end of a phrase was sometimes followed immediately by a small compensating hold-up before playing the next beat. In his recording of his *Scène*... No. 5/44\(^{60}\) (ex. 4.30), for instance, Hubay accelerates before leaving a slight gap prior to the beginning of b. 45, and similarly in b. 46. However, even in ‘free’ or unaccompanied passages such as the opening bars of his *Scène*... No. 5 (ex. 4.31) Hubay’s playing was typically ‘in-time.’ Rather, in this case, Hubay’s rubato is achieved by a speed increase through the g semibreve in b. 14 so that it loses exactly one quarter of its printed value, sounding as a dotted-minim. Thereafter, the first of Hubay’s four *espressivo* crotchets begins on the final beat of b. 14 and the semiquaver ascent (printed to start in b. 16) actually commences on the last beat of b. 15. The speed of the four semiquaver groups is even and strictly in the original tempo followed by a lengthening of \(e^4\) and a brief ‘compensating’ hold-up (together taking approximately one crotchet beat) before the *sforzando* c-sharp\(^1\) is played. Furthermore, recordings illustrate that Hubay may have advocated this practice to those he taught; in his 1908 recording of Hubay’s *Scène*... No. 5/14–16\(^{61}\) (see ex. 4.31), Szigeti shares his teacher’s practice, although the ‘hold-ups’ in b. 44 and b. 46 (see ex. 4.30) are less exaggerated in Szigeti’s performance than in Hubay’s version.

---

\(^{60}\) Discography item 52.

\(^{61}\) Discography item 155.
With the exception of printed rallentandi, recordings show that Hubay rarely used an accelerando or rallentando independently of a compensating tempo adjustment. Where he did employ non-compensating rubato, the effect was typically used to vary the expression of repeated material. In his recording of his Scène... No. 5/2862 (see ex. 4.25), for example, Hubay employs a prominent rallentando at the end of the bar to vary the expression from the corresponding place in b. 26. As with other localised rubato types, Hubay varies the second appearance of the figure. While in his own recordings Hubay did not generally use accelerandi or rallentandi independently of a compensating tempo distortion, the recordings of his pupils at the beginning of the century illustrate that those under his instruction applied this device. Such evidence suggests either that it had formed part of Hubay’s teaching at this time or that he had not objected to it being used by his pupils. Vecsey’s 1903 recording of Hubay’s Carmen, Fantasy Brillante Op. 363 illustrates his tendency to accelerate very suddenly towards cadences with no compensating slackening of the tempo. Likewise, in his 1911 recording of Tartini’s Devil’s Trill Sonata, 2/108, 110 and 11264 (ex. 4.32), Vecsey hurries through each pair of semiquavers, and in his 1908 recording of Hubay’s Zephir Op. 30 No. 5/10-1265 (ex. 4.33) Szigeti uses prominent accelerandi through each ascending arpeggio figure with no attempt to compensate with a subsequent rallentando. The tempo only returns to stability in b. 13 where a slow portamento and an exaggerated printed tenuto help to re-establish a steady pulse.

62 Discography item 52.
63 Discography item 215.
64 Discography item 230.
65 Discography item 157.
Recordings show that another important aspect of Hubay’s expression through tempo flexibility was his tendency to use separate speeds to emphasise melodic features, following the same practice observed in the nineteenth century. In this way, in his recording of his Scène… No. 5/121-122 and 126-12766 (ex. 4.34), he plays in a conspicuously slower tempo (crotchet = 108) than in the rest of this section (crotchet = 152). Tempo flexibility was also occasionally used to slow down the tempo, as exemplified by Hubay’s performance of his Scène… No. 12/15-1667 (ex. 4.35). Here, the quaver group in b. 16 is played in a speed of crotchet = 40 with no preceding slackening of the overall tempo (crotchet = 52). Once more, the second statement receives the tempo adjustment rather than the first. Sources illustrate that Hubay conveyed this tendency to his pupils (although in Szigeti’s 1908 recording of Hubay’s Scène… No. 5/121-22 and 126-12768 (see ex. 4.34) the speed is not altered as it is in Hubay’s 1929 version). In Szigeti’s 1911 performance of Beethoven’s Kreutzer Sonata Op. 47, 2/Var. It69 (ex. 4.36), for example, the first two quaver beats are played steadily in a much slower speed (quaver = 106) than the remainder of the section (quaver = 152-160). No acceleration is used between these two speeds. Similarly, in his 1908 recording of J. S. Bach’s Partita for Solo Violin in E major BWV 1006, Preludio/1-370 (ex. 4.37), Szigeti uses two separate speeds; bb. 1-2 are played at crotchet = 112 and b. 3 onwards at crotchet = 152. Likewise, in Szigeti’s 1908 and 1913 recordings of Hubay’s Zephir Op.

66 Discography item 52.
67 Discography item 53.
68 Discography item 155.
69 Discography item 128.
70 Discography item 112.
30 No. 5\textsuperscript{71} (see ex. 4.23), bb. 47-50 are played in a suddenly slower speed (crotchet = 66) than the previous material (crotchet = 80) to emphasise the \textit{espressivo} direction at this point.

Melodic Rubato

Recordings show that Hubay’s application of melodic rubato was infrequent. This may be seen as a result of his reduced application of small-scale rubato effects. However, Hubay’s enthusiastic endorsement of Vieuxtemps’ distaste for ‘pulling phrases out of shape’ and Zipernovszky’s recollection that Hubay advised against too much flexibility of tempo suggest that his reluctance to overuse the effect had been founded on a philosophical rejection of such conscious dislocations rather than a simple aversion to this or that localised rubato device. Where Hubay did apply melodic rubato, recordings show that the temporary disruption of alignment was only very brief and typically as a result of compensation rubato, as with Ysaïe. In his recording of Bach-Wilhelmj’s \textit{Air}...\textsuperscript{19}\textsuperscript{72} (ex. 4.38), for instance, Hubay executes the two semiquavers at the end of the bar slightly before the orchestra play its final quaver. Hubay’s premature arrival here is emphasised by the early departure of the ascending slide from d\textsuperscript{1}. Consequently, Hubay begins b. 20 just ahead of the orchestra and redresses the balance of tempo by slackening the speed of the two semiquavers in this bar. Also noteworthy in this sequence is his variation of only the second appearance of the dotted crotchet-two semiquaver figure, following the previously described strategy.

\textsuperscript{71} Discography item 157 and 159.
\textsuperscript{72} Discography item 48.
Recordings of Hubay's pupils show a predominantly infrequent and (where applied) very subtle use of melodic rubato, suggesting that he conveyed his own cautious approach to this device to his pupils at the beginning of the century. Furthermore, on the rare occasions it was used, such pupils appear to have regarded it as appropriate regardless of the style of repertoire being played. In his 1908 recording of Hubay's Zephyr Op. 30 No. 5/3973 (ex. 4.39), Szigeti slackens the tempo of his melody at a different rate from his accompanist, Henry Bird, arriving on c-sharp⁳ earlier than Bird's minim chord by cutting short the printed value of his previous d⁴. Szigeti fits back in with Bird by remaining on f-sharp⁴ long enough to join with his pianist at the start of b. 40. Similarly, in b.40, Szigeti's tenuto f-sharp⁴ causes his fourth beat to arrive slightly late. Once more, Bird's piano part is strictly in tempo.

Recordings illustrate that the effect of this type of rubato was often heightened by a quick slide between two notes in an accelerated figure, as was also the case for Hubay (see ex. 4.38). In a number of his earliest recordings, Szigeti emphasises distortions of tempo by this method; in his 1911 recording of Beethoven's Kreutzer Sonata Op. 47, 2/46 (ex. 4.40), for example, Szigeti's early arrival on b-flat⁴ following a fast slide dislocates his line from the same melodic material in the piano part. The two players are reunited for the final quaver beat of the bar. In b. 48 Szigeti's quick slide to d⁴ again provides a temporary dislocation of the material between the two instruments. Similarly, in recordings by both Vecsey74 (1910) and Szigeti75 (1911) of Schubert-Wilhelmj's Ave

73 Discography item 157.
74 Discography item 223.
75 Discography item 187.
Maria/3 (ex. 4.41), a prominent slide between c\textsuperscript{1} and e\textsuperscript{1} coincides with an \textit{accelerando} and contributes to the effect of the e\textsuperscript{1} quaver arriving slightly before the beat in the accompaniment. The accompaniment remains strictly in tempo in both performances. As with Hubay’s use of the device, Vecsey’s and Szigeti’s application of melodic rubato here enhances a longer \textit{accelerando} through these bars.

In summary, recordings show that most aspects of Hubay’s approach to matters of tempo and rhythmic flux were conveyed to his pupils at the beginning of the century. Above all, tempo was not regarded as fixed and nor were note values considered as necessarily calling for a literal interpretation in performance. Hubay’s planned distortion of rhythmic values to be applied during passages marked \textit{cantabile or espressivo} and his strategy to alternate the expression of repeated figures by this method was demonstrably conveyed to his pupils at this time. Similarly, his pupils’ use of small-scale compensation rubato (to be executed with the same strategy) and their employment of localised tempo hold-ups, independent \textit{rallentandi} and \textit{accelerandi}, sectionalised speeds and their adherence to a connection between the speed of a slide and the effect on tempo mirror the same practices in Hubay’s recordings. As with other expressive devices considered in this thesis, Hubay’s ploy to generate differences between like material thus appears to have been entrenched in the approaches of his pupils. Such consistencies between the methods of Hubay and his young pupils highlight potential ‘family’ likenesses.
Rhythm and Tempo in Hubay’s Pupils’ Performances

Rhythmic Adjustment

In comparison to recordings made at the beginning of the century, those from approximately 1930 onwards illustrate a reduction in the use of adjustments to printed note values and a growing inclination towards rhythmic clarity. In his 1910 recording of Schumann’s Träumerei,\textsuperscript{76} for example, Vecsey retains only two adjustments, in b. 4 (see ex. 4.21) and b. 12, whereas in his 1904 version\textsuperscript{77} there are eleven such examples. In his 1925 recording of the same piece\textsuperscript{78} all such changes are omitted. Likewise, in his c. 1933 recording of Bach-Wilhelmj’s Air… /13-14\textsuperscript{79} (see ex. 4.20), Vecsey’s performance does not include such distortions whereas in c. 1909\textsuperscript{80} figures in these bars are changed.

Similarly, in Szigeti’s 1913 recording of Hubay’s Zephir Op. 30 No. 5\textsuperscript{81} (see ex. 4.23) only two rhythmic adjustments are included (in b. 34 and b. 46) compared to four in 1908.\textsuperscript{82} In his 1926 version\textsuperscript{83} all rhythms are played as printed. In this way, too, in Szigeti’s 1937 performance of Brahms’ Violin Sonata Op. 108, 2/19\textsuperscript{84} (ex. 4.42), the adjustment to semiquavers made in his 1927 version\textsuperscript{85} is absent, and the change to the

\textsuperscript{76} Discography item 226.
\textsuperscript{77} Discography item 225.
\textsuperscript{78} Discography item 227.
\textsuperscript{79} Discography item 210.
\textsuperscript{80} Discography item 209.
\textsuperscript{81} Discography item 159.
\textsuperscript{82} Discography item 157.
\textsuperscript{83} Discography item 161.
\textsuperscript{84} Discography item 138.
\textsuperscript{85} Discography item 136.
semiquaver pair in his 1928 recording of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77, 2/9386 (ex. 4.43) is missing from his two later recordings of the work. Similarly, in a 1921 recording of J. S. Bach’s Concerto for Two Violins BWV 1043, 2/887 (ex. 4.44), Fachiri varies the evenness of repeated semiquavers in this manner. When d’Arányi and Fachiri recorded the work again in 192688 no such adjustments were made. That a more literal execution of printed rhythms had become the popular ideal in performance is typified by one critic’s praise, in 1937, of Székely’s ‘absolute purity of rhythm.’89

Where rhythmic adjustment continued by Hubay’s pupils, its application was typically judicious, tending only to be used to vary the expression of repeated or sequentially presented figures containing evenly printed note values. For example, in his 1926 and 1941 recordings of Dvorák-Kreisler’s Slavonic Dance No. 2/32-3790 (ex. 4.45), Szigeti alternates the location of his rhythmic adjustments. Likewise, d’Arányi changes rhythms in her 1927 recording of Schubert’s Piano Trio D. 898, 2/9691 (ex. 4.46) but omits them from the sequential repeat of the figure in 2/97, and Brown’s distortion of two quavers in his 1924 recording of Tchaikovsky’s Violin Concerto Op. 35, 2/4092 (ex. 4.47) is omitted from the repeat of the same figure in 2/46. Similarly, Brown observes the actual values of the two quavers (c-sharp2 and b1) in Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, 2/11793

86 Discography item 137.
87 Discography item 31.
88 Discography item 34.
90 Discography items 147 and 150.
91 Discography item 22.
92 Discography item 4.
93 Discography item 3.

170
(ex. 4.48), whereas in the sequential repeat of the figure in the following bar the corresponding quavers ($e^2$ and $d$-sharp$^3$) are adjusted. In this way, too, in her c. 1950 recording of Hubay's Sonata Romantique Op. 22, 2/25-27\textsuperscript{94} (ex. 4.49), Lengyel adjusts only the rhythm of the second statement in the sequence. Also, in 3/110 (ex. 4.50), she alters the quaver pair to a semiquaver and a dotted quaver, whereas the same figure in the exposition (3/7) is played as printed. Significantly, in 3/110, the adjustment occurs in the same bar as Hubay marks cantabile. Recordings generally agree, therefore, that the second statement of a figure usually received this type of modification, reflecting the same approach in Hubay's own recordings.

In 'character-pieces,' however, the seemingly random use of rhythmic adjustment continued, especially in works whose performance style was associated with either a specific way of playing or an individual player. While her alternative rhythms are not as frequent as Joachim's (nor are they identical) in her performance of Joachim's Romanze/9-16 (see ex. 4.2) and bb. 115-122 (see ex. 4.3),\textsuperscript{95} d'Arányi exhibits more spontaneity in their location than in other repertoire. Likewise, in her 1929 recording of Kreisler's Rondino/47 (ex. 4.51) and b. 55,\textsuperscript{96} d'Arányi adjusts evenly printed quavers, particularly at the approach to a cadence.\textsuperscript{97} Similarly, in their separate recordings of Drdla's Souvenir/18 (ex. 4.52), 34 and 96, Ormandy\textsuperscript{98} (1928) and d'Arányi\textsuperscript{99} (1929) each

\textsuperscript{94} Discography item 62.
\textsuperscript{95} Discography item 18.
\textsuperscript{96} Discography item 19.
\textsuperscript{97} Dotted pairs do not appear in these bars in the original edition of the piece or in reprints from 1911, 1915, 1917 or 1920 in versions published either by Carl Fischer, Inc., (New York) or Schott (Mainz).
\textsuperscript{98} Discography item 94.
change the printed triplet figure to a quaver and two semiquavers. In his own 1920
recording of the piece, Drdla distorts the same rhythm to a quaver-dotted quaver-
semiquaver group. Unlike d'Arányi and Drdla, however, Ormandy plays the final pair of
quavers in b. 38 as semiquaver-dotted quaver and the last three quavers of b. 45 as dotted
quaver-semiquaver-quaver in response to Drdla's indication that this new section should
be *livelier* (ex. 4.53). In the reverse of this effect, d'Arányi occasionally evenly out
rhythms that were printed unequally; in her recording of Gluck-Kreisler's *Mélodie*\(^{101}\)
(ex. 4.54), for example, her slight *accelerando* is compensated by a broadening of the
tempo in the last crotchet beat of the bar and a change of the printed dotted quaver-
semiquaver to an even pair of quavers.\(^{102}\) Similarly, in his 1936 recording of Sibelius'
*Romance* Op. 78 No. 2/15\(^{103}\) (ex. 4.55), Telmányi uses the device to compensate for his
quickening of the tempo in b. 14.

Recordings show that pieces in a deliberately Hungarian or folk idiom tended to carry
with them an associated application of rhythmic adjustment. Flesch writes 'the national
melismas [in Sarasate's *Zigeunerweisen*] may be adjusted.' For semiquaver-dotted
quaver pairs he recommends 'a heavy accent on the beat as well as an abbreviation to
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ } \\
\text{ } \\
\text{ } \\
\text{ } \\
\text{ } \\
\text{ } \\
\text{ } \\
\text{ } \\
\end{array}
\]'.\(^{104}\) In a similar way, Szigeti\(^{105}\) (1930), Székely\(^{106}\) (1937) and Martzy\(^{107}\) (1951 and

---

\(^{99}\) Discography item 15.
\(^{100}\) Discography item 26.
\(^{101}\) Discography item 16.
\(^{102}\) Also, see d'Arányi playing Joachim's *Romance*\(^{35},\) 41 and 42 where dotted figures are
evened out to quaver pairs (see ex. 4.18).
\(^{103}\) Discography item 208.
\(^{105}\) Discography item 123.
\(^{106}\) Discography item 99.
1960) adjust the evenly printed rhythms of Bartók’s *Romanian Dance* No. 4/6 (ex. 4.56), 20 and 22 (ex. 4.57), 27, 30 and 34 (ex. 4.58), although Szigeti’s are the most frequent and most pronounced.

**Accelerando and Rallentando**

Theoretical changes of opinion to the planned use of *accelerandi* and *rallentandi* for expressive purposes comprised two themes: first, that time borrowed need not always be paid back, exemplified by the acceptance of this view in the third edition (1928) of *Grove’s Dictionary*;

108 and secondly, that tempo and rhythm tended to be considerably less flexible than in previous decades. In the second edition of his treatise (1938), Honeyman concludes that among the attributes of ‘perfect execution must be… strict time and pure expression,’

109 whereas in the first edition (1912) he does not mention the need for such metric stringency. Honeyman’s association of a comparatively inflexible and un-manipulated tempo with a performance style that conveyed purity of expression is exemplified in recordings. In Szigeti’s 1940 and 1944 recordings of Beethoven’s *Kreutzer* Sonata Op. 47, 2/Var. IV/39

110 (see ex. 4.27), for example, the lengthening of the first note of each demisemiquaver group and compensating *accelerando* through the remaining notes used in his 1911 recording

111 is omitted, as in recordings of the same

107 Discography items 68 and 69.
110 Discography items 132 and 133.
111 Discography item 128.
work by Martzy\textsuperscript{112} and Végh;\textsuperscript{113} rather, the bar is played strictly in time. Similarly, in Szigeti’s 1947 and 1961 recordings of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 2/19\textsuperscript{114} (ex. 4.59) the demisemiquaver groups are played in time, whereas in his 1932 version\textsuperscript{115} these figures each receive compensation rubato. The change in attitude is also clarified by comparing the performances of different players. Szigeti, for example, does not apply compensation rubato in his 1933 recording of Schubert-Friedberg’s \textit{Rondo/8-9}\textsuperscript{116} (ex. 4.60) whereas the less stylistically forward-looking Szentgyorgyi uses the device in these bars in his 1930 recording.\textsuperscript{117}

In addition to omitting localised compensation rubati in their performances, some players increasingly tended to control the application of the device by using it to vary the expression of same and similar figures (as Hubay had done) whereby only one statement of a repeated figure was thus manipulated. In his three recordings of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto Op. 61, 2/21\textsuperscript{118} (see ex. 4.59), for instance, Szigeti plays both sextuplet figures in strict tempo but in the following bar (where the figures are repeated) he varies the expression by using compensation rubato for both. Similarly, in her recording of Schoeck’s Violin Concerto \textit{Quasi una Fantasia} Op. 21, 1/117\textsuperscript{119} (ex. 4.61), Geyer distorts a semiquaver group in this manner but does not apply the device to a similar figure in b.

\textsuperscript{112} Discography item 71.
\textsuperscript{113} Discography item 239.
\textsuperscript{114} Discography items 134 and 135.
\textsuperscript{115} Discography item 131.
\textsuperscript{116} Discography item 188.
\textsuperscript{117} Discography item 110.
\textsuperscript{118} Discography item 131.
\textsuperscript{119} Discography item 47.
115, and, in their separate recordings of Franck’s Violin Sonata, 2/47 (ex. 4.62), Martzy\textsuperscript{120} and Zathureczky\textsuperscript{121} both play the quaver group in time but use compensation rubato during the sequential repeat of the same figure in 2/51. That the second appearance of a repeated figure should be varied in this manner agrees with the already established way of approaching the expression of like or identical material, suggesting that Hubay’s pedagogical strategies in this respect had been both effective and long lasting.

Despite the growing acceptance that compensation rubato was an ‘absurd theory,’\textsuperscript{122} the practice of balancing the give and take of an otherwise steady tempo persisted without always serving to vary the expression of like material, especially by the older generation of players surveyed. Examples from recordings made in the 1920s of a variety of repertoire typify this tendency. Thus, Brown’s recording of Tchaikovsky’s Violin Concerto Op. 35, 2/40-3\textsuperscript{123} (see ex. 4.47) contains two instances. Similarly, d’Arányi clearly interprets the ausdrucksvoll marking in the second movement of Schumann’s Violin Concerto\textsuperscript{124} (see ex. 4.80) as an indication for a significant flexibility of tempo; in her opening phrase she, as Brown in his Tchaikovsky Concerto, makes rallentandi often through only one note at a time (as in 2/4) and compensates for the time ‘borrowed’ with a slight quickening of the speed in the following few notes.\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{120} Discography item 79.
\textsuperscript{121} Discography item 244.
\textsuperscript{123} Discography item 4.
\textsuperscript{124} Discography item 23.
\textsuperscript{125} Also see examples 4.63, 4.64 and 4.65.
The use of a brief tempo hold-up as compensation for a previous quickening of the speed was preserved, although with reduced frequency of use. In his 1928, 1948 and 1959 recordings of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77, 1/96-101\textsuperscript{126} (ex. 4.66), Szigeti makes an *accelerando* through each group of six semiquavers and compensates by a brief wait before playing the three-note chords at the start of each of bb. 97-100. Similarly, Vecsey’s slight acceleration through each of b. 17, b. 18, b. 19, b. 20 and b. 21 in the *Allegro* from Kreisler’s *Praeludium und Allegro*\textsuperscript{127} (ex. 4.67) is compensated by a small gap at the end of each bar. Likewise, d’Arányi\textsuperscript{128} and Ormandy\textsuperscript{129} both speed through the triplet anacrusis figures of Drdla’s *Souvenir*\textsuperscript{4} and 6 (ex. 4.68) (and b.20, b.28, b.30, b.82, b.84, b.90 and b. 102) and follow each with a brief // before playing the next semiquaver.

While this style of rubato gradually became obsolete (with occasional exceptions) recordings show, nonetheless, that only players of the older generation persisted with its application; in her 1954 recording of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77, 1/96-101 (see ex. 4.66), for example, Martzy\textsuperscript{130} plays without Szigeti’s tempo distortions.

The increasing acceptance of using *accelerandi* or *rallentandi* that were independent of any compensating tempo adjustments is clarified by recorded performances from the 1930s onwards; in his 1928 performance of Brahms’ Violin Concerto Op. 77, 1/400-401\textsuperscript{131} (ex. 4.69), for example, Szigeti uses a compensating *accelerando* to balance the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[126] Discography items 137, 140 and 143.
\item[127] Discography item 217.
\item[128] Discography item 15.
\item[129] Discography item 94.
\item[130] Discography item 74.
\item[131] Discography item 137.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
time gained in each bar, whereas in his 1948 and 1959 recordings\(^{132}\) he lengthens the first note of each bar but does not compensate with a subsequent quickening of the tempo (as with Martzy in the same passage).

As previously observed, there existed a clear predilection for stepwise moving figures, frequently occurring as passing notes, to receive independent *accelerandi*. This device continued in use by some players. In her recording of Bach’s Partita for Solo Violin in E major BWV 1006/ *Loure*\(^{133}\) (ex. 4.70), for instance, Geyer tends to move quickly through some pairs of passing notes and in his recordings of Bach’s Partita for Solo Violin in B minor BWV 1002/ *Bourrée*,\(^ {134}\) Szigeti shares some of Joachim’s localised *accelerandi*, (see ex 4.15 and 4.16). While the use of this device in unaccompanied music may undoubtedly be ascribed to the metrical freedom and spontaneity of execution associated with such repertoire, players of Szigeti’s generation also continued to use non-compensating *accelerandi* in accompanied pieces. In this manner, Szentgyörgyi accelerates through some triplet quavers in his 1930 recording of Schubert-Friedberg’s *Rondo*\(^ {135}\) (ex. 4.71), especially at the approach to a cadence. However, recordings show that the device gradually became less frequently applied. In Szigeti’s 1927 recording of the final movement of Beethoven’s Violin Sonata Op. 30 No. 3,\(^ {136}\) for example, the lead-up to most main cadences is hurried (as in 3/31 (see ex. 4.78) 82, 102 and 173) whereas

\(^{132}\) Discography items 140 and 143.
\(^{133}\) Discography item 41.
\(^{134}\) Discography items 113, 118 and 122.
\(^{135}\) Discography item 110.
\(^{136}\) Discography item 130.
in his 1944 performance\textsuperscript{137} and in Zathureczky’s 1959 recording\textsuperscript{138} the use of this technique is absent, albeit with one or two exceptions (such as 3/82 in Szigeti’s 1953 recording). Martzy’s decision in 1951 and 1960\textsuperscript{139} to play the entire movement strictly in tempo typifies the more straightforward approach of the younger generation of players. Similarly, in his 1941 recording of Schubert’s Sonatina Op. 137, 1/43 (ex. 4.72) and 55 (ex. 4.73),\textsuperscript{140} Szigeti accelerates through figures whereas Martzy (1957),\textsuperscript{141} Szigeti’s junior by thirty two years, remains steadily in tempo in the same bars. That the device had become stylistically outdated by the end of the period surveyed is clarified by Végh’s insistence that it is ‘old fashioned and a little tasteless.’\textsuperscript{142}

Sectionalised Tempi

Sources illustrate that despite most players’ rejection of the segmentation of individual motifs from a main tempo, the device continued in use especially in performances from the older generation of players considered. In her c. 1950 recording of Hubay’s Sonata Romantique Op. 22, 1/195-196 and 1/205-206\textsuperscript{143} (ex. 4.74), for example, Lengyel applies a temporary slower speed (crotchet = 152) within the context of a faster tempo (crotchet = 200). Lengyel’s slower speed is the same tempo as that of her exposition. Similarly, in

\textsuperscript{137} Discography item 133.
\textsuperscript{138} Discography item 242.
\textsuperscript{139} Discography items 70 and 72.
\textsuperscript{140} Discography item 189.
\textsuperscript{141} Discography item 90.
\textsuperscript{142} Végh, S., in a masterclass with Ingerborg Scheerer-Joy, violin, and Peter Pettinger, piano, playing Mozart’s Violin Concerto in B-flat major K. 207, Allegro; 17\textsuperscript{th} July 1979, ‘International Musicians’ Seminar,’ Godolphin House. BBC TV2 broadcast on 20/8/1979, director, West, P., sound engineer, Turner, M.
\textsuperscript{143} Discography item 62.
2/15 (ex. 4.75), she plays the triplet figure in a slower speed (crotchet = 80) than her initial tempo (crotchet = 92), and in 3/92 and 94 (ex. 4.76) she plays in a reduced speed (crotchet = 112), returning to her original tempo (crotchet = 138) immediately after each slower bar. Similarly, Vecsey’s first Allegro phrase in his 1925 recording of Kreisler’s Praeludium und Allegro\textsuperscript{144} (ex. 4.77) is constructed from two distinct speed segments (in addition to a third reached via an accelerando). Vecsey begins the section in a speed of crotchet = 80 but at b. 3 plays suddenly faster (crotchet = 108), quickening gently through the second and third beats of b. 4 before reaching a final quicker speed (crotchet = 120) at the start of b. 5.

Recordings from the 1940s onwards show that the use of temporary local speeds occurring without a previous or subsequent accelerando or rallentando gradually became less frequent, following the decline in the application of small-scale rubato devices so far observed. For instance, whereas in his 1911 recording of Beethoven’s Kreutzer Sonata Op. 47, 2/Var. II/\textsuperscript{145} (see ex 4.36) Szigeti uses two separate speeds for the first two quaver beats, in his later recordings of the work\textsuperscript{146} (1940 and 1944) and in versions by Martzy\textsuperscript{147} (1956) and Végh\textsuperscript{148} (1982) these bars are played in one tempo. Similarly, in his 1944 recording of Beethoven’s Violin Sonata Op. 30 No. 3, 3/28-32,\textsuperscript{149} Szigeti plays steadily in one speed, whereas in his 1927 recording\textsuperscript{150} (ex. 4.78) he uses a separate faster

\textsuperscript{144} Discography item 217.
\textsuperscript{145} Discography item 128.
\textsuperscript{146} Discography items 132 and 133.
\textsuperscript{147} Discography item 71.
\textsuperscript{148} Discography item 239.
\textsuperscript{149} Discography item 133.
\textsuperscript{150} Discography item 130.
tempo (crotchet = 176) for each semiquaver group. In this case, the tenuto crotchets are played at the original speed of the movement (crotchet = 152-160), Szigeti instead shortening the time allowed to play the intervening semiquavers. Martzy’s decision in 1951 and 1960\textsuperscript{151} to play the phrase strictly in tempo again typifies the simpler approach taken by her generation. Szigeti’s preservation of his 1908 practice of using separate speeds in his 1949 and 1956 recordings of J. S. Bach’s Partita for Solo Violin in E major BWV 1006, Preludio/1-3 (see ex. 4.37) attests to the metrical freedom associated with unaccompanied repertoire rather than being representative of his general practice in the 1940s and 1950s. The more straightforward approach of the younger generation of players is typified by Martzy’s single speed for this passage.\textsuperscript{152}

Melodic Rubato

Recordings illustrate that melodic rubato became used infrequently, seemingly as a consequence of the rejection of some small-scale rubato devices but also because of more general misgivings about the artistic suitability of manufacturing deliberate metric disunity between a melody and its accompaniment. Thus, In his 1926 recording of Hubay’s Zephyr Op. 30 No. 5/39\textsuperscript{153} (see ex. 4.39), Szigeti’s rallentando is shared exactly by the piano accompaniment, unlike in his 1908 version.\textsuperscript{154} Similarly, in his 1940 and 1944 recordings of Beethoven’s Kreutzer Sonata Op. 47, 2/46-48\textsuperscript{155} (ex. 4.40), Szigeti

\textsuperscript{151} Discography items 70 and 72.
\textsuperscript{152} Although she slightly lengthens the first note (e\textsuperscript{1}) in b. 3.
\textsuperscript{153} Discography item 161.
\textsuperscript{154} Discography item 157.
\textsuperscript{155} Discography items 132 and 133.
and each of his pianists play exactly together, Szigeti omitting the melodic rubato of his 1911 recording.\textsuperscript{156} But while Szigeti appears to have dismissed the device fairly readily after his first recordings, other of Hubay’s older pupils took longer to abandon it. Indeed, a reviewer of d’Arányi playing Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64 in 1929 comments that ‘the orchestra and she played in perfectly adjusted time… sometimes apart but they always came together again.’\textsuperscript{157} Also, in their 1924 recording of Spohr’s Sonata for Two Violins Op. 67, 2/45-47\textsuperscript{158} (ex. 4.79), d’Arányi and Fachiri make striking use of the device; d’Arányi’s melody deviates from a steady pulse, most usually due to her frequent use of localised compensation rubato, while Fachiri keeps her accompanying semiquavers strictly in tempo. Similarly, in her 1938 recording of Schumann’s Violin Concerto, 2/4-8\textsuperscript{159} (ex. 4.80) d’Arányi’s tempo is extremely flexible with the result that the melody moves in and out of time with the orchestra. Here, she relies on small-scale compensation rubato (b. 5 and bb. 7-8), some quickening and lengthening of individual notes (b. 4) and sectionised speeds (bb. 5-6) to dislocate the melody from its already syncopated orchestral accompaniment. Likewise, in his 1924 recording of Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto Op. 64, 1/128\textsuperscript{160} (ex. 4.81), Brown uses melodic rubato, cutting short the full value of b\textsuperscript{3} by almost one whole quaver and causing a striking disunity of his line and the change of harmony in the orchestra in 1/130. He compensates for this loss of time by slackening his speed in 1/130. Similarly, in 1/154 (ex. 4.82), Brown’s acceleration through the final two crotchets of the bar is independent of the

\textsuperscript{156} Discography item 128.
\textsuperscript{157} Unsigned review, October 1929, cited in Macleod, J., \textit{The Sisters}, p. 183.
\textsuperscript{158} Discography item 24.
\textsuperscript{159} Discography item 23.
\textsuperscript{160} Discography item 3.
steady accompaniment,\footnote{For example, bb. 238-250.} and, in 1/256 (ex. 4.83), the melodic line is again dislocated from its accompaniment by Brown beginning his entry slightly early. The orchestra remains exactly in time and it and Brown only reunite following his compensatory lengthening of g-sharp in b. 259.

In summary, recordings show that despite a tendency to simplify the performance of most types of repertoire by reducing the amount of tempo and rhythmic flexibility used (exemplified most clearly in the performances of the youngest players surveyed), the older generation of Hubay’s pupils maintained a predilection for some of the devices used in their earliest performances. For example, the continued use by such players of rhythmic adjustments, tempo hold-ups, non-compensating rubato, tempo sectionalisation and melodic rubato confirms that their original induction to matters of tempo flexibility, as provided by Hubay, was enduring. In particular, the continued application of a strategy to generate expressive differences between like material by consistently varying only the second statement of a repeated figure suggests that Hubay’s teaching had been robustly influential, remaining apparent even in the context of wider stylistic changes during his pupils’ careers. Aspects of recorded performances reveal, however, that Hubay’s pupils were indeed influenced by such general trends in performance. Sources exemplify the rejection of rhythmic adjustment as an expressive device and the neglect of tempo hold-ups, non-compensating rubato at cadences, tempo sectionalisation, localised compensating rubato and melodic rubato. Such sources show that, in general, performers
considered an exact or literal interpretation of rhythms and a predominantly inflexible
approach to tempo to be both tasteful and appropriate by the end of the period examined.
Conclusions

In this thesis I have examined in detail the changes in the use of expressive devices in violin performance that occurred in approximately the first half of the twentieth century. Recordings show that performers typically moved from using expressive devices selectively, as recommended in nineteenth-century treatises and exemplified in Joachim’s recordings, to a more frequent and exaggerated application. In particular: vibrato changed from its function of highlighting important notes to being more-or-less continuous, often perceived specifically as expressing the personality of the performer rather than the music itself; expressive and technical slides were employed more liberally than previously; and flexibility of tempo was exploited routinely to assist in conveying expression. But from c. 1940, players gradually simplified their approach to expressive fingerling and rhythmic and tempo distortions (although Hubay’s older pupils were more likely to retain features of the approach of the early decades of the century than their younger contemporaries) whilst vibrato remained continuous. Recordings thus satisfactorily illustrate Auer’s and Flesch’s remarks (presented in the introduction to this thesis) concerning the way in which changing styles in instrumental performance are subject to the artistic tastes of each age.

The thesis also set out to explore whether, in the context of such shifts as described by Auer and Flesch, a player’s initial training (that is ‘genes’) or other external influences (‘environment’) was more dominant. This research exemplifies that style in violin
performance was relative to the aesthetic sense of the age in which a performance was
delivered, suggesting that 'environmental' influences were predominantly important.
Violinists who changed their playing style to satisfy the fashion of the day were most
successful. Those who did not change, to re-cite Szigeti, 'had little chance of
maintaining their hold.'\(^1\) Indeed, recordings show that Hubay's approach to matters of
musical expression on the violin was essentially a product of the twentieth century.
Aspects of his playing in recordings from the 1920s resemble more closely his pupils' style at this time than his recommendations in editions published at the end of the
nineteenth century or Joachim's playing. As Milsom notes (within the earlier time-frame examined in his study), 'older performers seem to embody nineteenth-century theory to a greater degree than younger figures, some of whom (such as Hubay...) suggest the gestation of later, more intrinsically twentieth-century values.'\(^2\) Hubay's recordings illustrate that he did not rest on his stylistic laurels, evolving his use of expressive devices beyond that which he had learned as a younger player. The appropriation of 'modern' aspects in his recorded performances such as a more continuous vibrato, more frequent L-slides and a rejection of rhythmic adjustment to aid expression illustrate Milsom's contention.

To most players of the early twentieth century, keeping pace with trends was vitally important to being a successful artist and there seems to have been little room for activity on the periphery of what was considered modern. Szigeti's polarised view that those who failed to move with the times moved out of the spotlight epitomises what must have been

---

\(^1\) Szigeti, J., *With Strings*, p. 19.
seen as acceptable. This may go some way to explaining the anxiety evident in much of
Szigeti's writing of being linked to past practices and traditions of playing. As violinists,
he and others of his generation tended not to look back. But recordings also show that
the stylistic traits ('genes') taught by Hubay to his pupils were often long lasting, in the
same way that some of what Joachim had instilled in his pupil, Hubay, also stood the test
of time. In particular, Hubay's pattern of locating expressive devices in one or other part
of a repeated figure, usually in order to enhance the expression of a second statement,
was conveyed to his pupils. With varying rigour, depending on the artist considered,
such players then used this strategy throughout their careers, even in the midst of shifting
tastes and fashions. Indeed, it may be said that they used it because of such changes - to
give their interpretations continuity. Some expressive devices proved longer lasting or
more characteristic than others. The typically slow and wide-oscillating vibrato
associated with Hubay and the Hungarian school, for example, was especially enduring,
even following the trend to vibrate continuously. This lent its membership a recognisable
distinguishing mark and, in part, satisfies Leviste's contention that vibrato conveyed 'a
characteristic of personality.' 13 Such a similarity between the vibratos of Hubay and his
pupils has prompted Tully Potter to reflect that, in her concerto recordings from the
1950s, Marzty used 'a Hubay–vibrato.' Acknowledging that this was a shared feature, he
writes, 'she [had] it under better control than most of her Hungarian colleagues from the
same stable.' 14

---

3 Leviste, R., *La Technique*, p. 6.
4 Potter, T., CD sleeve notes from *Johanna Martzy, Mendelssohn and Brahms Violin
The research also shows that written theory and actual practice sometimes disagreed. This reveals two important conclusions about the relationship between theory and practice. First, approaches to expression in violin performance in the period surveyed were often more fluid than treatises and other written sources suggest. Secondly, by-and-large, such treatises tended to prescribe practice rather than explain it as it really was. But disagreements between these sources point towards more than mere disparities.

Flesch, whilst formally only ever commending Hubay's playing, indirectly found considerable fault with his approach to expressive means. As cited at intervals throughout this thesis, Flesch objected generally to a slow vibrato, slides to an open-string, restated departing notes creating 'crushed-note' figures and portamento between small intervals. Such tendencies are manifestly present in Hubay's recordings and the recordings of his pupils, suggesting that Hubay's approach was considerably less restrained than Flesch's and that his way of playing (and what he taught his pupils) was often at odds with the prescriptions of other celebrated teachers of his time. The consistencies between the playing of Hubay and his pupils as well as the frequent inconsistencies between Hubay's playing and Flesch's advice ultimately satisfy the definition of 'school' presented in the first chapter of this thesis: 'a succession of persons who in... some department of practice are disciples of the same master or who are united by a general similarity of principles and methods.'\(^5\) In addition, the occasional inconsistencies between recordings and written sources in the twentieth century highlight the inherent problem of using only written materials and suggests that for seventeenth-, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century players, too (as for those under scrutiny in this study),

actual performance style may not always unerringly have corresponded to the
prescriptions of treatises from these eras.

The broader implications of this research cover several areas. The research highlights
that recordings should, undoubtedly, be at the core of an investigation into twentieth-
century performing practice; practitioners in a given field of performance always know
more than they can ever say, their recordings illustrating that which is tacit in written
sources. There are, of course, limitations to examining expression under headings such
as those in this study, just as treatises are also restricted by the same shortcoming. An
actual performance demonstrating such findings is, therefore, beneficial to a more
complete understanding. But even a historically informed delivery of a work can never
wholly represent the practices of the past - even when relying on recordings as source
material. In a sense, such a performance has as much to do with the tastes (and ‘needs’ in
Flesch’s sense) of today than it does with those of a century ago. As Taruskin observed
in 1995, ‘what we call historical performance is the sound of now, not then. It derives its
authenticity not from its historical verisimilitude, but from being, for better or worse, a
true mirror of late twentieth-century taste.’6 Similarly, Butt writes ‘historically informed
performance is an essential part of contemporary culture and… however great its
shortcomings, it contributes to the continual survival and flourishing of western music.’7
Taruskin and Butt seem to build on that which Auer and Flesch felt to be decisive on
performance style in their era. Their comments indicate that the acceptance of and
confidence in the recycling of knowledge and the reconstruction of practice exhibited by

performers in the twenty first century has undergone a seismic shift from the caution shown by players such as Szigeti throughout their careers of linking themselves to past stylistic practices. An investigation into why players and listeners today crave something that they perceive to be more ‘authentic’ or honest (and, therefore, more appropriate or beautiful) than that which might be produced without a constant referencing of the past would prove a fascinating and worthwhile endeavour, and one which might well benefit from the research presented in this thesis.
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9. Bach, J. S.
Concerto for Two Violins in D minor BWV 1043.
Fachiri, A., violin 1; d’Arányi, J., violin 2;
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32. Bach, J. S.

Sonata in A major BWV 1015, Andante.

Fachiri, A., violin; Tovey, D.F., piano.

Recorded in 1928.

National Gramophone Society (NGS) 117, 78 rpm.

See also Beethoven, L. v., Sonata for Violin and Piano in G
major Op. 96.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CL00056617.
33. Bach, J. S.

Concerto for Two violins in C minor BWV 1060.

Fachiri, A., violin 1; d’Arányi, J., violin 2; Hobday, E., piano.

Recorded in c. 1923.

Vocalion K-05110, Matrix No. 03559, 78 rpm.

See also Pugnani (arr. Moffat), Sonata for Two Violins, Andante.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CL 0011240.

34. Bach, J. S.

Concerto for Two Violins in D minor BWV 1043.

Fachiri, A., violin 1; d’Arányi, J., violin 2;

un-named orchestra; Chapple, S., conductor.

Recorded in 1926.

Vocalion A-0252/3, Matrix No. 04244x, 04245, 04246, 04247, 78 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CL 0011033-4.

35. Beethoven, L. v.

Sonata for Violin and Piano in G major Op. 96.

Fachiri, A., violin; Tovey, D.F., piano.

Recorded in 1928.
National Gramophone Society (NGS) 114-7, 78 rpm.

See also Bach, J. S., Sonata in A major BWV 1015, 

Andante.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CL0005611, 1CL0005613, 
1CL0005615, 1CL0005617.

36. Boccherini, L.

Sonata for Two Violins, (arr. Moffat), Andante Espressivo.

Fachiri, A., violin 1; d'Aranyi, J., violin 2; Hobday, E., piano.

Recorded in 1924.

Vocalion K-05142, 78 rpm.

See also Pugnani, G., Sonata for Two Violins.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 9CL 0027450.


Spanish Dance.

Fachiri, A., violin; Newton, I., piano.

Recorded in 1925.

Vocalion K-05173, Matrix No. 03441, 78 rpm.

See also Bach, J. S., Partita for Solo Violin in B minor 

BWV 1002, Sarabande.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 9CL0027459.
   Sonata for Two violins, *Andante*.
   Fachiri, A., violin 1; d'Arányi, J., violin 2; Hobday, E.,
   piano.
   Recorded in c. 1923.
   Vocalion K - 05110, Matrix No. 03560x, 78 rpm.
   See also Bach, J.S., Concerto for Two Violins in C minor
   BWV 1060.
   BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CL0011240.

   Sonata for Two Violins, *Allegro Assai* and *Allegro Vivace*.
   Fachiri, A., violin 1; d'Arányi, J., violin 2; Hobday, E.,
   piano.
   Recorded in 1924.
   Vocalion K-05142, Matrix No. 03710, 78 rpm.
   See also Bocherini, Sonata for Two Violins.
   BLSA shelf-mark No. 9CL0027450.

40. Spohr, L.
   d’Arányi, J., violin 1; Fachiri, A., violin 2.
Recorded in 1924.

Vocalion D-02146, Matrix No. 03490, 78 rpm.

See also Bach, J.S. Sonata for Two Violins in C major

BWV 1037, *Gigue*.

Reissued as part of *The Recorded Violin*, Pearl, BVA II, 1990, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035506.

---

Geyer, Stefi  
(1888-1956)  

41. Bach, J. S.  

Partita for Solo Violin in E major BWV 1006, *Loure*.

Geyer, S., violin.

Recorded in 1946.

Columbia ZX159, LZX1.

Reissued as part of *L'Art de Stefi Geyer*, LYS 398, 1998, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD 0199019.

---


*Slavonic Dance* No. 2 in E minor.

Geyer, S., violin; Schulthess, W., piano.

Recorded in c. 1927.

Parlophone P-9130-11, Matrix No. 20226, 78 rpm.

CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD 0199019.

Reissued as part of *The Recorded Violin*, Pearl BVII, 1990, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035506.

43. Goldmark, K.

*Air.*

Geyer, S., violin; Schulthess, W., piano.

Recorded in c. 1927.

Parlophone P-9130-11, Matrix No. 20225.


CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD 0199019.

44. Haydn, J.

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra in C major Hob.VIIa: 1.

Geyer, S., violin; Collegium Musicum Zürich; Sacher, P., conductor.

Recorded in 9/1946.

Columbia CZX227, LZX238/239.

Reissued as part of *L’Art de Stefi Geyer*, LYS 398, 1998, CD.
45. Kreisler, F.

_Schön Rosmarin._

Geyer, S., violin; Schulthess, W., piano.

Recorded in c. 1927.

Columbia 2302 LE1.

Reissued as part of _L'Art de Stefi Geyer_, LYS 398, 1998, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD 0199019.

46. Mozart, W. A.

_Adagio in E major K 261._

Geyer, S., violin; Collegium Musicum Zürich; Sacher, P., conductor.

Recorded in 1946.

Columbia CZX185/31, LZX7.

Reissued as part of _L'Art de Stefi Geyer_, LYS 398, 1998, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD 0199019.
47. Schoeck, O.

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra Quasi una Fantasia Op. 21.

Geyer, S., violin; Tonhalle Orchestra Zürich; Andreae, V., conductor.

Recorded on 6/2/1947.

Original issue details unknown.

Reissued as part of L'Art de Stefi Geyer, LYS 398, 1998, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD 0199019.


Air on the G-String (from Suite No. 3 in D major BWV 1068).

Hubay, J., violin; Budapest Conservatory Symphony Orchestra; Zsolt, N., conductor.

Recorded on 31/10/1929.

HMV AN418, Matrix No. CV 713, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Jenö Hubay and his pupil Emil Telmányi, Danacord Daco 150, 1982, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0073494.
Reissued as part of Jenö Hubay and Carl Flesch, Biddulph
LAB 045, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0033282.


Larghetto, (from Sonata for Flute and Harpsichord in B
minor No 9).

Hubay, J., violin; Budapest Conservatory Symphony
Orchestra; Zsolt, N., conductor.

Recorded on 4/11/1929.

HMV AN418, Matrix No. CV712, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Jenö Hubay and his pupil Emil
Telmányi, Danacord Daco 150, 1982, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0073494.

Reissued as part of Jenö Hubay and Carl Flesch, Biddulph
LAB 045, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0033282.

50. Hubay, J.

Berceuse Op. 79 No. 9.

Hubay, J., violin; Hertz, O., piano.

Recorded on 4/12/1928.

HMV AN217, Matrix No. CW2047, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Jenő Hubay and his pupil Emil

Telmányi, Danacord Daco 150, 1982, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0073494.

Reissued as part of Jenő Hubay and Carl Flesch, Biddulph

LAB 045, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0033282.

51. Hubay, J.


Hubay, J., violin; Hertz, O., piano.

Recorded on 4/12/1928.

HMV AN217, Matrix No. 2046, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Jenő Hubay and his pupil Emil

Telmányi, Danacord Daco 150, 1982, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0073494.

Reissued as part of The Recorded Violin; Vol. 2, Pearl

BVAII, 1990, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035506.

Reissued as part of Jenő Hubay and Carl Flesch, Biddulph

LAB 045, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0033282.
52. Hubay, J.

*Scène de la Csarda* No. 5 *(Hungamzo Balaton)* Op. 35.

Hubay, J., violin; Hertz, O., piano.

Recorded on 4/12/1928.

HMV AN1691, Matrix No. 2048/9, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Jenö Hubay and Carl Flesch*, Biddulph

LAB 045, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0033282.

53. Hubay, J.

*Scène de la Czarda* No. 12 *(Pici Tubicám)* Op. 83.

Hubay, J., violin; Budapest Conservatory Symphony Orchestra; Zsolt, N., conductor.

Recorded on 31/10/1929.

HMV AN442, Matrix No. CV696/7, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Jenö Hubay and his pupil Emil Telmányi*, Danacord Daco 150, 1982, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0073494.

Reissued as part of *Important Early Sound Recordings, Violinists*, Vol. 1, Symposium 1071, 1989, CD.

Reissued as part of *Jenö Hubay and Carl Flesch*, Biddulph

LAB 045, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0033282.
54. Hubay, J.


Hubay, J., violin; Basildes, M., soprano; Hertz, O., piano.

Recorded on 22/11/1929.

HMV AN454, Matrix No. CV804, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of _Jenő Hubay and Carl Flesch_, Biddulph LAB 045, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. ICD0033282.

55. Hubay, J.

_Hungarian Fantasy_ Op. 76 No. 2.

Hubay, J., violin; unnamed, piano.

Recorded in 1935.

Original issue details unknown.

Private collection.

56. Bach, J. S.

_Johannes Christian Joachim_ (1831-1907)

Sonata for Solo Violin in G minor BWV 1001, _Adagio_.

Recorded in 1903.

Gramophone and Typewriter 047006, Matrix No. 204y, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of *Important Early Sound Recordings*,

*Violinists* Vol. 1, Symposium 1071, 1989, CD.

Reissued as part of *Joachim, Sarasate, Ysaïe*, Opal CD9851, 1992, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0053069.

57. Bach, J. S.

Partita for Solo Violin in B minor BWV 1002, *Bourée*.

Joachim, J, violin.

Recorded in 1903.

Gramophone and Typewriter 047904, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joachim, Sarasate, Ysaïe*, Opal CD9851, 1992, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0053069.


*Hungarian Dance* No. 1 in G minor.

Joachim J., violin; unnamed, piano.

Recorded in 1903.

Gramophone and Typewriter 047907, 78 rpm.

Reissued as ASCO A123, 78 rpm.

Reissued as Pearl Gemm 101, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 2LP00610855.

_Hungarian Dance_ No. 2 in D minor.

Joachim, J., violin; unnamed, piano.

Recorded in 1903.

Gramophone and Typewriter 047905, 78 rpm.

Reissued as ASCO A123, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Delta TQD3035, 33.3 rpm.

Reissued as part of HMV D88, D803, 33.3 rpm.

Reissued as part of _The Recorded Violin_, Vol. I,

Pearl BVA I, 1990, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035504.

60.  Joachim, J.

_Romanze_ in C major.

Joachim, J., violin; unnamed, piano.

Recorded in 1903.

Gramophone and Typewriter 047906, Matrix No. 218ySDZZ, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of _Joachim, Sarasate, Ysaïe, Opal_ CD9851, 1992, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0053069.
Kreisler, Fritz 61. Kreisler, F.
(1875-1962) *Rondino (on a theme of Beethoven).*
Kreisler, K., violin; Lamson, C., piano.
Recorded on 6/10/1928.
Victor 1386 (HMV DA 1044), Matrix No. BE 16985-4,
78 rpm.
Reissued as part of *Kreisler Plays Kreisler*, Golden Legacy
GLR6 106, 1994, CD.

Lengyel, Gabriella 62. Hubay, J.
(b. 1920) *Sonata Romantique* Op. 22.
Lengyel, G., violin; Lengyel, A., piano.
Recorded in c. 1950.
Unpublished recording.
Private Collection.

Marteau, Henri 63. Sarasate, P. de.
Marteau, H., violin; unnamed, piano.
Recorded on 12/12/1927, (Berlin).
Original recording details unknown.
Reissued as part of *Important Early Sound Recordings,*
*Violinists*, Vol. 1, Symposium 1071, 1989, CD,
Martzy, Johanna  
(1924-1979)  

64. Bach, J. S.

Partita for Solo Violin in E major BWV 1006.
Martzy, J., violin.
Recorded on 20/6/1955.
Bayerischen Rundfunks, München.
Issued as part of Martzy, Bach, Coup d'Archet Coup CD007, 1999, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0189568.

65. Bach, J. S.

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra in E major BWV 1042.
Martzy, J., violin; Barvarian State Radio Symphony Orchestra; Jochum, E., conductor.
Recorded on 24/4/1959.
Bayerischen Rundfunks, München.
Issued as part of Johanna Martzy, Mozart and Bach Violin Concertos, Coup d'Archet Coup CD002, 1997, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0167471.

66. Bach, J. S.

Sonata for Solo Violin in G minor BWV 1001.
Martzy, J., violin.

Recorded in 1960 (live), (Redpath Hall, Montreal, Canada).

Issued as part of *Legendary Treasures, Johanna Martzy*, Vol. 1, Doremi DHR 7753, 2000, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0170574.

67. **Bach, J. S.**

Sonata for Solo Violin in G minor BWV 1001.

Martzy, J., violin.

Recorded on 4/5/1962.

Broadcast on Deauchlandradio/RIAS Berlin.

Issued as part of *Martzy, Bach, Coup d’Archet Coup CD007*, 1999, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0189568.

68. **Bartók, B., (arr. Széklely, Z.).**

*Six Romanian Folk Dances.*

Martzy, J, violin; Antonietti, J., piano.

Recorded 31/10/1951.

Broadcast on Radio Suisse Romande.

Issued as part of *Johanna Martzy, Favourite Short Works*, Coup D’Archet Coup CD006, 1999, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0189566.

_Six Romanian Folk Dances._

Martzy, J., violin; Pommers, L., piano.

Recorded in 1960 (live), (Redpath Hall, Montreal, Candada).

Issued as part of _Legacy Treasures, Johanna Martzy,_

Vol. 1, Doremi DHR 7753, 2000, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0170574.

70. Beethoven, L. v.

_Sonata for Violin and Piano in G major Op. 30 No. 3._

Martzy, J., violin; Antonietti, J., piano.

Recorded on 31/10/1951.

Broadcast on Radio Suisse Romande.

Issued as part of _Joanna Martzy and Jean Antonietti,_

_Beethoven Sonatas for Violin and Piano, Coup D'Archer_

Coup CD003, 1997, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1cd0167452.

71. Beethoven, L. v.

_Sonata for Violin and Piano in A major (Kreutzer) Op. 47._

Martzy, J., violin; Antonietti, J., piano.

Recorded on 6/5/1956.

Broadcast on Barvarian State Radio, (Munich).
Issued as part of Joanna Martzy and Jean Antonietti,  
Beethoven Sonatas for Violin and Piano, Coup D'Archet  
Coup CD003, 1997, CD.  
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0167452.

Sonata for Violin and Piano in G major Op. 30 No. 3.  
Martzy, J., violin; Pommers, L., piano.  
Recorded in 1960 (live), (Redpath Hall, Montreal, Canada).  
Issued as part of Legendary Treasures, Johanna Martzy,  
Vol. 1, Doremi DHR 7753, 2000, CD.  
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0170574.

73. Beethoven, L. v. 
Piano Trio in C minor Op. 1 No. 3.  
Martzy, J., violin; Szabo, P., cello; Hajdu, I., piano.  
Broadcast on WDR Cologne.  
Issued as part of Beethoven and Dvorák Trios, Johanna  
Martzy, Paul Szabo and István Hajdu, Coup D'Archet  
Coup CD004, 1998, CD.  
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0167453.
74. Brahms, J.

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra Op. 77.

(Cadenza by Joachim, J.).

Martzy, J., violin; Philharmonia Orchestra; Kletzki, P.,
conductor.


Columbia 33CX 1165.

Reissued as part of Johanna Martzy, Mendelssohn and
Brahms Violin Concertos, Testament SBT 1037, 1994, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0070306.

75. Brahms, J.

Sonata for Violin and Piano No. 1 in G major Op. 78.

Martzy, J., violin; Hajdu, I., piano.


Broadcast on Schweizer Radio DRS.

Issued as part of Johanna Martzy, István Hajdu, Brahms
and Ravel Violin Sonatas. Coup D’Archet, Coup CD005,
1999, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0189565.

76. Dvořák, A.

Piano Trio in E minor Op. 9 (Dumky).
Martzy, J., violin; Szabo, P., cello; Hajdu, I., piano.


Broadcast on WDR Cologne.

Issued as part of Beethoven and Dvorák Trios, Johanna
Martzy, Paul Szabo and István Hajdu, Coup D’Archet
Coup CD004, 1998, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0167453.


Danza Española.

Martzy, J., violin; Antonietti, J., piano.


Broadcast on Deutschlandradio/RIAS Berlin.

Issued as part of Johanna Martzy, Favourite Short Works,
Coup D’Archet Coup CD006, 1999, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0189566.

78. Fiocco, J.

Allegro.

Martzy, J., violin; Antonietti, J., piano.


Broadcast on Deutschlandradio/RIAS Berlin.
Issued as part of *Johanna Martzy, Favourite Short Works*,
Coup D’Archet Coup CD006, 1999, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0189566.

79. Franck, C.
Sonata for Violin and Piano in A major.
Martzy, J., violin; Antonietti, J., piano.
Recorded on 15/7/1959.
Broadcast on VARA Matinée.
Issued as part of *Johanna Martzy, Jean Antonietti, Franck and Ravel Violin Sonatas*, Coup D’Archet Coup CD001, 1997, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0167450.

80. Handel, G. F.
Sonata in F major Op. 1 No. 12.
Martzy, J., violin; Antonietti, J., piano.
Broadcast on Senderfreies, Berlin.
Issued as part of *Johanna Martzy, Favourite Short Works*,
Coup D’Archet Coup CD006, 1999, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0189566.
81. Handel, G. F.

Sonata in F major Op. 1 No. 12.

Martzy, J., violin; Pommers, L., piano.

Recorded in 1960 (live), (Redpath Hall, Montreal, Canada).

Issued as part of *Legendary Treasures, Johanna Martzy*, Vol. 1, Doremi DHR 7753, 2000, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0170574.

82. Handel, G. F.

Sonata in A major Op. 1 No. 3.

Martzy, J., violin; Antonietti, J., piano.

Recorded on 4/5/1962.

Broadcast on Deutschlandradio/RIAS Berlin.

Issued as part of *Johanna Martzy, Favourite Short Works*, Coup D’Archet Coup CD006, 1999, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0189566.

83. Kreisler, F.

*Rondino (on a theme of Beethoven).*

Martzy, J., violin; Antonietti, J., piano.


Broadcast on Deutschlandradio/RIAS Berlin.
Issued as part of *Johanna Martzy, Favourite Short Works*,

Coup D'Archet Coup CD006, 1999, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0189566.

84. Martinu, B.

*Etude Rhythmique, Arabesque* No. 1.

Martzy, J., violin; Antonietti, J., piano.

Recorded on 13/10/1951.

Broadcast on Radio Suisse Romande.

Issued as part of *Johanna Martzy, Favourite Short Works*,

Coup D'Archet Coup CD006, 1999, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0189566.

85. Mendelssohn, F.

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra in E minor Op. 64.

Martzy, J., violin; Philharmonia Orchestra; Kletzki, P.,

conductor.

Recorded on 20, 21, 23/12/1955, (Kingsway Hall, London).

Columbia 33CX 1497, 33.3 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Johanna Martzy, Mendelssohn and Brahms Violin Concertos*, Testament SBT 1037, 1994, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0070306.
86. Milhaud, D.

*Le Printemps.*

Martzy, J., violin; Antonietti, J., piano.

Recorded on 31/10/1951.

Broadcast on Radio Suisse Romande.

Issued as part of *Johanna Martzy, Favourite Short Works,*

Coup D'Archet Coup CD006, 1999, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0189566.

87. Mozart, W. A.

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra in G major K. 216.

Martzy, J., violin; Barvarian State Radio Symphony Orchestra; Jochum, E., conductor.

Recorded on 19/6/1955.

Broadcast on Barvarian State Radio.

Issued as part of *Joahanna Martzy, Mozart and Bach violin Concertos,* Coup d'Archet Coup CD002, 1997, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0167471.

88. Ravel, M.

Sonata for Violin and Piano.

Martzy, J., violin; Antonietti, J., piano.

Recorded on 27/1/1965.
Broadcast on VARA Matinée.

Issued as part of *Johanna Martzy, Jean Antonietti, Franck and Ravel Violin Sonatas*, Coup D'Archet Coup CD001, 1997, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0167450.

89. **Ravel, M.**

Sonata for Violin and Piano

Martzy, J., violin; Hajdu, I., piano.


Broadcast on Schweizer Radio DRS.

Issued as part of *Johanna Martzy, István Hajdu, Brahms and Ravel Violin Sonatas*, Coup D'Archet, Coup CD005, 1997, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0189565.

90. **Schubert, F.**

Sonatina for Violin and Piano in D major Op 137 No. 1, D. 384.

Martzy, J., violin; Antonietti, J., piano.

Recorded in 1957.

Columbia 33CX 1359, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0181315.
91. Schubert, F.


Martzy, J., violin; Antonietti, J. piano.

Recorded in 1957.

Columbia 33CX 1359, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0181315.

92. Stravinsky, I.

*Duo Concertant* (1932).

Martzy, J., violin; Pommers, L., piano.

Recorded in 1960 (live), (Redpath Hall, Montreal, Canada).

Issued as part of *Legendry Treasures, Johanna Martzy*, Vol. 1, Doremi DHR 7753, 2000, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0170574.

93. Szymanowski, K.

*Notturno* and *Tarentella* Op. 28.

Martzy, J., violin; Pommers, L., piano.

Recorded in 1960 (live), (Redpath Hall, Montreal, Canada).

Issued as part of *Legendry Treasures, Johanna Martzy*, Vol. 1, Doremi DHR 7753, 2000, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0170574.

Ormandy, Eugene (1899-1985)

94. Drdla, F.

_Souvenir._

Ormandy, E., violin; Goldner, S., harp.

Recorded on 30/8/1928.

Okeh 41147, Matrix No. 401086-B, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of _The Art of Eugene Ormandy_,

Biddulph WHL 06415, 1999, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0188557.


_Humoresque._

Ormandy, E., violin; Goldner, S., harp.

Recorded on 30/8/1928.

Okeh 41147, Matrix No. 401085-E. 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of _The Art of Eugene Ormandy_,

Biddulph WHL 06415.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0188557.


_Kiss Me Again_ (from _Mlle Modiste)._  

Ormandy, E., violin; Axt, W., piano.
Recorded on 24-26/5/1925.

Cameo 746, Matrix No. 1470-A.

Reissued as part of The Art of Eugene Ormandy,

Biddulph WHL 06415.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0188557.


Hymn to the Sun (from Le Coq d'Or).

Ormandy, E., violin; Axt, W., piano.

Recorded on 8-10/11/1923.

Cameo 465, Matrix No. 707-A.

Reissued as part of The Art of Eugene Ormandy,

Biddulph WHL 06415.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0188557.


Song of India (from Sadko).

Ormandy, E., violin; Axt, W., piano.

Recorded on 8-10/11/1923.

Cameo 465, Matrix No. 708-C.

Reissued as part of The Art of Eugene Ormandy,

Biddulph WHL 06415.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0188557.
(1903-2001)

Six Romanian Dances, (1, 3, 4 and 6 only).

Székely, Z., violin; Frid, G., piano.

Recorded in c. 1937, (London).

Decca D-K872, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of The Recorded Violin; Vol. 2, Pearl
BVAII, 1990, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035506.

100. Bartók, B.

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra No. 2.

Székely, Z., violin; Amsterdam Concertgebouw Orchestra;

Mengelberg, W., conductor.

Recorded on 23/3/1939 (Amsterdam).

Hungaroton LPX 11573, 33.3 rpm.

Reissued on Philips 426 104-2, CD.

101. Bartók, B.

String Quartet No. 5.

Székely, Z., violin 1; Kuttner, M., violin 2; Koromzay, D.,

viola; Magyar, G., cello.

102. Bartók, B.

String Quartet No. 6.

Székely, Z., violin 1; Kuțtner, M., violin 2; Koromzay, D., viola; Magyar, G., cello.

Recorded on 7/9/1955, (live), (Edinburgh).

BBC broadcast, 9th Edinburgh Festival.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 2CDR0001532.

103. Bartók, B.

Complete String Quartets.

Székely, Z., violin 1; Kuttner, M., violin 2; Koromzay, D., viola; Magyar, G., cello.


Deutsche Gramophon Gesellschaft 18650/2, 33.3 rpm.

Reissued on Deutsche Gramophon GmbH 457750-2, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0175783.

104. Beethoven, L. v.

String Quartet in E Minor Op. 59 No. 2.
Szekely, Z., violin 1; Kuttner, M., violin 2; Koromzay, D., viola; Magyar, G., cello.


BBC broadcast, 9th Edinburgh Festival.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 2CDR0001531.

105. Manen, J.


Szekely, Z., violin; Frid., G., piano.

Recorded in c. 1937, (London).

Decca D-K872, 78 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CL58413.

Reissued as part of *The Recorded Violin*; Vol. 2, Pearl BVAII, 1990, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035506.

106. Porpora, N. A.

Sonata for Violin and Piano in G Major.

Szekely, Z., violin; Frid, G., piano.

Recorded in c. 1937, (London).

Decca D-K863 D-25877, 78 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CL58406.
107. Tchaikovsky, P. I.

String Quartet No. 1 in D Major Op. 11, *Andante*  
*Cantabile.*

Székely, Z., violin 1; Moskowsky, A., violin 2; Koromzay, D., viola; Palotai, V., cello.

Recorded in 1938, (London).

HMV G-C3106, 78 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CL15347.

Szentgyörgyi, László 108. Paganini, N.  
(1897-1954)  
Concerto in D major Op. 6 No. 1, *Allegro.*

Szentgyörgyi, L., violin; Berlin State Opera Orchestra; Schmalstich, C., conductor.

Recorded in 1930.

HMV C2457-8, Matrix No. CNR794-2 and CNR795-2, 78 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CL0014407.


*Malagueña.*

Szentgyörgyi, L., violin; Schmalstich, C., piano.

Recorded in 1930.

See also Schubert, F., *Rondo*.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CL0013724.


*Rondo*.

Szentgyorgyi, L., violin; Schmalstich, C., piano.

Recorded in 1930.

HMV 2001, Matrix No. CLR5441-2, 78 rpm.

See also Sarasate, P. de., *Malagueña*.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CL0013724.

---

**Szigeti, József**

(1892-1973)

111. Arnold, S.

*Nocturne*.

Szigeti, J., violin; Bird, H., piano.

Recorded on 4/1/1911.

Gramophone and Typewriter 3-7934, Matrix No. ab13028e, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913)*, Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.
112. Bach, J. S.

Partita for Solo Violin in E major BWV 1006, Preludio.

Szigeti, J., violin.

Recorded on 30/9/08.

Gramophone and Typewriter 07911, Matrix No. 2611f, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913), Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.

113. Bach, J. S.

Partita for Solo Violin in B minor BWV 1002, Bourée.

Szigeti, J., violin.

Recorded in 1926.

Columbia 2073M, Matrix No. D 1633, 78 rpm.

Reissued as Columbia 71186D.

Reissued as part of The Art of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 1, Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The recording with Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes, Biddulph LAB 070-71, 1993, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.
114. Bach, J. S.

Sonata for Solo Violin in G minor BWV 1001.

Szigi, J., violin.

Recorded on 3/2/1931.

Columbia 67989/90D, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *The Art of Joseph Szigi*, Vol. 1,

Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.

115. Bach, J. S.

Partita for Solo Violin in E major BWV 1006, *Gavotte*.

Szigi, J., violin.

Recorded in 1931.

Columbia 67990, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *The Art of Joseph Szigi*, Vol. 1,

Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.

116. Bach, J. S.

Sonata for Solo Violin in A minor BWV 1003.

Szigi, J., violin.

Recorded in 1933.
Columbia 68152/3D.

Reissued as part of The Art of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 1,
Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.

117. Bach, J. S.

Concerto for Two Violin and Orchestra in D minor
BWV 1043.
Flesch, C., violin 1; Szigeti, J., violin 2; unnamed
orchestra; Goehr, W., conductor.
Recorded on 30/8/1937.
Columbia LX659/60, Matrix No. CAX8060/63, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti plays Bach and Bloch,
Pearl Gemm CD9938, 1992, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0040338.

118. Bach, J. S.

Partita for Solo Violin in B minor BWV 1002, Bourée.
Szigeti, J., violin.
Recorded in 3/1941.
Columbia 71186D, Matrix No. XC030107.
Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The recording with Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes*, Biddulph LAB 070-71, 1993, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.

119. Bach, J. S.

Sonata for Solo Violin in G minor BWV 1001.

Szigeti, J., violin.


Bruno Walter Society WSA 706.

Reissued as part of *J.S. Bach Unaccompanied Violin Works, Joseph Szigeti*, Music and Arts CD 774, 1993, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0188180.

120. Bach, J. S.

Partita for Solo Violin in E major BWV 1006.

Szigeti, J., Violin.

Recorded on 13/2/1949, (live), (New York).

Bruno Walter Society WSA 706.

Reissued as part of *J.S. Bach Unaccompanied Violin Works, Joseph Szigeti*, Music and Arts CD 774, 1993. CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0188180.
121. Bach, J. S.
Sonata for Solo Violin in A minor BWV 1003.
Szigeti, J., violin.
Recorded on 13/2/1949, (live), (New York).
Bruno Walter Society WSA 706.
Reissued as part of *J.S. Bach Unaccompanied Violin Works*, Joseph Szigeti, Music and Arts CD 774, 1993, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0188180.

122. Bach, J. S.
Six Sonatas and Partitas for Solo Violin BWV 1001-1006.
Szigeti, J., violin.
Bach Guild 627/9, 33.3 rpm.
BL shelf-mark No. 1LP0057865.
Reissued on Vanguard 92530 and 152022, 33.3 rpm.
Reissued on Vanguard 08.8022.72, CD.

*Six Romanian Dances*.
Szigeti, J., violin; Bartók, B., piano.
Recorded on 7/1/1930.
Columbia LB6, Matrix No. WA9908/9, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 2, Biddulph LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, Bach, Bartók and Brahms*, Biddulph LAB 153, 1999, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0173919.

Reissued as part of *Composers in Person, Béla Bartók and Ernő Dohnányi*, EMI Classics CDC 5 55031 2, 1994, CD.


*Seven Hungarian Folk Tunes.*

Szigeti, J., violin; Bartók, B., piano.

Recorded on 7/1/1930.

Columbia LX31, Matrix No. WAX5322/3, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 2, Biddulph LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.

Reissued as part of *The Recorded Violin*, Pearl BVAII, 1990, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035506.

Reissued as part of *Composers in Person, Béla Bartók and Ernő Dohnányi*, EMI Classics CDC 5 55031 2, 1994, CD.
125. Bartók, B.

*Rhapsody No. 1*

Szigeti, J., violin; Bartók, B., piano.

Recorded on 2/5/1940.

Columbia 11410D, Matrix No. WXCO 26790/91, 789 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Recording with Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes*, Biddulph LAB 070-71, 1993, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.

126. Bartók, B.

*Contrasts.*

Szigeti, J., violin; Goodman, B., clarinet; Bartók, B., piano.

Recorded on 13/5/1940.

Columbia 70362/63D, Matrix No. WXCO 26819122, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Recording with Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes*, Biddulph LAB 070-71, 1993, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.

127. Bartók, B.

*Sonata for Violin and Piano No. 2.*
Szigeti, J., violin; Bartók, B., piano.


Vanguard VRS 1130 92525.


BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0015087.


Sonata for Violin and Piano in A major (Kreutzer) Op. 47, Andante con Variazione.

Szigeti, J., violin; Bird, H., piano.

Recorded on 4/1/1911.

Gramophone and Typewriter 07948, Matrix No. ac4736f, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913), Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.


Minuet in G major, No. 2.

Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhrseitz, K., piano.

Recorded in 1926.
Columbia 2073m, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of The Art of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 1,
Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.

130. Beethoven, L. v.

Sonata for Violin and Piano in G major Op. 30 No. 3.

Allegro Vivace.

Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhrseitz, K., piano.

Recorded in 1928.

Columbia 17037D, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of The Art of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 1,
Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300


Concerto for Violin and Orchestra in D major Op. 61.

Szigeti, J., violin; British Symphony Orchestra; Walter, B.,
conductor.

Recorded in 5/1932.

Columbia 68070/4D, Matrix No. CAX 6388/97, 78 rpm.
Reissued on Columbia M6X 31513, 33.3 rpm.
Reissued as part of *Szigeti plays Beethoven and Brahms*,
Pearl Gemm CD9345, 1990, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0049998.

132. **Beethoven, L. v.**

Sonata for Violin and Piano in A major Op. 47 (*Kreutzer*).
Szigeti, J., violin; Bartók, B., piano.
Vanguard VRS 1130.
Reissued as part of *The Centenary Edition of Bartók’s Records (complete)*, Vol. 1, 1920-1945, Hungaroton LPX
12326-33, 1981, 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0015087.
Resissued on Vanguard 08.8008.71, CD.

133. **Beethoven, L. v.**

10 Sonatas for Violin and Piano (complete).
Szigeti, J., violin; Arrau, C., piano.
Recorded in 1944, (live).
Reissued as part of *Beethoven, The Ten Sonatas for Piano and Violin*; Vanguard SRV 30013, VRS 1109/12,
08.8042.73, 1993, CD.

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra in D major Op. 61.

Szigeti, J., Violin; New York Philharmonic Orchestra; Walter, B., conductor.


Columbia ML 4012, 33.3 rpm.

Reissued on Columbia ML4012, 33.3 rpm.

Reissued on Sony MPK 52536, CD.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, Beethoven and Mozart

Concertos, Strings QT 99.367, 1998, CD.


Concerto for Violin and Orchestra in D major Op. 61.

Szigeti, J., violin; London Symphony Orchestra; Dorati, A.,

conductor.


Mercury MG50358, 33.3 rpm.

Reissued on Mercury SR 90358, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0036597.

136. Brahms, J.


Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhrseitz, K., piano.
Recorded in 7/1927.

Colombia 67612D, Matrix No. L2269, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of The Art of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 1,

Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Brahms Recordings,

Strings QT 99.403, 1999, CD.

137. Brahms, J.

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra in D major Op. 77,
(cadenza by Joachim, J.).

Szigeti, J., violin; The Hallé Orchetsra; Harty, H.,
conductor.

Recorded in 1928.

Columbia L2265/9, Matrix No. VAX 44201/28, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Szigeti plays Beethoven and Brahms,

Pearl Gemm CD9345, 1990, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0049998.

138. Brahms, J.


Szigeti, J., violin; Petri, E., piano.

Recorded on 8/1/1937.
Columbia 69155/7D, 78 rpm.
Reissued on Columbia LX699/701, Matrix No. CAX8134/9, 78 rpm.
Reissued on HMV HQM1127.
Reissued as part of The Art of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2.
Biddulph LAB 007-8, 1989, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.
Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Brahms Recordings,
Strings QT 99.403, 1999, CD.
Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, Biddulph LAB 153,
1999, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0173915.


Hungarian Dance No. 5.
Szigeti, J., violin; Foldes, A., piano.
Recorded on 24/11/1941.
Columbia 17340D, Matrix No. C031950, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Recording with Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes, Biddulph LAB 070-71, 1993, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.
140. Brahms, J.

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra in D major Op. 77,
(cadenza by Joachim, J.).
Szigeti, J., violin; New York Philharmonic;
Mitropoulos, D., conductor.
Recorded on 24/10/1948, (live), (New York).
AS DISCA5518.
Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Brahms Recordings*,
Strings QT 99.403, 1999, CD.

141. Brahms, J.

Piano Trio in C major Op. 87.
Szigeti, J., violin; Casals, P., cello; Hess, M., piano.
Recorded 16/6/1951, (live), (Prades).
Columbia ML 4720, 33.3 rpm.
Reissued on Bruno Walter Society WSA 714, 33.3 rpm.
Reissued on Sony MPK 52535, CD.
Reissued as part of *The Casals Edition*, Sony SMK66571,
1994, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0095469.
142. Brahms, J.

Szigeti, J., violin; Barrows, J., horn, Horszowski, M.,
piano.
Mercury MG50210. 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0099542.

143. Brahms, J.

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra in D major Op. 77,
(cadenza by Joachim, J.).
Szigeti, J., violin; London Symphony Orchestra;
Menges, H., conductor.
Recorded 28/6/1959.
Mercury MG50225, 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0099501.


Scherzo Valse No. 10, Piüce Pittoresque.
Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.
Recorded in 1933.
Columbia 68162D 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 2, Biddulph
LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.


*La Folia* Op. 5 No. 12.

Szigeti, J., violin; Foldes, A., piano.

Recorded on 5/6/1940.

Columbia 71185/86D, Matrix No. XCO27422/24, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Sony MPK 52569.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Recording with Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes*, Biddulph LAB 070-71, 1993, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.

146. Debussy, C. A.

Sonata for Violin and Piano in G minor.

Szigeti, J., violin; Foldes, A., piano.

Recorded on 24/11/1941.

Columbia 7/590/3D, Matrix No. XCO 31998/200, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Rococo 2062, CD.
Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Recordings with
Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes, Biddulph LAB 070-71,
1993, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.


Slavonic Dance in E minor Op. 72 No. 2.

Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhseitz, K., piano.

Recorded on 20/9/1926.

Columbia 50144D, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Columbia L1963, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Recordings with
Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes, Biddulph LAB 070-71,
1993, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.


Slavonic Dance in G minor Op. 46 No. 2.

Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhseitz, K., piano.

Recorded on 29/6/1927.

Columbia 04129, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of *The Art of Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 1,
Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1999, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.


*Slavonic Dance* in G minor Op. 46 No. 1.

Szigeti, J., violin; Foldes, A., piano.

Recorded on 21/3/1941.

Columbia 17338D, Matrix No. CO30105, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Recordings with Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes*, Biddulph LAB 070-71, 1993, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.


*Slavonic Dance* in E minor Op. 72 No. 2.

Szigeti, J., violin; Foldes, A., piano.

Recorded on 21/11/1941.

Columbia 17338D, Matrix No. 631951, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Recordings with Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes*, Biddulph LAB 070-71, 1993, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.
151. Elgar, E.

*Adieu.*

Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.

Recorded on 24/2/1934.

Columbia 2150m, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2.* Biddulph

LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.


*Danse Espagnole.*

Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.

Recorded in 1932.

Columbia (J) J5169, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2.* Biddulph

LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.


*Danza del Molinaro.*

Szigeti, J., violin; Foldes, A., piano.

Recorded on 5/6/1940.
Columbia 70744D, Matrix No. XCO27425, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Recordings with Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes, Biddulph LAB 070-71, 1993, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.


_Larghetto,_ (from Sonata for Flute and Harpsichord in B minor No. 9).

Szigeti, J., violin; Bird, H., piano.

Recorded on 1/1/1913.

Gramophone and Typewriter 07984, Matrix No. 26948f, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913), Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.

155. Hubay, J.


Szigeti, J., violin; Bird, H., piano.

Recorded on 30/9/1908

Gramophone and Typewriter 07910, Matrix No. 2608f, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913), Biddulph, LAB 043. CD, 1991
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332

156. Hubay, J.

*Der Zephyr* Op. 30 No. 5.

Szigeti, J., violin; Bird, H., piano.

Recorded on 1/11/1908.

Gramophone and Typewriter 07913, Matrix No. 2676f, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913)*, Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.

157. Hubay, J.

*Noturno* Op. 42.

Szigeti, J., violin; Bird, H., piano.

Recorded on 1/11/1908.

Gramophone and Typewriter 07912, Matrix No. 2679f, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913)*, Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.
158. Hubay, J.

*Unter Ihrem Fenster* Op. 38 No. 2.

Szigeti, J., violin; Bird, H., piano.


Gramophone and Typewriter 07946, Matrix No. 4113f, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913)*, Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.

159. Hubay, J.

*Der Zephyr* Op. 30 No. 5.

Szgeti, J, violin; Bird, H., piano.

Recorded on 1/11/1913.

Gramophone and Typewriter 07913x, Matrix No. Z6949f, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913)*, Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.

160. Hubay, J.

*Der Zephyr* Op. 30 No. 5.
Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhrseitz, K., piano.

Recorded on 9/7/1926.

Columbia 7131m, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of The Art of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 1, Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.

161. Hubay, J.

Maros Vise Op. 18 No. 3.

Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.

Recorded in 1932.

Columbia.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2, Biddulph LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.

162. Hubay, J.

Maros Vise Op. 18 No. 3.

Szigeti, J., violin; Foldes, A., piano.

Recorded on 24/1/1941.


BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.

163. Ives, C.

Sonata for Violin and Piano No. 4, *Children’s Day at the Camp Meeting*.

Szigeti, J., violin; Foldes, A., piano.

Recorded in 1941.

New Music Quarterly Recordings 1616, Matrix No.

ARS2457/58, 78 rpm.


BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.


*Intermezzo*, (from Háry Janos).

Szigeti, J., violin; Foldes, A., piano.

Recorded on 24/11/1941.

Columbia 17340D, Matrix No. C031949150, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Recordings with Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes*, Biddulph LAB 070-71, 199, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.

165. **Kreisler, F.**

*Sicilienne and Rigaudon (in the Style of Francoeur).*

Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhreitz, K., piano.

Recorded on 9/7/1926.

Columbia 7131m, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Columbia L1788, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *The Art of Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 1, Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.

166. **Kreisler, F.**

*Tambourin Chinois.*

Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhreitz, K., piano.

Recorded in 1928.

Columbia 7144m, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Columbia L2037, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *The Art of Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 1, Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.
167. Kreisler, F.

*Liebestöd.*

Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhreit, K., piano.

Recorded on 7/6/1928.

Columbia m6x 31513, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *The Art of Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 1,
Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.

168. László, Z.

*Ungarishe Weisen* Op. 5.

Szigeti, J., violin; Bird, H., piano.

Recorded on 8/6/1909.

Gramophone and Typewriter 07921, Matrix No. 3123f,
78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913)*, Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.


*Snow.*
Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.

Recorded on 2/3/1937.

Columbia 17130D, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2, Biddulph
LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.

170. Mendelssohn, F.

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra in E minor Op. 64.

Szigeti, J., violin; London Philharmonic Orchestra;

Beecham, T., conductor.

Recorded on 27-28/9/1933.

Columbia ML2217, 78 rpm.

Reissued as Columbia M6X 31513, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Pearl Gemm, 9377, CD.

Reissued as part of Musica Memoria 30272, CD.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Concerto
Recordings, Strings QT 99.396, 1999, CD.

171. Milhaud, D.

Le Printemps.

Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhreitz, K., piano.

Recorded on 8/9/1926.
Columbia 7278m, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Columbia L1963, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *The Art of Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 1,

Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.


*Saudades do Brazil* No. 7, *Corcovado*.

Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhreitz, K., piano.

Recorded in c. 1927.

Columbia 2073m, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Columbia D1527, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *The Art of Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 1,

Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.


*Saudades do Brazil* No. 8, *Tijuca*.

Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhreitz, K., piano.

Recorded in c. 1927.

Columbia D1633, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *The Art of Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 1,

Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

*Saudades do Brazil* No. 9, *Sumare*.

Szigeti, J., violin; Foldes, A., piano.

Recorded on 5/6/1940.

Columbia 70744D, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Columbia LOX502, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Recordings with Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes*, Biddulph LAB 070-71, 1993, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.


*Minuet*, from Divertimento in D major No. 17.

Szigeti, J., violin; Bird, H., piano.

Recorded on 1/11/1908.

Gramophone and Typewriter 07915, Matrix No. 2677f, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913)*, Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.
176. Mozart, W. A.

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra in D major K. 218.
(Cadenza by Joachim, J.).
Szigeti, J., violin; London Philharmonic Orchestra;
Beecham, T., conductor.
Recorded on 8/10/1934.
Columbia 4533, 78 rpm.
Reissued on Columbia M6X31513.
Reissued as part of Pearl Gemm, 9377, CD.
Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, Beethoven and Mozart

177. Mozart, W. A.

Sonata for Violin and Piano in E minor K. 304.
Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.
Recorded on 2/3/1937.
Columbia 69005D, 78 rpm.
Reissued on Columbia LX604, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2. Biddulph
LAB007-8, 1989, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.
178. Paganini, N.


Szigté, J., violin.

Recorded on 28/9/1933.

Columbia 68555D, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Columbia LX263, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Musica Memoria 30272, CD.

Reissued as part of The Art of Joseph Szigté, Vol. 1,

Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.

179. Paganini, N.


Szigté, J., violin.

Recorded on 23/8/1935.

Columbia 68555D, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Columbia Lx435, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of The Art of Joseph Szigté, Vol. 1,

Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.

180. Paganini, N.

Szigeti, J., violin.

Recorded in 1926.

Columbia 2059m, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of The Art of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 1,

Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.


Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhrseitz, K., piano.

Recorded on 7/6/1928.

Columbia 264638, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Columbia L2207, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of The Art of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 1,

Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.


Gavotte, from Symphony No. 1 in D major, (Classical).

Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.

Recorded on 2/3/1937.

Columbia 17130D, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Columbia LB38, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2*, Biddulph

LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.

183. Ravel, M. (arr. Leduc.).

*Pièce en Forme d'Habanera.*

Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.

Recorded on 6/3/1936.

Columbia 689322D, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Columbia Lx575, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2*, Biddulph

LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.


*The Flight of the Bumble Bee.*

Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.

Recorded on 1/6/1933.

Columbia 7304m, 78 rpm.

Reissued on Columbia M6x31513, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2*, Biddulph

LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.

*Romance* in E flat major Op. 44 No. 1.

Szigeti, J., violin; Bird, H., piano.

Recorded on 1/11/1908.

Gramophone and Typewriter 07914, Matrix No. 2674f, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913)*, Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.


Szigeti, J., violin; Bird, H., piano.

Recorded on 1/11/1908.

Gramophone and Typewriter 07914, Matrix No. 2677f, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913)*, Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.


*Ave Maria.*
Szigeti, J., violin; Bird, H., piano.

Recorded on 19/9/1911.

Gramophone and Typewriter 07955, Matrix No. 25467f, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913), Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.

188. Schubert, F. (arr. Freidberg.).

Rondo.

Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.

Recorded on 31/5/1933.

Columbia 69062D, Matrix No. LX630, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2, Biddulph LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.

189. Schubert, F.


Szigeti, J., violin; Foldes, A., piano.

Recorded on 25/11/1941.

Columbia 71487/88D, Matrix No. XCO 32003/05, 78 rpm.
Reissued on Bruno Walter Society WSA 713, 33.3 rpm.

Reissued as part of Sony MPK52538, CD.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Recordings with Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes, Biddulph LAB 070-71, 1993, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.

190. Schubert, F. (arr. Freidberg.).

Rondo.

Szigeti, J., violin; Foldes, A., piano.

Recorded on 26/11/1941.

Columbia 71488D, Matrix No. XCO32002, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, The Recordings with Béla Bartók and Andor Foldes, Biddulph LAB 070-71, 1993, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0057677.

191. Schubert, F.

Piano Trio in B flat Major D 898.

Szigeti, J., violin; Fournier, P., cello; Schnabel, A., piano.

Recorded on 1/10/1947, (live).

Bruno Walter Society RR488, 33.3 rpm.

Reissued as part of Music and Arts III, 2002, CD.

*Etude* Op. 8 No. 10.

Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.

Recorded on 6/3/1936.

Columbia 68922D (USA), Columbia LX575 (UK).

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2*, Biddulph LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.


*Valse Triste* Op. 44.

Szigeti, J., violin; Bird, H., piano.

Recorded on 3/4/1912.

Gramophone and Typewriter 07971, Matrix No. a16217f, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti, The Complete HMV Recordings (1908-1913)*, Biddulph, LAB 043, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028332.


*Pastorale.*

Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N. piano.
Recorded on 1/6/1933.

Columbia 7304m, Matrix No. m6x31513.
Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2, Biddulph
LAB007-8, 1989, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.

195. Stravinsky, I. (arr. Stravinsky-Duschkin.).

Dance Russe, (from Petrushka).
Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.
Recorded on 2/3/1937.
Columbia 17130D (USA), Columbia LB38 (UK).
Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2, Biddulph
LAB007-8, 1989, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.

196. Szymanowski, K.

La Fontaine d'Aréthuse, from Mythes Op. 30 No. 1.
Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.
Recorded on 1/6/1933.
Columbia 7304m (USA), Columbia LX307 (UK), 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Joseph Szigeti, Vol. 2, Biddulph
LAB007-8, 1989, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.
197. Tartini, G.

Sonata for Violin and Piano in G Major Op. 12 No. 2.

Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhrseitz, K., piano.

Recorded in 1928.

Columbia 17036/7D, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *The Art of Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 1,

Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.


*Adagio*, from Concerto in A Major.

Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.

Recorded on 6/3/1936.

Columbia 69062D (USA), Columbia LX630 (UK), 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 2, Biddulph

LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.


Szigeti, J., violin; Ruhrseitz, K., piano.

Recorded on 1/7/1927.
Columbia 04129 (USA), Columbia 2097 (UK), 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *The Art of Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 1,

Biddulph LAB 005-6, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028300.

---


*Capriol Suite.*

Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.

Recorded on 6/3/1936.

Columbia 17074D (USA), Columbia LB32 (UK), 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 2, Biddulph

LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.

---


Sonata in D Major Op. 10 No. 3.

Szigeti, J., violin; Magaloff, N., piano.

Recorded on 6/3/1936.

Columbia 68922D (USA), Columbia LX575 (UK), 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Joseph Szigeti*, Vol. 2, Biddulph

LAB007-8, 1989, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0028301.
Telmányi, Emil
(1892-1988)

202.  Bach, J. S.
Sonatas and Partitas for Solo Violin BWV 1001-1006.
Telmányi, E, violin.
Recorded in 11/1953 (BWV 1001, 1002) and 3/1954
(BWV 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006).
Decca LXT 2951, LXT 2952, LXT 2953, 33.3 rpm.
Reissued as Emil Telmányi Plays Bach, Danacord Daco
147, 148, 149, 33.3 rpm, 1984, 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0073493.

Prélude in A flat major Op. 28 No. 17.
Telmányi, E, violin; Kiss, P., piano.
Recorded in 1935.
Clangor M9326, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Jenö Hubay and his pupil Emil
Telmányi, Danacord Daco 150, 1982, 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0073494.

204.  Hubay, J.
Les Fileuses.
Telmányi, E, violin; Moore, G., piano.
Recorded in 1935.
HMV (unpublished record).

Issued as part of Jenő Hubay and his pupil Emil Telmányi,
Danacord Daco 150, 1982, 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0073494.

205. Hubay, J.

_Scène de la Csarda_ No. 2 Op. 13.

Telmányi, E., violin; The Budapest Orchestra;
Fricsay, F., conductor.

Recorded in 1942.

Radiola SP8028.

Reissued as part of Jenő Hubay and his pupil Emil
Telmányi, Danacord Daco 150, 1982, 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0073494.

206. Hubay, J.

_Scène de la Csarda_ No. 4 Op. 32.

Telmányi, E., violin; Telmányi, A., piano.

Recorded in 1959.

Qualiton HPL3527, 33.3 rpm.

Reissued as part of Jenő Hubay and his pupil Emil
Telmányi, Danacord Daco 150, 1982, 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0073494.

*Romance* Op. 28.

Telmányi, E., violin; Kiss, P., piano.

Recorded in 1935.

Clangor M9324, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Jenö Hubay and his pupil Emil Telmányi*, Danacord Daco 150, 1982, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0073494.

208. Sibeluis, J.

*Romance* Op. 78 No. 2.

Telmányi, E., violin; Kiss, P., piano.

Recorded in 1936.

HMV DB2893, Matrix No. 2EA1348, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *The Recorded Violin*, Vol. 2, Pearl BVA II, 1990, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035506.

Vecsey, Ferenc (1893-1935)


*Air on the G-string* (from Suite for Orchestra in D major BWV 1066).

Vecsey, F., violin; unnamed, piano.
Recorded in c. 1909.
Fonotipia 62507 (Italy); Odeon 8022FXA (elsewhere), 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Masters of the Bow, MB 1002, 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0097505.


Air on the G-string, (from Suite for Orchestra in D major BWV 1066).
Vecsey, F., violin; Agosti, G., piano.
Recorded in c. 1933.
Polydor 10413, Matrix No. 3465GN, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Franz von Vecsey, The Electric Recordings, Pearl Gemm CD9498, 1991, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035055.

211. Bazzini, L.

La Ronde des Lutins.
Vecsey, F., violin; unnamed, piano.
Recorded in 1910.
Fonotipia 74089, Matrix No. xxPh4636, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of *The Great Virtuosi of the Golden Age*,
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0051570.

212. **Beethoven, L. v.**

Sonata for Violin and Piano in E flat major Op. 12 No. 3.
Vecsey, F., violin; Agosti, G., piano.
Recorded in c. 1933.
Polydor 10318/20, Matrix No. 5738/43GR; Decca
DE7033/5, Matrix No. 5738/43GR (UK), 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of *Ferenc Vecsey*, Rococo 2072, 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0118665.
Reissued as part of *Masters of the Bow*, MB 1002,
33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0097505.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035055.

213. **Debussy, C. A. (arr. Kreisler, F.).**

*En Bateau.*

Vecsey, F., violin; Agosti, G., piano.
Recorded in 1934, (Berlin).
Polydor 10306, Matrix No. 5736/2GR8, 78 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035055.
Reissued as part of *The Recorded Violin*, Vol. 2, Pearl BVA II, 1990, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035506.


Vecsey, F., violin; unnamed, piano.

Recorded in c. 1909.
Fonotipia 62506, Matrix No. 4523 (Italy); Odeon 8022FXA and 1597FXI, Matrix No. 4523 (elsewhere), 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Masters of the Bow, MB 1002, 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0097505.
Reissued as part of *Ferenc Vecsey*, Rococo 2072, 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0118665.

215. Hubay, J.

*Carmen, Fantasie Brillante* Op. 3.
Vecsey, F., violin; unnamed, piano.

Recorded in 1903.
Gramophone and Typewriter 07900, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Ferenc Vecsey, Rococo 2072, 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0118665.

216. Kreisler, F.

Grave (in the style of Bach).

Vecsey, F., violin; Agosti, G., piano.

Recorded in 1925, (Berlin).
VOX 06378E and Kristall 05050, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Franz von Vecsey, The Electric Recordings, Pearl Gemm CD9498, 1991, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035055.

217. Kreisler, F.

Praeludium und Allegro, (in the style of Pugnani).

Vecsey, F, violin; Agosti, G., piano.

Recorded 1925, (Berlin).
VOX 06378E and Kristall 05050, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Franz von Vecsey, The Electric Recordings, Pearl Gemm CD9498, 1991, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035055.

*Guitarre* Op. 45 No. 2.

Vecsey, F., violin; unnamed, piano.

Recorded in 1910.

Fonotipia 62509 (Italy); Odeon 2230 (elsewhere), 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Ferenc Vecsey*, Rococo 2072, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0118665.

219. Paganini, N.


Vecsey, F., violin.

Recorded in 1910.

Fonotipia 62502 (Italy); Odeon 67770 (elsewhere), 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Masters of the Bow*, MB 1002,

33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0097505.

Reissued as part of *Ferenc Vecsey*, Rococo 2072, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0118665.

220. Paganini, N.


Vecsey, F., violin.
Recorded in c. 1933-4.

Polydor 10333, Matrix No. 5733 1/2 GR8.

Reissued as part of Masters of the Bow, MB 1002, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0097505.

221. Palmgren,

*Canzonetta.*

Vecsey, F., violin; Agosti, G., piano.

Recorded in c. 1933-4, (Berlin).

Polydor 10686, Matrix No. 5747 1/2 GR8, 78 rpm.


BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035055.

222. Reger, M.

*Wiegenlied.*

Vecsey, F., violin; Agosti, G., piano.

Recorded in c. 1933-4, (Berlin).

Polydor 10413, Matrix No. 3466GN, 78 rpm.


BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035055.

*Ave Maria* Op. 52 No. 6.

Vecsey, F., violin; unnamed, piano.

Recorded in 1910.

Fonotipia 62504, Matrix No. XPh4632 (Italy); Odeon 8021

FXA, Matrix No. XPh4632 (elsewhere), 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Masters of the Bow*, MB 1002, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0097505.

Reissued as part of *Ferenc Vecsey*, Rococo 2072, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0118665.


*Ave Maria* Op. 52 No. 6.

Vecsey, F., violin; Agosti, G., piano.

Recorded in 1925, (Berlin).

VOX 06332E, Matrix No. 115AAA, 78 rpm.


BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035055.
225. Schumann, R.

*Träumerei* Op. 15 No. 7.

Vecsey, F., violin; unnamed, piano.

Recorded in 1904.

Fonotipia 62505 and Odeon 62501, 78 rpm

Reissued as part of *Ferenc Vecsey*, Rococo 2072, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0118665.

226. Schumann, R.

*Träumerei* Op. 15 No. 7.

Recorded in 1910.

Vecsey, F., violin; unnamed piano.

Gramophone and Typewriter 7964, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Ferenc Vecsey*, Rococo 2072, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0118665.

227. Schumann, R.

*Träumerei* Op. 15 No. 7.

Vecsey, F., violin; Agosti, G., piano.

Recorded in 1925.

Vox 06332, 78rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035055.

228. Sibelius, J.

_Nocturne._

Vecsey, F., violin; Agosti, G., piano.

Recorded in c. 1933-4.

Polydor 10333, Matrix No. 5737 1/2 GR8, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of _Franz von Vecsey, The Electric Recordings_, Pearl Gemm CD9498, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035055.

229. Singigaglia, L.

_Caproccio all'Antica_ Op. 25 No. 2.

Vecsey, F., violin; unnamed, piano.

Recorded in 1910.

Fonotipia 62501, Matrix No. xPh4629 (Italy); Odeon 0-5604, Matrix No. xPh4629, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of _Masters of the Bow_, MB 1002, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0097505.

Reissued as part of _Ferenc Vecsey_, Rococo 2072, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0118665.

*Grave and Allegro Assai*, from Sonata in G Minor (*Devil's Trill*).

Vecsey, F., violin; unnamed, piano.

Recorded in 1911.

Fonotipia 74091 (Italy); Odeon 6639 (elsewhere), 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Masters of the Bow*, MB 1002,

33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0097505.

Reissued as part of Ferenc Vecsey, Rococo 2072, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0118665.

231. Vecsey, F.

*Foglio D'Album*.

Vecsey, F., violin; unnamed, piano.

Recorded in 1910.

Fonotipia 62500, Matrix No. xPh4535 (Italy); Odeon 8026

FXC, Matrix No. xPh4535 (elsewhere), 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of *Masters of the Bow*, MB 1002,

33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0097505.

Reissued as part of *Ferenc Vecsey*, Rococo 2072, 33.3 rpm.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0118665.

232. Vecsey, F.

_Cascade._

Vecsey, F., violin; Agosti, G., piano.

Recorded in c. 1933-4, (Berlin).

Polydor 10306, Matrix No. 5736 1/1 GR8, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of _Franz von Vecsey, The Electric Recordings_, Pearl Gemm CD9498, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035055.

233. Vecsey, F.

_Chanson Nostaligique._

Vecsey, F., violin; Agosti, G., piano.

Recorded in c. 1933-4, (Berlin).

Polydor 10333, Matrix No. 5735 1/2 GR8.

Reissued as part of _Franz von Vecsey, The Electric Recordings_, Pearl Gemm CD9498, 1991, CD.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0035055.

234. Wieniawski, H.

_Souvenir de Moscou Op. 6._

Vecsey, F., violin; unnamed, piano.
Recorded in 1910.

Fonotipia 62503 and 74092 (Italy); Odeon 6640 and 6027 FCX, 78 rpm.

Reissued as part of Masters of the Bow, MB 1002, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0097505.

Reissued as part of Ferenc Vecsey, Rococo 2072, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0118665.

235.  Wieniawski, H.

Meno Mosso, from Fantasie Brillante (on themes from Gounod's Faust), Op. 20.

Recorded in 1910.

Fonotipia 62508 (Italy); Odeon 2229 and 8023 FXA.

Reissued as part of Masters of the Bow, MB 1002, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0097505.

Reissued as part of Ferenc Vecsey, Rococo 2072, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0118665.

Végh, Sandor  236.  Bach, J. S.


Végh, S., violin.
Valois MB840/2, CD.
Reissued on Auvdis/Naïve V4865, 1999, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0197287.

237.  Bartók, B.

Complete String Quartets.
Végh, S., violin 1; Zöldy, S., violin 2; Janzer, G., viola;
Szabo, P., cello.
Recorded in 4-7/1972, (La Chaux-de-Fonds, Switzerland).
Auvdis/Naïve, V4870.
Reissued as Naïve V 8470, 2001, CD.

238.  Beethoven, L. v.

Complete String Quartets.
Végh, S., violin 1; Zöldy, S., violin 2; Janzer, G., viola;
Szabo, P., cello.
Recorded in: 12/1972, No. 8, No. 11; 3/1973, No. 7, No. 9,
No. 10; 6/1973, No. 12, No. 16; 7/1973, No. 13, No. 14,
No. 15; 10/1973, No. 2, No. 4, No. 5, No. 6; 1/1974, No. 1,
No. 3, (Paris).
Auvdis/Naïve, V5892, 1986, CD.
Reissued as Naïve V 4871, 2000, CD.

239. Beethoven, L. v.
Végh, S., violin; Schiff, A., piano.
Recorded in 1997 (Live) (London), broadcast on
Unpublished recording.
BLSA shelf-mark No. H8545.

Ysaÿe, Eugene 240. Fauré, G.
(1885-1931) Berceuse Op. 16.
Ysaÿe, E., violin, De Creus, C., piano.
Recorded in 12/1912 (New York).
Columbia 7112, Matrix No. 36519, 78 rpm.
Reissued as Delta TQD 3033, 78 rpm.
Reissued as part of Joachim, Sarasate, Ysaÿe, Opal
CD9851, 1992, CD.
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1CD0053069.
(1903-1959) |  
For Children, No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, No. 5, No. 7, No. 9, and No. 10.  
Zathureczky, E., violin; Pressler, M., piano.  
Recorded on 28/2/1959, (live), (Bloomington University, Indiana).  
Hungaroton LPX11641, 33.3 rpm.  
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0220517.

Sonata for Violin and Piano in G major Op. 30 No. 3.  
Zathureczky, E., violin; Pressler, M., piano.  
Recorded on 28/2/1959, (live), (Bloomington University, Indiana).  
Hungaroton LPX11641, 33.3 rpm.  
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0220517.

La Folia Op. 5 No. 12.  
Zathureczky, E., violin; Petri, E., piano.  
Recorded in c. 1950.  
Qualiton (H)LPX (M)1051, 33.3 rpm.  
BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0114967.
244. Franck, C.

Sonata for Violin and Piano in A major.

Zathureczky, E., violin; Pressler, M., piano.

Recorded on 28/2/1959, (live), (Bloomington University, Indiana).

Hungaroton LPX11641, 33.3 rpm.

BLSA shelf-mark No. 1LP0220517.
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Preface

This volume contains the musical examples referred to in volume one. It is divided into four sections. Each section presents examples pertinent to the corresponding chapter in volume one. In the interest of clarity, annotations have been kept to a minimum.

Thus, — between two notes means a slide between those notes and is accompanied by ‘B,’ ‘L’ or ‘SF’ (single-finger slide), referring to its type as detailed in chapter two.

Intermediate notes and ‘crushed note’ figures are shown by cue-sized notes. Where an example illustrates the sliding of a violinist in a recording, the slide lines used have been transcribed from that recording. Unless otherwise stated in volume one, where slide lines occur in an example taken from an edition these represent the author’s interpretation of implied slides. Vibrato is shown by wavy lines: \[\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\] denotes a fast vibrato and \[\dashed\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\] indicates a comparatively slower vibrato; bow vibrato is shown as \[\dashed\dashed\dashed\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\]; and a straight line means that no vibrato is used. Vibrato shown by these means refers only to the note/notes or bar/bars over which the symbol is placed. Arrows refer to tempo changes, \[\rightarrow\] representing an accelerando and \[\leftarrow\] meaning a rallentando. A change in tempo depicted in this way affects only the note/notes or bar/bars over which the arrow is positioned. In the case of ‘melodic rubato,’ vertical dotted-lines (\[\dotted\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\]) show the alignment of parts in a recording, either indicating the dislocation of a solo line from its steady accompaniment or a subsequent coming together of these parts.
Abbreviations

A    Leopold Auer
B    Eddy Brown
C    Lucien Capet
Ch   Léopold Charlier
D    Ferdinand David
Dd   Franz Drdla
d’A   Jelly d’Arányi
G    Stefi Geyer
H    Jenö Hubay
J    Joseph Joachim
M    Johanna Martzy
O    Eugene Ormandy
Sz   Józef Szigeti
Szá   Zoltán Székely
Szen  László Szentgyorgyi
T    Emil Telmányi
V    Sándor Végh
W    August Wilhelmj
Z    Ede Zathureczky
I e-string
II a-string
III d-string
IV g-string
ed. printed edition
☐ at the heel of the bow
▷ at the point of the bow
→ bow movement towards the heel
\lor up-bow
\land down-bow

\[\text{If 'ed.' is not used it may be assumed that the source in question is a recording.}\]
Chapter 1


**Ex. 1.18** Beethoven, Violin Concerto in D major Op. 61, 3/151-152, ed. Hubay (1918) and ed. Szigeti (1962).


Ex. 1.26  

Ex. 1.27  
Chapter 2

ex. 2.1 con’d.

Ed. W (1896): 2 0 0 0 2-2 2-2
Ed. J (1905): 2 0 (o) 1 1
Ed. H (1918): 2 4 0 (o) 0 2-2
Sz (1932): 2 4 3 1 0 0 0 2-2
Sz (1947): 2 4 1 3 0 0 0
Sz (1954): 2 4 1 3 0 0 0
Sz (1961): 2 4 1 3 0 0 0
Ed. Sz (1962): 2 4 1 3 0 0 2 II 1 3 1 0 1 1


Ex. 2.2 Huber, Hegediiskola, Etude 23/1-2 (1875).
Ex. 2.3  Huber, *Deuxième Fantasie sur les Motifs Hongroises* 16 (1875).

Ex. 2.4  Beethoven, *Romance* in F major Op. 50/1-2, ed. Auer (1916).

Ex. 2.6  Joachim, *Romanze* 41-45, as played by Joachim (1903).

---

Ex. 2.7  J. S. Bach, Sonata for Solo Violin in G minor BWV 1001, *Adagio* 18, as played by Joachim (1903).

---

Ex. 2.8  Viotti, Violin Concerto No. 22 in A minor, 2/41-42, ed. Huber (1875) and ed. Joachim (1905).

Ex. 2.11  Huber, *Prélude Fantasie sur les Motifs Hongroises* 16-17, ed. Huber (1875).

Ex. 2.12  Huber, *Deuxième Fantasie sur les Motifs Hongroises* 24-25, ed. Huber (1875).

Ex. 2.13  Vieuxtemps, *Romance* in F major 15-20, ed. Vieuxtemps (1877).
Ex. 2.14  Vieuxtemps, *Romance* in F major/33-38, ed. Vieuxtemps (1877).

Ex. 2.15  Viotti, Violin Concerto No. 22 in A minor, 1/80-86, ed. Huber (1875) and ed. Joachim (1905).

Ex. 2.16  Joachim, *Romanze* 87-92, as played by Joachim (1903) and d’Arányi (1923).
Ex. 2.17  Joachim, *Romanze*/9-19, as played by Joachim (1903).

Ex. 2.19  Brahms, *Hungarian Dance* No. 3/13-14, ed. Joachim (1871).


Ex. 2.21  Huber, *Deuxième Fantasie sur les Motifs Hongroises* 34-35, ed. Huber (1875).
Ex. 2.22  Joachim, *Romanze* 122-126 and 130-133, as played by Joachim (1903).

Ex. 2.23  Mozart, Violin Concerto in D major K. 218, 2/31-33, ed. Joachim (1905).


Ex. 2.26  Joachim, *Romanze* 72-76, as played by Joachim (1903).
Ex. 2.27  Joachim, *Romanze* 87-92, as played by Joachim (1903) and d’Arányi (1923), (the intermediate note in square brackets is d’Arányi’s).

Ex. 2.28  Brahms, *Hungarian Dance* No. 1/15-24, as played by Joachim (1903).

Ex. 2.30  Gaviniès, 24 Matinées, No. 23/1-2, ed. Hubay (1909).

Ex. 2.31  Hubay Six Etudes de Violon (pour développer la technique de la main gauche) Op. 64, No. 5/17, ed. Hubay (1896).

Ex. 2.32  Beethoven, Sonata for Violin and Piano Op. 47 (Kreutzer), Andante con variazione, IV/14-15, as played by Szigeti (1911).
Ex. 2.33  Hubay, *Scène de la Csarda* No. 5/16-18, as played by Szigeti (1908) and Hubay (1928).

Ex. 2.34  J. S. Bach (arr. Wilhelmj), *Air on the G-String*/1-5, ed. Hubay (1910) and as played by Vecsey (c.1909 and c. 1933) and Hubay (1929).
Ex. 2.35  Hubay, *Scène de la Csarda* No. 5/11-22, as played by Szigeti (1908) and Hubay (1928), (the intermediate note in square brackets in Hubay's).


\(^{1}\)This material is repeated in Beethoven's score in bb. 79-81.
Ex. 2.38  Greig (arr. Hubay), *Solvejgs Lied* 17-18, ed. Hubay (1907).


Ex. 2.43  C. P. E. Bach (arr. Geyer), Minuet/7-10, ed. Geyer (1906).


Ex. 2.45  Rubinstein, *Romance* Op. 44 No. 1/3-6, as played by Szigeti (1908).
Ex. 2.46  Hubay, *Zephir* Op. 30 No. 5/33-50, as played by Szigeti (1908, 1913 and 1926).
Ex. 2.46 con’d.

Ex. 2.46  Hubay, Zephyr Op. 30 No. 5/33-50, as played by Szigeti (1908, 1913 and 1926).
Ex. 2.47 Schumann, *Träumerei* 16-24, as played by Vecsey (1904, 1910 and 1925).

Ex. 2.49  Mendelssohn, *Violin Concerto in E minor Op. 64*, 1/150-153, ed. Joachim (1905) and Hubay (1910)

Ex. 2.51  Paganini, Violin Concerto No. 1 in D major, 1/137-140, ed. Hubay (1909).


Ex. 2.55  J. S. Bach (arr. Wilhelmj), *Air on the G-String* 13-14, as played by Hubay (1929).
Ex. 2.56  Hubay, *Scène de la Csárda* No. 12/5-24, as played by Hubay (1929).
Ex. 2.57  Handel (arr. Hubay), *Larghetto* 1-12, as played by Vecsey (c. 1909), Szigeti (1913) and Hubay (1929), ed. Hubay (1908) and ed. Brown (1920).
Ex. 2.57 Handel (arr. Hubay), Larghetto/1-12, as played by Vecsey (c. 1909), Szigeti (1913) and Hubay (1929), ed. Hubay (1908) and ed. Brown (1920).
Handel (arr. Hubay), *Larghetto*1-12, as played by Vecsey (c. 1909), Szigeti (1913) and Hubay (1929), ed. Hubay (1908) and ed. Brown (1920).

Hubay, *Intermezzo*17-18, as played by Hubay (1928).
Ex. 2.59 Hubay, *Scène de la Csarda* No. 5/23-35, as played by Szigeti (1908) and Hubay (1928), (the restated departing note and intermediate notes in square brackets are Hubay’s).
Ex. 2.60 Handel (arr. Hubay), *Larghetto* 21-23, ed. Hubay (1908) and as played by Vecsey (c. 1909), Szigeti (1913) and Hubay (1929), (the intermediate note in square brackets in Hubay’s).

Ex. 2.61 Rubinstein, *Romance* Op. 44 No. 1/9-11, as played by Szigeti (1908).

Ex. 2.62 Rubinstein, *Romance* Op. 44 No. 1/19-20, as played by Szigeti (1908).

Ex. 2.68  Hubay, *Six Etudes de Violon (pour développer la technique de l'archet)*


Ex. 2.69  Tchaikovsky, Violin Concerto in D major Op. 35, 1/74-76.
Ex. 2.70  Beethoven, Violin Concerto in D major Op. 61, 1/516-518, ed. Joachim (1905) and Hubay (1918).

Ex. 2.71  Brahms (arr. Hubay), Hungarian Dance No. 10/79-81, ed. Hubay (1911).

Ex. 2.72  Hubay, Magyar nóta Op. 67 No. 1/36-37, ed. Hubay (1897).
Ex. 2.73  Vecsey, *Valse Triste*/6-14, ed. Vecsey (1916).

Ex. 2.74  Mendelssohn, Violin Concerto in E minor Op. 64, 1/361-363, ed. Joachim (1905) and Hubay (1910) (the bowing in parenthesis is Hubay’s).

Ex. 2.76  Hubay, *Scène de la Csarda* No. 12/5-10, as played by Hubay (1929).


Ex. 2.78  Hubay, *Intermezzo* 30, as played by Hubay (1928).
Ex. 2.79  Hubay, *Intermezzo* 37-46, as played by Hubay (1928).

Ex. 2.80  Beethoven, Sonata for Violin and Piano Op. 47 (*Kreutzer*), 2/36-39, as played by Szigeti (1911).
Ex. 2.81  Beethoven, Sonata for Violin and Piano Op. 47 (*Kreutzer*), 2/53-54, as played by Szigeti (1911).

Ex. 2.82  Beethoven, Sonata for Violin and Piano Op. 47 (*Kreutzer*), *Andante con variazione*, IV/96-97, as played by Szigeti (1911).

Ex. 2.83  Schubert (arr. Wilhelmj), *Ave Maria*3-5, as played by Vecsey (1910 and 1925) and Szigeti (1911).
Ex. 2.84  Paganini, Violin Concerto No. 1 in D major Op. 6, 1/244-246, ed. Hubay (1909) and as played by Szentgyorgyi (c. 1930).


Ex. 2.86  Schumann, *Träumerei* 30-33, as played by Vecsey (1904 and 1910 and 1925).
Ex. 2.87  Rubinstein, *Romance* Op. 44 No. 1/13-17, as played by Szigeti (1908).

Ex. 2.88  Beethoven, Sonata for Violin and Piano Op. 47 (*Kreutzer*), 2/44-46, as played by Szigeti (1911).
Ex. 2.89  J. S. Bach (arr. Wilhelmi), *Air on the G-String* 17-20, as played by Hubay (1929).

Ex. 2.90  Beethoven, Sonata for Violin and Piano Op. 47 (*Kreutzer*), 2/11-16, as played by Szigeti (1911).
Ex. 2.91  Handel (arr. Hubay), *Larghetto* /7-9, as played by Vecsey (c. 1909) and Szigeti (1913).

Ex. 2.92  Tartini, *Devil's Trill Sonata*, 2/103, as played by Vecsey (1910).

Ex. 2.94 Beethoven, Violin Concerto in D major Op. 61, 1/513-516, ed. Hubay (1918) and as played by Szigeti (1932).

Ex. 2.95 Drdla, Souvenir/8-11, ed. Drdla (1913), as played by Drdla (1920), Ormandy (1928) and d’Arányi (1929).
Ex. 2.96 Vitali, Chaconne/39-41, ed. Charlier (1922) and as played by d'Arányi (1929).

Ex. 2.97 Joachim, Romanze/23-26, as played by Joachim (1903) and d'Arányi (1923).
Ex. 2.98 Mendelssohn, Violin Concerto in E minor Op. 64, 1/9-12, ed. Hubay (1910) and as played by Brown (1924) and Szigeti (1933).

Ex. 2.99 Paganini, Violin Concerto No. 1 in D major Op. 6, 1/241-44, ed. Hubay (1909) and as played by Szentgyorgyi (c. 1930), (intermediate note in square brackets is Szentgyorgyi's).
Ex. 2.100 Vitali, Chaconne/30-32, ed. Charlier (1922) and as played by d’Arányi (1929).

Ex. 2.101 Drdla, Souvenir/16-20, ed. Drdla (1913) and as played by Ormandy (1928).
Ex. 2.102  Dvorák (arr. Kreisler), *Slavonic Dance* No. 2 in E minor/83-86, as played by Geyer (c. 1927).

Ex. 2.103  Dvorák (arr. Kreisler), *Slavonic Dance* No. 2 in E minor/125-128, as played by Geyer (c. 1927).

Ex. 2.104  Schubert, Piano Trio No. 1 in B-flat major D. 898, (violin part) 2/28-30, as played by d'Arányi (1927).
Ex. 2.105  Drdla, *Souvenir* 76-78, as played by Ormandy (1928) and d’Arányi (1929).

Ex. 2.106  Schubert, Piano Trio No. 1 in B-flat major D. 898, (violin part) 2/34-36, as played by d’Arányi (1927).

Ex. 2.107  Hubay, *Scène de la Csarda* No. 3/7-9, as played by Szigeti (1932 and 1941).
Ex. 2.108  Bartók, String Quartet No. 5, (violin 1 part) Adagio molto/19-22, as played by Székely (1952 and 1962) and Végh (1972).


Ex. 2.113  Schumann, Violin Concerto in D minor, 2/20-22, as played by d'Arányi (1938).
Ex. 2.114 Brahms, Piano Trio in C major Op. 87, (violin part) 2/72-74, as played by d’Arányi (1935).

Ex. 2.115 Schoeck, Violin Concerto *Quasi una Fantasia* Op. 21, 1/110-116, as played by Geyer (1947).


Ex. 2.118  Mendelssohn, Violin Concerto in E minor Op. 64, 1/147-160, as played by Brown (1924) and Szigeti (1933), (the intermediate note in square brackets is Brown’s).
Ex. 2.118  Mendelssohn, Violin Concerto in E minor Op. 64, 1/147-160, as played by Brown (1924) and Szigeti (1933).

Ex. 2.119  Franck, Sonata for Violin and Piano in A major, 3/13-16, as played by Zathureczky (1959).
Ex. 2.120  Schubert, Sonatina for Violin and Piano in D major Op. 137 No. 1, 1/38-44, as played by Szigeti (1941) and Martzy (1957).

Ex. 2.121  Bartók, String Quartet No. 1, (violin 1 part) 1/1-5, as played by Székely (1961) and Végh (1972).
Ex. 2.124   Hubay, *Scène de la Csarda* No. 3/11-14, as played by Szigeti (1932 and 1941).

Ex. 2.125   Hubay, *Scène de la Csarda* No. 3/60-63, as played by Szigeti (1932 and 1941).
Ex. 2.126  Mendelssohn, Violin Concerto in E minor Op. 64, 2/9-20, as played by Szigeti (1933).

Ex. 2.128  Hubay, *Scène de la Csarda* No. 3/33-43, as played by Szigeti (1931 and 1941).
Ex. 2.129  Franck, Sonata for Violin and Piano in A major, 2/108-111, as played by Zathureczky (1959).


Ex. 2.131  Schubert, Sonatina for Violin and Piano in D major Op. 137 No. 1, 2/53-56, as played by Szigeti (1941).
Ex. 2.132  Brahms, Piano Trio in C major Op. 87, 1/13-19, as played by Szigeti (1952).

Ex. 2.133  Schubert, Piano Trio in B-flat major D. 898, (violin part) 2/96-98, as played by d’Arányi (1927).

Ex. 2.134  Schubert, Piano Trio in B-flat major D. 898, (violin part) 2/104-106, as played by d’Arányi (1927).
Ex. 2.135  Kreisler, Rondino/48-54, as played by Martzy (1966).

Ex. 2.136  Mendelssohn, Violin Concerto in E minor Op. 64, 1/226-234, as played by Brown (1924) and Szegiti (1933), (the intermediate notes in square brackets are Brown's).
Ex. 2.137  Brahms, Violin Concerto in D major Op. 77, 2/42-43, as played by Martzy (1954) and Szigeti (1959), (the intermediate note in square brackets is Szigeti’s).

Ex. 2.138  Schubert, Sonatina for Violin and Piano in D major Op. 137 No. 1, 2/5-9, as played by Szigeti (1941) and Martzy (1957), (the intermediate note in square brackets is Szigeti’s).

Ex. 2.139  Kreisler, Schön Rosmarin/34-38, as played by Geyer (1927).
Ex. 2.140  J. S. Bach, Partita for Solo Violin in E major BWV 1006, Loure/20-22, as played by Geyer (1946).

Ex. 2.141  Mendelssohn, Violin Concerto in E minor Op. 64, 1/389-401, as played by Brown (1924).
Ex. 2.142  Hubay, *Scène de la Csarda* No. 2/64-65, as played by Telmányi (1942).

Ex. 2.143  Kreisler, *Rondino* 25-28, as played by Martzy (1966).
Chapter 3


3.3 Boccherini, Quintet for two violins, viola and two cellos in D major G. 313, 3/1-3,
(violin 1 part), as shown in Baillot’s *L’Art du Violon*.

3.4 Sarasate, *Carmen Fantasy* Op. 25, *Introduction*34-38, as played by Marteau
(1927).

3.6 J. S. Bach (arr. Wilhelmj), *Air on the G-String* 1-4, as played by Hubay (1929)
and Vecsey (c. 1909 and c. 1933).
3.7 Handel (arr. Hubay), *Larghetto* 13-18, as played by Vecsey (c. 1909) and Hubay (1929).
Larghetto

3.8 Handel (arr. Hubay), Larghetto/1-12, as played by Hubay (1929).
3.9 J. S. Bach (arr. Wilhelmj), *Air on the G-String* 17-20, as played by Hubay (1929).

3.11 Hubay, Hungarian Fantasy Op. 76 No. 2/1-5, as played by Hubay (1935).

3.12 J. S. Bach (arr. Wilhelmj), Air on the G-String/11-12, as played by Hubay (1929).
3.13 Schubert (arr. Wilhelmj), *Ave Maria* 10, as played by Vecsey (1910).

3.14 Schumann, Violin Concerto in D minor, 2/49-50, as played by d'Arányi (1938).

3.15 Hubay, *Intermezzo* 31-38, as played by Hubay (1928).
3.16 Hubay, *Scène de la Csárda* No. 12/5-10, as played by Hubay (1929).

3.17 Schumann, *Träumerei* 16-18, as played by Vecsey (1904).

3.18 Mozart, *Adagio* in E major K. 261/16-17, as played by Geyer (1946).
3.19  Mozart, Adagio in E major K. 261/6, as played by Geyer (1946).

3.20  Hubay, Sonata Romantique Op. 22, 2/33-36, as played by Lengyel (c. 1950).


3.25 Corelli, *La Folia* Op. 5 No. 12/139-142, as played by Zathureczky (c. 1950).
3.26 Schumann, Violin Concerto in D minor, 2/11-13, as played by d’Arányi (1938).

3.27 Beethoven, Sonata for Violin and Piano in G major Op. 96, 2/18-21, as played by Fachiri (1926).


3.30  Brahms, Violin Concerto in D major Op. 77, 1/390-396, as played by Szigeti (1928 and 1948).
3.31 Vitali, *Chaconne* 39-40, as played by d’Arányi (1929).

3.32 Dvorák (arr. Kreisler) *Slavonic Dance* No. 2 in E minor 1-3, as played by Geyer (1927).

3.33 Corelli, *La Folia* Op. 5 No. 12/12-16, as played by Zathureczky (c. 1950).
3.34 Corelli, *La Folia* Op. 5 No. 12/154-158, as played by Zathureczky (c. 1950).


3.38 Corelli, *La Folia* Op. 5 No. 12/17-22, as played by Szigeti (1940) and Zathureczky (c. 1950).

3.40 Mozart, Violin Concerto in D major K. 218, 2/21-28, as played by Szigeti (1934).

3.41 Schubert (arr. Wilhelmj), *Ave Maria* 3-5, as played by Vecsey (1925).
3.42 Schumann, Violin Concerto in D minor, 2/42-43, as played by d’Arányi (1938).

3.43 Bartók, Six Rumanian Dances, 4/27-34, as played by Szigeti (1930).
3.44 J. S. Bach, Partita for Solo Violin in E major BWV 1006, Loure/1-2, as played by (Geyer (1945), Szigeti (1949 and 1955), Telmányi (1955), Martzy (1955) and Végh (1971).

3.46 Vitali, *Chaconne* 6-9, as played by d'Arányi (1929).

Chapter 4

J. S. Bach, Sonata for Solo Violin in G minor BWV 1001, ed. Joachim and Moser (1908), *Adagio* 1-6, as played by Joachim (1903).
Ex. 4.2  Joachim, *Romanze* 9-23, as played by Joachim (1903) and d’Arányi (1923).
Ex. 4.3 Joachim, Romanze/115-122, as played by Joachim (1903) and d’Arányi (1923).
Ex. 4.4  Joachim, *Romanze* 76-80, as played by Joachim (1903).

Ex. 4.6 Sarasate, *Carmen Fantasy* Op. 25, 3/68-74, as played by Marteau (1927).

Ex. 4.7 Rode, Violin Concerto No. 7, 1/58-60, as shown in Spohr’s *Violinschule*, p. 185.


Ex. 4.12  Sarasate, *Carmen Fantasy* Op. 25, 3/57-61, as played by Marteau (1927).

Ex. 4.13  Sarasate, *Carmen Fantasy* Op. 25, 4/36-43, as played by Marteau (1927).

Ex. 4.15  J. S. Bach, Partita for Solo Violin in B minor BWV 1002, ed. Joachim and Moser (1908), *Bourée/1-9*, as played by Joachim (1903) and Szigeti (1926).
Ex. 4.16  J. S. Bach, Partita for Solo Violin in B minor BWV 1002, ed. Joachim and Moser (1908), *Bourée/26-30*, as played by Joachim (1903) and Szigeti (1926).

Ex. 4.17  Sarasate, *Carmen Fantasy* Op. 25, 4/51-54, as played by Marteau (1927).
Ex. 4.18  Joachim, *Romanze* 29-43, as played by Joachim (1903) and d'Arányi (1923).

Ex. 4.19  Sarasate, *Carmen Fantasy* Op. 25, 1/4-8, as played by Marteau (1927).
Ex. 4.20  J. S. Bach (arr. Wilhelmj), *Air on the G-String* 13-16, as played by Vecsey (c. 1909).

Ex. 4.21  Schumann, *Träumerei* 1-4, as played by Vecsey (1904 and 1910).
Ex. 4.22  Tartini, Devil's Trill Sonata, 2/103-108, as played by Vecsey (1911).
Ex. 4.23  Hubay, *Zephir* Op. 30 No. 5/33-50, as played by Szigeti (1908 and 1913).
Ex. 4.23 con’d.

Ex. 4.23 Hubay, *Zephir* Op. 30 No. 5/33-50, as played by Szigeti (1908 and 1913).
Larghetto

Ex. 4.24  Handel (arr. Hubay), *Larghetto* 1-14, as played by Vecsey (c. 1909), Szigeti (1913) and Hubay (1928).
Ex. 4.24 Handel (arr. Hubay), *Larghetto*1-14, as played by Vecsey (c. 1909),
Szigeti (1913) and Hubay (1928).
Ex. 4.25  Hubay, *Scène de la Csarda* No. 5/23-28, as played by Hubay (1928).

Ex. 4.26  Hubay, *Intermezzo* 23-30, as played by Hubay (1929).
Ex. 4.27  Beethoven, Sonata for Violin and Piano Op. 47 (Kreutzer), *Andante con variazione*, IV/39-41, as played by Szigeti (1911).

Ex. 4.28  J. S. Bach (arr. Wilhelmj), *Air on the G-String/1-5*, as played by Vecsey (c. 1909) and Hubay (1929).
Ex. 4.29  Rubinstein, *Romance* Op. 44 No. 1/3-6, as played by Szigeti (1908).

Ex. 4.30  Hubay, *Scène de la Csarda* No. 5/42-47, as played by Szigeti (1908) and Hubay (1928).
Ex. 4.31  Hubay, *Scène de la Csarda* No. 5/11-18, as played by Szigeti (1908) and Hubay (1928).

Ex. 4.32  Tartini, *Devil's Trill* Sonata, 2/108-114, as played by Vecsey (1911).
Ex. 4.33  Hubay, *Zephir* Op. 30 No. 5/10-14, as played by Szigeti (1908).

Ex. 4.34  Hubay, *Scène de la Csarda* No. 5/118-129, as played by Hubay (1928).
Ex. 4.35  Hubay, Scène de la Csárda No. 12/15-17, as played by Hubay (1929).

Ex. 4.36  Beethoven, Sonata for Violin and Piano Op. 47 (Kreutzer), Andante con variazione, Var. II/1-3, as played by Szigeti (1911).

Ex. 4.37  J. S. Bach, Partita for Solo Violin BWV 1006, Preludio/1-4, as played by Szigeti (1908, 1949 and 1956).
Ex. 4.38  J. S. Bach (arr. Wilhelmj), *Air on the G-String* 19-21, as played by Hubay (1929).

Ex. 4.40  Beethoven, Sonata for Violin and Piano Op. 47 (Kreutzer), \textit{Andante con variazione}/45-49, as played by Szigeti (1911).

Ex. 4.41  Schubert (arr. Wilhelmj), \textit{Ave Maria}/3-4, as played by Vecsey (1910) and Szigeti (1911).

Ex. 4.43  Brahms, Violin Concerto Op. 77, 2/90-94, as played by Szigeti (1928).

Ex. 4.44  J. S. Bach, Concerto for Two Violins in D minor BWV 1043, 2/7-9 (solo violin 2 part), as played by Fachiri (1921).
Ex. 4.45  Dvorák, *Slavonic Dance* No. 2 in E minor/32-37, as played by Szigeti (1926 and 1941).

Ex. 4.46  Schubert, Piano Trio D. 898, (violin part) 2/96-98, as played by d’Arányi (1927).

Ex. 4.47  Tchaikovsky, Violin Concerto Op. 35, 2/40-48, as played by Brown (1924).
Mendelssohn, Violin Concerto Op. 64, 2/116-119, as played by Brown (1924).


Ex. 4.51 Kreisler, *Rondino* 45-48, as played by d’Arányi (1929).

Ex. 4.52 Drdla, *Souvenir* 16-20, as played by Drdla (1920) (above stave) and Ormandy (1928) and d’Arányi (1929) (below stave).

Ex. 4.53 Drdla, *Souvenir* 37-50, as played by Ormandy (1928).
Ex. 4.54  Gluck (arr. Kreisler), *Mélodie* 6-8, as played by d’Arányi (1929).

Ex. 4.55  Sibelius, *Romance* Op. 78 No. 2/14-16, as played by Telmányi (1936).

Ex. 4.56  Bartók, *Six Rumanian Dances*, 4/3-6, as played by Szigeti (1930), Székely (1937) and Martzy (1951 and 1960).
Ex. 4.57  Bartók, *Six Rumanian Dances*, 4/19-22, as played by Szigeti (1930), Székely (1937) and Martzy (1951 and 1960).

Ex. 4.58  Bartók, *Six Rumanian Dances*, 4/27-34, as played by Szigeti (1930), Székely (1937) and Martzy (1951 and 1960).
Ex. 4.58 con’d.

Ex. 4.58  Bartók, *Six Rumanian Dances*, 4/27-34, as played by Szigeti (1930), Székely (1937) and Martzy (1951 and 1960).
Ex. 4.59  Beethoven, Violin Concerto in D major Op. 61, 2/19-22, as played by Szigeti (1932).

Ex. 4.60  Schubert (arr. Friedberg) Rondo/6-10, as played by Szentgyorgyi (1930).
Ex. 4.61  Schoeck, Violin Concerto *Quasi una Fantasia* Op. 21, 2/114-117, as played by Geyer (1947).

Ex. 4.62  Franck, Violin Sonata in A major, 2/45-53, as played by Martzy (1959) and Zathureczky (1959).
Ex. 4.63  Herbert, (arr. Parker) 'Kiss Me Again' (from *Mlle Modiste*)/12-24, as played by Ormandy (1925).

Ex. 4.64  Sarasate, *Malagueña*/5-9, as played by Szentgyorgyi (1930).

Ex. 4.65  Paganini, Violin Concerto No. 1 in D major, 1/229-234, as played by Szentgyorgyi (1930).

Ex. 4.67    Kreisler, Praeludium und Allegro, Allegro/16-21, as played by Vecsey (1925).
Ex. 4.68  Drdla, *Souvenir* /4-8, as played by Ormandy (1928) and d’Arányi (1929).

Ex. 4.69  Brahms, Violin Concerto in D major Op. 77, 1/398-402, as played by Szigeti (1928, 1948 and 1959) and Martzy (1954).
Ex. 4.70  J. S. Bach, Partita for Solo Violin in E major BWV 1006, Loure/1-2, as played by Geyer (1946).

Ex. 4.71  Schubert (arr. Friedberg), Rondo/10-13, as played by Szentgyorgyi (1930).

Ex. 4.72  Schubert, Sonatina for Violin and Piano in D major Op. 137 No. 1, 1/42-44, as played by Szigeti (1941).
Ex. 4.73  Schubert, Sonatina for Violin and Piano in D major Op. 137, No. 1, 1/53-57, as played by Szigeti (1941).

Ex. 4.74  Hubay, *Sonata Romantique* Op. 22, 1/193-208, as played by Lengyel (c. 1950).
Ex. 4.75    Hubay, *Sonata Romantique* Op. 22, 2/13-16, as played by Lengyel
(c. 1950).

Ex. 4.76    Hubay, *Sonata Romantique* Op. 22, 3/91-95, as played by Lengyel
(c. 1950).
Ex. 4.77  Kreisler, *Praeludium und Allegro*, Allegro/1-6, as played by Vecsey (1925).

Ex. 4.79  Spohr, Sonata for Two Violins Op. 67, 2/45-48, as played by d'Arányi
(violin 1) and Fachiri (violin 2) (1924).
Ex. 4.80 Schumann, Violin Concerto in D minor, 2/4-9, as played by d’Arányi (1938).
Ex. 4.81  Mendelssohn, Violin Concerto in E minor Op. 64, 1/127-131, as played by Brown (1924).
Ex. 4.82 Mendelssohn, Violin Concerto in E minor Op. 64, 1/153-156, as played by Brown (1924).

Ex. 4.83 Mendelssohn, Violin Concerto in E minor Op. 64, 1/256-259, as played by Brown (1924).