



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Waszak, Anna

DIVERGENCE OR CONTINUITY? AN INDICATIVE EXAMINATION OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY APPROACHES TO “BAROQUE” VIOLIN REPERTOIRE IN ANNOTATED EDITIONS

Original Citation

Waszak, Anna (2021) DIVERGENCE OR CONTINUITY? AN INDICATIVE EXAMINATION OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY APPROACHES TO “BAROQUE” VIOLIN REPERTOIRE IN ANNOTATED EDITIONS. Masters thesis, University of Huddersfield.

This version is available at <https://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/35625/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

**DIVERGENCE OR CONTINUITY?
AN INDICATIVE EXAMINATION
OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY APPROACHES
TO “BAROQUE” VIOLIN REPERTOIRE
IN ANNOTATED EDITIONS**

ANNA WASZAK

**A thesis submitted to the University of Huddersfield
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the Degree of MA
by Research**

March 2021

Copyright statement

1. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns any copyright in it (the “Copyright”) and s/he has given The University of Huddersfield the right to use such Copyright for any administrative, promotional, educational and/or teaching purposes.
2. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts, may be made only in accordance with the regulations of the University Library. Details of these regulations may be obtained from the Librarian. This page must form part of any such copies made.
3. The ownership of any patents, designs, trademarks and any and all other intellectual property rights except for the Copyright (the “Intellectual Property Rights”) and any reproductions of copyright works, for example graphs and tables (“Reproductions”), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property Rights and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property Rights and/or Reproductions.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	4
Abstract	5
Introduction	6
Chapter 1. Points of Convergence: Baroque Music Today and its Relationship with The Past. 8	
1.1. A Summary of Current HIP Practices	8
1.2. A Summary of Current “Conservatoire Normative” Practices	13
1.3. Mainstream and HIP Critiques of “Romantic Performance” and Various Meanings of “Authenticity”	17
Chapter 2. The “Classical German Violin School” c. 1830-1920: Attitudes towards the Performance of Baroque Music	24
2.1. Stylistic and Technical Understandings amongst the Members of Spohr’s Tradition ..	24
2.2. Andreas Moser – “On Style and Artistic Performance” – Comments on the Essay	32
2.2.1. <i>Vibrato</i>	32
2.2.2. Fingering.....	34
2.2.3. Articulation, Phrasing and Tempo.....	35
2.2.4. Embellishments.....	37
Chapter 3. Nineteenth-Century Approaches to Baroque Music – Analyses of Nineteenth- Century Editions of Corelli’s <i>La Folia</i> op. 5	41
Chapter 4. Nineteenth-Century Approaches to Baroque Music – Analyses of Nineteenth- Century Editions of J. S. Bach BWV 1001 in G minor, mvt. I <i>Adagio</i>	59
Conclusions	67
References	69
Appendices	76

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation for my supervisor, Dr David Milson, whose guidance has been invaluable throughout this study. I also wish to thank Dr Polly Ann Flinders who has been a great source of support as Academic Skills Tutor as well as my mother, Dr Małgorzata Waszak for her overall support and editorial assistance.

Abstract

This dissertation will examine a selection of nineteenth-century editions of Arcangelo Corelli's *La Folia* op. 5 and Johann Sebastian Bach's *Adagio* in G minor BWV 1001. The purpose of conducting this textual analysis is to investigate the manner in which Baroque music was perceived and taught by musicians of the German Violin School based around the Leipzig Conservatoire in the period 1830-1920. Through close examination of their approaches towards "historical style", the research aims to explore the notion that nineteenth-century musicians knew little about earlier performing practices. It will hopefully shed some new light upon the degree of continuity between eighteenth- and nineteenth-century performance, and this may imply possible ways of enriching the state of contemporary HIP. The research has been conducted in keeping with the substantial scholarship on restoring lost performing traditions by Clive Brown, David Milsom and George Kennaway, which has been referred to as the "Leeds School" by David Milsom in *Romantic Violin Performing Practices: A Handbook* (Milsom, 2020).

Introduction

The subject of this research is manners of perceiving eighteenth-century violin repertoire by the nineteenth-century representatives of German violin school in the period c.1830-1920. This violinistic tradition left us with some illuminating evidence regarding the editors' and performers' approach towards eighteenth-century repertoire – an approach which was distinct from the one that became prevalent at the beginning of the twentieth century along with the birth of “modernism”.

Whilst there is a considerable amount of literature in the field of nineteenth-century style and violin technique thanks to the research of figures such as Clive Brown and David Milsom, it is the issue of nineteenth-century editorial and performing approaches towards eighteenth-century music which is the main focus area of this thesis. Some of the most important literature used in the thesis include Clive Brown's *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900* (Oxford University Press, 1999), David Milsom's *Theory and Practice in Late Nineteenth-Century Violin Performance* (Ashgate Pub Ltd, 2003) as well as articles on nineteenth-century performing practice and editing approaches on University of Huddersfield's CHASE website (<http://mhm.hud.ac.uk/chase/>) by Clive Brown, David Milsom, and Duncan Druce. Literature on more philosophical aspects of Historically-Informed Performance Practice (HIP) includes celebrated writings by Bruce Haynes, John Butt, Christopher Hogwood, Nikolaus Harnoncourt and Richard Taruskin.

The aim of the thesis is to challenge the notion that most nineteenth-century editors were ignorant of what we today understand to be “historical style”. It will examine nineteenth-century German violin treatises and editions of famous baroque pieces with the aim of proving the editors' knowledge and, more importantly, concern over stylistic differentiation. As a result of comparison of two Baroque compositions representing two very distinct styles (mvt. I *Adagio* of BWV 1001 in G minor and Corelli's *La Folia* op. 5) it will hopefully outline the differences in approach of the figures such as Joseph Joachim or Ferdinand David towards the German and the Italian baroque styles. I believe that the difference in length between the chapters on Bach and Corelli is indicative of the editors' attitude towards the degree of freedom they felt the repertoire in question allowed.

The research questions are therefore as follows:

1. What did musicians of the nineteenth-century German violin school understand by “historical style”?

2. Did the nineteenth-century German editors adopt different approaches based on the music they were editing and how much of that was “inherited” as a continuation of the eighteenth-century performing tradition?
3. How much did “the letter” differ from the intention behind their editing approaches?

The dissertation consists of four main chapters. Chapter 1 outlines the current positions of HIP and the largely declining nowadays “conservatoire normative” regarding the repertory in question. A set of technical and stylistic understandings have been compared and contrasted in order to be subsequently tested against their representation in nineteenth century Germany. Chapter 1 also outlines popular critiques of the “Romantic Style” viewed against the backdrop of the “Authenticity Debate”, initiated in 1980s by writers such as Richard Taruskin, who claim that HIP and “mainstream normative performance” both misrepresent earlier practices to a certain degree. Chapters 2, 3 and 4 are the heart of the thesis and deal with nineteenth-century approaches to baroque music. Chapter 2 describes German violin school of Leipzig in more theoretical terms, whereas Chapters 3 and 4 provide case studies of editions and first existing early twentieth-century recordings (where applicable).

Whilst it is acknowledged that the terms “Historically-Informed Performance”, “Conservatoire Normative Performance” and “Romantic Performance” are generalisations which inevitably comprise a multitude of performing practices, they have been devised for the purpose of brevity of this discussion. “Romantic Performance” is a particularly vast term and distinctions will be made between its appearance in various contexts in order to arrive at as clear as possible an image of the German violin school’s understanding of baroque music.

Chapter 1.

Points of Convergence: Baroque Music Today and its Relationship with the Past

In order to explore nineteenth-century approaches to baroque music, which will be the heart of the thesis in the following chapters, it is necessary to outline the current attitudes and approaches to eighteenth-century music as well as views on nineteenth-century performance practice with regard to three different topics. The first two areas are a set of current (both technical and stylistic) understandings of the “HIP” performance style and the same with regard to the “conservatoire normative approach”. The final section of this chapter discusses critiques of the “Romantic” performance style by both of the above contemporary performance communities. Despite the very distinct aesthetics characterising the HIP and the “conservatoire normative” approaches, as well as the communities’ use of different instruments, there are scholars (i.e. Richard Taruskin, Gary Tomlinson, Howard Mayer Brown) who argue that there is more that binds these two approaches than might be the general expectation. Through analysis of performing practices and scholars’ writings, this chapter examines whether there are any points of consensus between the HIP and “conservatoire normative” communities and the implications the critique of the “Romantic performance” had upon the modern manners of perceiving music in general.

1.1. A Summary of Current HIP Practices

Nikolaus Harnoncourt commented on Baroque music:

We all know how a foreign language is learned. By analogy, Baroque music is for us a foreign language, since we obviously do not live in the Baroque period. Therefore, as in the case of a foreign language, we must learn vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation – musical articulation, the theory of harmony, the theory of phrasing and accentuation. (Harnoncourt, 1988, p. 39)

A considerable amount of twentieth-century scholarship regarding Historically-Informed Performance is concerned with the issues of “learning the language” of baroque music, always emphasising the idea of music as speech. The rhetorical aspect of baroque music, so obvious and integral to the HIP musical perception, is irrevocably connected with the use of articula-

tion as an expressive device, putting sense into music: “If music is like rhetoric, then it must include punctuation. Imagine a person reading a text without any punctuation and how nonsensical this would be” (Tarling, 2005, p. 7). There is a debate whether Harnoncourt’s and Tarling’s views are revolutionary, as the idea of music as speech dates back to the eighteenth century and retained validity throughout the nineteenth century, as will be argued in chapters 2, 3 and 4. Whilst Harnoncourt considers this to be a twentieth-century, strictly HIP view, it should be acknowledged that the links between vocal and instrumental music were expressed as part of the nineteenth-century performing practice and that certain traits of the baroque style were naturally fed into the romantic performance style due to the similarities between eighteenth- and nineteenth-century musicians’ approaches to performance.

An obvious element of the interest in HIP is the use of period instruments and the study of organology as a means of expression. In terms of the violin it is self-evident that use of particular bow models will have a profound effect on the sound. In a short video released as part of AAM’s “Breaking Down Baroque” series, where baroque violin bows ranging from an early seventeenth-century Castello-type bow suited for diminutions to a High Baroque “Corelli Bow” capable of both articulating and sustaining *cantabile* lines are presented, Bojan Čičič argues that it is somewhat ineffective to go against the features of the bow and the manner of playing facilitated by the bow is usually the manner in which it is easiest to play the music in question (Čičič & Burnett, 2019).

Another important issue characterising the HIP attitude is the implicit use of ornamentation. This area, however, is far more complex and a lot of criticism has been voiced over some HIP musicians’ strictness and inflexibility when approaching this topic. In the chapter entitled “Notation as Example” John Butt comments on works in which “(...) the notation presents only one possible version of the piece. In this the notation does, in fact, offer precise performance directives, but perhaps with no single performer in mind, and rather by way of example than prescription” (Butt, 2002, p. 109). Corelli’s Twelve Violin Sonatas op. 5, which will be subject to analysis in the following chapters, are known to have acquired a reputation as core violin repertory and basis for technical study very early on, which can be supported by Tartini’s advice to Maddalena Lombardini to practise “an op. 5 Allegro daily” (Tartini, G., 1760, as cited in Zaslav, N., 1996, p. 108). Neal Zaslav describes the ornamented version of the sonatas number 1 - 6 in the Estienne Roger 1710 edition as “minimal, all-purpose examples that could work for many types of violinists in a variety of venues (...) intended primarily for inexperienced players who needed to be shown what was wanted in this type of music”

(Zaslaw, 1996, p. 109). John Holloway describes the Dubourg and Roman embellishments as examples of improvisers' ways of practising in order to develop their ideas (Holloway, 1996, p. 636). He states that "(...) today students of baroque violin are often encouraged to improvise their own embellishments to Corelli, hopefully with the knowledge of harmony and experience of the compositional process required by the 18th-century savants" (op. cit., p. 637). Despite this commonly-established consensus on the role of the written-out embellishments in Corelli's works, Peter Walls, upon examining a number of period recordings of the op. 5, notices many players' reluctance to venture beyond what is written on the page:

Violinists capable of wonderfully stylistic graces in Sonatas nos. 7 - 11 accept the Roger edition for Sonatas nos. 1 - 6. In a way this ought to not work, since all written out graces pretend to be a snapshot of a moment's inspiration. The conviction with which violinists can simulate improvisation suggests that – for the most part – spontaneity has always been well rehearsed. (Walls, 1996, p. 138)

Whilst raising an interesting point, Walls seems to be implying that musicians in all ages claim to be "spontaneous" whereas, actually, they play this spontaneity carefully as part of professional practice. (It is also worth noting that Walls was writing a quarter of a century ago). In one of his letters of 1778, Mozart stated that "[the performer should play in such a way] so that one believes that the music was composed by the person who is playing it" (Mozart & Spaethling, 2000). Far-fetched as it might be to draw too many parallels between those two quotations, they both illuminate the wider universal issue of what the public thinks we are doing and thinking *versus* what we are actually doing and thinking as performers.

Whilst the issue of ornamenting eighteenth-century Italian music leaves no doubts to contemporary HIP performers, the solo violin music of J. S. Bach seems to have achieved a status of 'sacred works', which made embellishments upon it quite a rare occurrence, even amongst HIP violinists. This can be inferred based on renditions of John Holloway, Pavlo Beznosiuk or Rachel Podger, upon comparing their Bach recordings (Holloway, 2007, Beznosiuk, 2011, Podger, 2006) with their recordings of Corelli (Holloway, 1996, Beznosiuk, 2013). An interesting example of substantially embellished J. S. Bach's solo violin works would be Shunske Sato's recording as part of the *All of Bach* series initiated in 2013 (Sato, 2018).

Rhythmic inequality is a common performance trait in HIP, and one that has implications for both practice and understanding in a range of other elements of performance aesthetics. Starting with the originally French *inegalité* related to rhythm, through bar hierarchy, harmony and dynamics, the recordings of Bach by Rachel Podger and John Holloway are illustrative of the current consensus on baroque phrasing and these performances operationalise

and illustrate current attitudes to the centrality of harmony as a means of navigating the music. In the *Adagio* of BWV 1001 both of the above-mentioned performers treat places like the third beat of bars 2 and 15, the second beat of bar 5, the arrivals at bars 7 and 9 as well as the very last chord as resolutions of the chords preceding them. Whilst Holloway varies the dynamics more (hence the stark contrast between the dissonances and their resolutions), Podger appears to be achieving the same effect through changing the intensity of sound. Viewed as more of an ornament than a strict instruction provided by the composer, dynamic markings remained largely at the service of harmonic emphasis and *Affekt*, which was to be conveyed. Upon comparison of two recordings of Corelli's *La Folia* op. 5 (Huggett, 2018 & Kraemer, 2018) one immediately notices a correlation between the *Affekt* (which is represented by tempo / expression markings) and dynamics. Equally importantly, terms such as *Adagio* or *Allegro* have their "identities" in the period understanding and bear specific indications with regards to expression. Whilst Monica Huggett and Trio Sonnerie seem to be maintaining a relatively low-key range of dynamics throughout most variations in order to only bring everything to a climax towards the end (bar 313 onwards), Hespèrion's rendition involves a lot more dynamic contrast between the mostly dark, subdued *Adagio* sections and the fiery, passionate *Allegros*. A manner of achieving dynamic diversity in HIP which is foreign to the "conservatoire normative" performance practice is through varying the size / colour of the continuo group – an effect used by both Huggett and Kraemer. Huggett decreases the volume and texture substantially in the variation starting in bar 281 by recording it with cello only (no harpsichord), which results in very linear, *chorale*-like quality, whilst Hespèrion XXI add a baroque guitar into the last variation (starting bar 313), hence contributing to the lavish character of the *Finale*.

Being far less conspicuous than bowing, the issue of fingering appears to pose less of a controversy. Through aiming to remain in low positions in order to shift as little as possible (a tendency largely dictated by holding the instrument "chin-off", however obviously not a prerequisite), historically-informed performers nowadays use open strings to a much greater extent. This leads to substantially more string-crossing and impacts the timbre through making the differences between the sound of individual strings more pronounced. In the performance note to his edition of *Six Sonatas for Violin and Obligato Harpsichord* BWV 1014 – 1019 (Bach & Manze, 2004), Andrew Manze makes a vital point about the concept of numbered positions being in its infancy in the baroque times, which made the fingering choices way more flexible (contractions, extensions). On top of allowing flexibility and freedom to

always arrive at new solutions, the fact that manuscripts and facsimile editions hardly ever contain any fingerings enhances better blending amongst members of HIP ensembles. Manze comments on that in his performance note:

It is sobering to remember that, of the countless eighteenth-century violin parts which survive, very few contain fingerings, and even fewer have bowing indications. There was not yet a tradition of using pencils or writing on sheet music. So bowings and fingerings, even in orchestral music, were worked out by means of a collective instinct for what was appropriate to the music and the moment. (op. cit.)

On the other hand, it might also indicate that eighteenth-century musicians did not prize modern notions of planning and timbral coherence as much as we do nowadays, hence their lack of need to remain on the same string as well as their increased flexibility regarding the issue of fingering in general. (Indeed, the prevalence of ‘bariolage’ textures in many eighteenth-century works further supports the view that timbral difference was perhaps more highly prized before the nineteenth century).

Rhythm and musical time were important and widely discussed elements of performance in the eighteenth century. The issue of inequality, although typically associated with French and French-inspired music, pervaded various aspects of eighteenth-century performance, both rhythm- and articulation-related. HIP performers’ substantial insight into the relation between dance and music is obvious, as an important share of baroque music in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was composed with the intention to serve as dance music in a social context or in theatrical settings. A lot of dances were also used as part of larger pieces (in the context of instrumental music mostly in sonatas and variations), and it is often not the title, but musical traits which imply connection to specific dances. As many types of baroque dances existed, each of them was characterised by particular dance steps, a specific character as well as tempo. However, as we know, even in HIP today, tempo variations can be considerable, and performances may often contain a certain degree of tempo fluctuation. The question of how much rhythmic elasticity is expected in stylised dances of J. S. Bach remains largely up to the performer. However, upon comparison of three recordings of the *Corrente* from BWV 1004 in D minor (Beznosiuk, 2014, Podger, 2018, Sato, 2018), one notices that, despite differences of tempo and varied timing, the features of the Italian-style *corrente* (fast tempo, running and springing steps, heavily-marked downbeats) have been convincingly conveyed.

The almost “physical” manner of experiencing rhythm (often illustrated by examples related to bodily movements) was an inherent part of the general training of musicians according to eighteenth-century sources, of which Leopold Mozart’s remark is very indicative:

Time is indicated by the lift and fall of the hand, according to which all those who sing or play together must accommodate themselves. And just as the doctors call the movement of the pulse “Systole” or “Diastole”, so one calls the down beat “Thesin” and the lift of the hand “Arsin”. (Mozart, p. 31)

Being able to beat time was of essence to Leopold Mozart, who advised teachers “constantly to guide the pupil’s hand according to the beat” until they were able to “beat each crotchet of the bar carefully, rhythmically, with spirit and zeal, and to express and to discern” prior to learning how to play the violin, (Mozart, pp. 33 – 34). Vittorio Ghielmi was supposed to say that every musician should learn the basics of percussion, which seems very adequate in this context.

1.2. A Summary of Current “Conservatoire Normative” Practices

The period between ca. 1890-1920 was characterised by particular diversity of styles and techniques in art as well as humanities and sciences. The large amount of social change which lay at the heart of that diversity resulted in the crystallisation of fundamental philosophic concepts, which dictated the aesthetic and axiological basis for artists of all areas. Ideas which resonated in culture were discoveries of Jung and Freud in the emerging field of psychology, as well as Nietzsche’s aesthetically-axiological concepts and the phenomenological work of Husserl. Exploration of human awareness resulted in a turn towards sheer perception of an artwork and away from analysing its structure or form. It was no longer expected of music to have a functional role and be semantic so much as it was to function on its own and be expressive (“Absolute Music”). Nietzsche criticised Wagner’s works for their symbolic aspirations and expressing non-musical ideas. He expected sovereign music, which manifested itself through sound as opposed to figures created out of sound (Gross, 1968-69). Hence the revolution in composition, which aimed to strip the music away from the excess of semantic meaning and gave rise to entirely new, unexplored qualities (Schoenberg).

The changes introduced upon rejection of the “old-fashioned” performance style reflected an overall turn away from the nineteenth-century and earlier written and oral instructions towards the physiological basis of violin playing. A different basic posture and position of both arms began to be considered appropriate, the chin rest started being used on a daily basis. While it is vital to bear those physical aspects in mind when considering changes in the aesthetic approach towards violin playing, the stylistic precepts adopted at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries provide an even clearer indication of a “modernist revolution”.

The previously described urgent need to “strip the music away” also manifested itself explicitly in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century approaches towards performance, which was when *Urtext* gained superiority over annotated editions. The resulting performing practice is the aforementioned “modernised” “conservatoire normative” approach, which has been largely declining since the emergence of HIP in Western countries during the second half of the twentieth century.

Christopher Hogwood expressed the non-semantic nature of *Urtext* editions, describing them as “a semantic impossibility, except in the case of works for which there is only a single autograph source that requires no transcription, commentary or explanation; in all other situations, opinion and personal judgement must make an early entry” (Hogwood, 2013, p. 123). He also remarked on the large amount of emphasis *Urtext* placed on the score in favour of the differing evidence of the original parts, as a result of which an account of the original ensemble size was lost, or at least unclear (op. cit., p. 126). Hogwood juxtaposed *Urtext* editions against what he referred to as FLH (*Fassung letzter Hand* – “last manuscript version”) and challenged the absolute primacy of either due to the existence of multiple versions written by the same composer of the same piece (Mendelssohn, Schubert, earlier on Corelli), interestingly – often without prioritising one over another (op. cit., p. 123). The twentieth-century “conservatoire normative” approach does not appear to ask nearly as many questions, which results in performances being almost deliberately similar to one another in terms of aspects such as rhythm, bowing, fingering and tempo.

Contrary to original instruments, gut strings and bows as well as their application summarised in the previous section, modern instruments do not facilitate performing eighteenth-century works, as they were originally meant to accommodate different types of music and acoustics. It is, however, the twentieth-century musicians’ intention behind their playing which is being thoroughly analysed in this section.

Hogwood summarised the lasting damage caused by the blind assumption that performance and the written text are a unity. He also referred to the issue of ornamentation and the “mental barrier” that prevented (likely still prevents) highly able musicians from departing from the original text and following any indications or lack of indications it contains:

Reverence for the unreal *Urtext* concept has done collateral damage: it has encouraged over-respect for a dictatorial hand, first the editor, later the conductor. Improvisation was a permanent component of pre-20th-century performing styles and should become so again, but this would mean that soloists (even singers) would sometimes need to take charge – and be

trained at conservatoires to take charge – of their personal contribution with truly improvised additions’. (Hogwood, p. 124)

Indeed, not often can any additions be heard in mainstream renditions of eighteenth-century music. Whilst, as discussed before, the issue of improvising embellishments poses more of a controversy with regard to the solo works of J. S. Bach, Italian music of the High Baroque period in early twentieth-century renditions remains unaltered too. Upon analysis of Grumiaux’s recording of Corelli’s *La Folia* (Grumiaux, 1956) in the violin and piano arrangement by Richardo Castagnone, one immediately notices an entire absence of added (even cadential) trills, let alone other, more elaborate embellishments of the melody. The Baroque set of variations was treated very literally, the only changes towards repeated phrases being a clear *forte-piano* differentiation. Even the *Adagio* variation in bar 201 consisting of dotted minims held over two bars (and which Corelli would be sure to have improvised upon) was rendered exactly as written.

As the above-described type of rendition was typically applied to Corelli, it should come as no surprise that twentieth-century renditions of unaccompanied Bach are not substantially different from one another either. There is another important element of Baroque music, closely related to ornamentation, which the mainstream conservatoire approach misrepresents; it is the rhythmic accuracy. In most early twentieth-century recordings there seems to be a general tendency towards treating all the music material equally, which is particularly noticeable in the BWV 1001 recording by Itzhak Perlman (Perlman, 2016). The first movement, *Adagio*, is a prelude with a harmonic skeleton and elaborate embellishments written out by the composer himself. Perlman plays the florid passages with metronomic accuracy, all of them very ‘deliberate’ and important. He makes no hint of ‘stealing and giving back’ time, neither does he differentiate between the chords carrying a harmonic tension and their resolutions with regard to volume or intensity. The entire material is treated very linearly, without a clear emphasis upon the polyphonic nature of this music.

It is not only the issue of timing which seems largely misrepresented by the “conservatoire normative” performance practice, but also the tempo itself. As described in the previous section, HIP devoted a great deal of attention to the features of Baroque dances as well as the speed considered most appropriate for each one of them according to written sources and musical sources. Modern players tend to divide the movements in Bach’s solo works into “slow” and “fast”, which does not always go in accordance with the intended character; hence the very common large disproportions between (for example) *Adagio* and *Fugue* or *Siciliana* and

Presto. Perlman's renditions of both *Adagio* and *Siciliana* seem to have been taken so slowly that the entire harmonic direction becomes ambiguous. The *Siciliana* is a particularly good example of a baroque dance, if stylised, with misrepresented features, such as a lifted third and sixth beat, light dotted rhythms and, most importantly, a pastoral character. The twentieth-century "performing tradition" which had been referred to earlier manifests itself very clearly in the manner in which tempos of well-known works undergo a gradual change in the process of performance. Bruce Haynes mentioned this phenomenon in *The End of Early Music* (Haynes, 2007) with regard to Mahler's Sixth Symphony, however I believe it can easily be applied to the above described, especially slow movements of Bach:

José Bowen has shown how Mahler's Sixth Symphony is gradually getting longer, based on some thirty recordings made during the second half of the twentieth century. Performances of this piece have evidently gotten slower. This is a simple example of how performing tradition has altered our conception of a work's identity. (Bowen, J. A. as cited in Haynes, p. 24)

The modern bow has created a multitude of technical and expressive possibilities, the most revolutionary one of them being to maintain equal sound throughout. The broad, seamless twentieth-century bowing style is therefore likely to misrepresent the eighteenth-century distinction between the upbow and downbow, articulated note beginnings or *messa di voce*. Grumiaux's recording of *La Folia*, to which reference had been made earlier, provides a very illustrative example of this misrepresentation. Grumiaux uses the upper half of the bow for all of the variations featuring detached quavers, all of them *staccato*, slightly marked and very equal. Whilst he made no distinction between the articulation of notes which are separated by leap and those proceeding by step, he often joined upbeats into the downbeats of the following bars (both unlikely, according to HIP).

With the gradual introduction of continuous vibrato at the start of the twentieth century, the entire "magic" of it being used for expressive reasons (a practice of which Joachim's students were the last advocates) disappeared. Another important aspect of the left hand technique is the mainstream players' turn away from the second and half positions in favour of larger and less frequent (yet silent) shifts. All of the above described features are perfectly illuminated by the two recordings mentioned earlier.

1.3. Mainstream and HIP Critiques of “Romantic Performance” and Various Meanings of “Authenticity”

The term “romantic performance” which will be referred to is the performance style predominant in the nineteenth century and commonly associated with overly expressive treatment of the musical material (Robert Hill calls it “range of interpretive prerogative”), particularly potent with regard to tempo flexibility, as well as the use of ornamental devices such as *portamento*, selective vibrato and dynamics. According to Hill,

(...) time is central because when the player organises time subjectively rather than adhering to an external, regular beat, timing decisions must be genuinely intuitive. They must be improvised, even if according to some kind of schematic plan; they cannot be “reproduced”. (Hill, 2005, p. 42)

Both of the above discussed communities of practice (“conservatoire normative” and HIP) tend to see “romantic performance” as slovenly, ill-disciplined, overly sentimental, textually ignorant, and advancing an excessively subjective and performer-centric approach to the music, at odds with current notions of appropriate “baroque” performance.

John H. Planer’s criticism of Pablo Casals’ rendition of Bach (London, Abbey Road Studios, 25. 11 1936) in *The Musical Quarterly* illuminates the most commonly attacked features of “Romantic performance”. Planer claims that, as opposed to elements such as the pitches, harmonies, texture and orchestration, which are indicated in the score “with relative precision” and therefore not as prone to changes during the act of performance, the free approach towards tempo was what often led to exaggeration and resulted in “a sentimentalist interpretation” which he much condemned. He further adds that “sentimentalist interpretations prefer extremely slow tempos and rubato, the performer’s subjective fluctuations of the pulse”. While a performer may change the dynamics, phrasing, and the voicing (prominence of each part), “sentimental interpretations distort the tempo the most” (Planer, 1989, pp. 214-215). It may be inferred from this quotation that Planer’s idea of a musical work is very much a fixed one, where certain criteria must be met and a high level of textual accuracy displayed.

In *The End of Early Music* Bruce Haynes clearly defined three performance styles: “period, modern and romantic”. He placed a clear line between the pre-nineteenth-century style (or rather “styles”, plural – most of them short-lived and intertwined with one another) and what he calls “romantic style”. According to Haynes, (...)

[since the early nineteenth century], musicians have deliberately tried to use the same general style of performing – Romantic style. At least, they have meant to, and think they have

been. It is as if people now at the beginning of the twenty-first century were still wearing the styles of clothes that were popular two centuries ago (in fact, the clothes – and the instruments – are not quite the same, though they are close). This very strong historical tradition is reinforced by a sense of pedagogical lineage, as musicians' CVs and course-catalogues attest: musicians frequently identify not only their teachers but, if they are eminent enough, the performing „school" to which they belong. It is from this heritage, often going back into the nineteenth century, that they derive their authority and influence as performers and teachers. (Haynes, 2007, pp. 21-22)

Haynes' notion of the romantic style is therefore that it was largely uniform and widely applied regardless of the repertoire. The establishment of the idea of violin schools in the nineteenth century is undeniable, yet the schools' approaches to the performance of earlier music as well as preservation of their legacies into the twentieth century are well known not to have all been the same. It seems to be the author's understanding, however, that (despite different means of expression as well as interest in the repertoire itself) nineteenth- and twentieth-century musicians displayed the same level of ignorance regarding earlier styles of performance: "Chronocentrism was the norm until well into the twentieth century", and musicians' interpretation and performances were aimed at maintaining "an unbroken chain of authority and orthodoxy". Haynes further argues that, "despite their occasional interest in the music of the past", musicians rarely attempted to recreate earlier styles. (op. cit., p. 26) He provides the example of Joseph Joachim and Andreas Moser's 1905 *Violinschule* as a failed attempt to "deal with stylistic issues in the performance of music of the past". Despite the intention, the writer asserts that "Moser too was captive on the carousel of time, as we can see from this distance". (op. cit., p. 27) Whilst he must have been to a certain point, he surely aspired to a degree of textual fidelity and stylistic differentiation, based upon the state of knowledge at the time, as did other musicians, editors and publishers of the more learned environment of Leipzig.

Bruce Haynes lists "romantic habits", which (according to him) were inherited into the twentieth century and which "are so much a part of how we do music that they represent barriers to approaching historical styles, often unconscious ones". (p. 68) Alongside such concepts as "the interpretive conductor" or "originality and the cult of genius" we can also read about "untouchability and text fetishism", "the Urtext Imperative" as well as "the transparent performer" and "perfect compliance to the score" from which it may be inferred that Haynes sees "Romanticism" to be more uniform and less in continuum with modernism than it seems to have been upon considering the impact of the German tradition. Haynes' focus seems to have largely been upon the Paris School concepts ("Romanticism's symbolic educational in-

stitution”) when describing “Romanticism” as a phenomenon as opposed to venturing into distinctions between diverse performing styles.

Nicholas Harnoncourt has put forward a very clear distinction between the earlier / baroque style and the “beautiful” style which (according to him) characterised nineteenth-century performance. Whilst placing the emphasis on the rhetorical aspect of baroque music and its ability to bring the listener to experience the deepest and most extreme emotions, Harnoncourt criticised the nineteenth-century style for its uniformity and superficiality: “It is no coincidence that the reduction of music to the beautiful, and thereby to the generally comprehensible, occurred at the time of the French Revolution” (Harnoncourt, 1995, p. 13). He saw lack of proper musical education (amongst both performers and audiences) as a trend which developed after the French Revolution and is being continued up to this day in mainstream performance:

Even today, musicians around the world continue to be trained in European music by the methods developed in revolutionary France, and listeners are taught in keeping with the same principles that it is not necessary to study music in order to comprehend it: all that is called for is simply to find it beautiful. Each individual therefore feels entitled and qualified to form his own judgement as to the value and the performance of musician attitude which was perhaps valid in post-revolutionary music, but which in no way applies to the music of the preceding ages. (op. cit., p. 14)

Similarly to Haynes, Harnoncourt saw the contemporary mainstream model of an artist (‘a kind of a superman’) as derived from the nineteenth century: ‘However, the portrait of the artist that emerged in this decadent late period has been preserved in stone, like so many other things from that time’ (op. cit., p. 69) He also commented on nineteenth-century editions of earlier music by saying that ‘one might almost say they [the edited works] have been converted into 19th-Century compositions’, this time, however, he considered the twentieth-century editorial style as part of which older scores were ‘purified of 19-Century additions and performed in a dessicated form’ even more detrimental to performance in general. He continued, however, by asserting the similarity between those two styles with regard to the strictly reverential editor – performer relation:

Yet the principle of the 19th Century in which what the composer intended had to be found expressly in the notes was retained and vice versa: anything not found in the notes was not intended and represented an arbitrary distortion of the work. (op. cit., p. 128)

It is the performance style cultivated by the nineteenth-century German violin school tradition which is the primary object of this research and will be discussed and analysed over the

course of the next two chapters. Having reached its prime around 1850-1900, German violin school began its decline, upon which Clive Brown commented in the following way:

By the early years of the twentieth century, however, the artistic and technical precepts that lay at the core of this German tradition were becoming increasingly out of touch with the changing tastes of the day. Within the generation of Joachim's death in 1907 few of the aesthetic aims, and virtually no trace of the distinctive techniques that had characterised his approach to violin playing (laid out in painstaking detail in the Joachim and Moser *Violinschule* of 1905) survived in the world of professional music making. (Brown, 2011)

In his pamphlet "On conducting" Wagner criticised the Leipzig Orchestra's inability to "play exactly as written", as well as its attitudes towards the issues of tempo and dynamics, which seems to corroborate much of the criticism this thesis aims to problematise. Regarding his own experience of performing Beethoven's Ninth Symphony with the ensemble, he said:

The masterly execution of this passage by the Paris orchestra consisted in the fact that they played it EXACTLY as it is written. Neither at Dresden, nor in London when, in after years, I had occasion to prepare a performance of the symphony, did I succeed in getting rid of the annoying irregularity which arises from the change of bow and change of strings. Still less could I suppress an involuntary accentuation as the passage ascends; musicians, as a rule, are tempted to play an ascending passage with an increase of tone, and a descending one with a decrease'. (Wagner, 1869, p. 9)

Amongst the most famously avid critics of the manner in which the nineteenth-century expressionism is being largely condemned by both modernist and HIP performers alike is Richard Taruskin. Whilst deploring the contemporary performers' lack of individuality and commitment, so ingrained in the nineteenth-century tradition of performing earlier works, he proposes two distinct meanings of the word "authentic", the first one being "genuine" that is "traceable to a stipulated origin". (Taruskin, 1995, p. 68) Taruskin sees the need of attribution as dating back to the Renaissance times, when the ancient classics were first discovered, and remarks: "So textual criticism, the art of science (opinions differ) of establishing authentic texts, was born" (op. cit., p. 67). Whilst there is nothing unnatural about the desire to trace the origins of a work of art, according to Taruskin "the material value placed on authorship in Western society is such that the cultural value of a work of art, as much as its pecuniary value, can be crucially affected by it" (op. cit., p. 68). John Spitzer provides a detailed overview of how established music critics expressed varied opinions regarding Mozart's *Sinfonia Concertante* in E-flat K. 297b depending on their belief as to the problematic issue of the work's authenticity. From the compilation of reviews he had made it is evident that the critics who considered the piece to have been written by Mozart himself valued it way more than the ones who found the matter of its origin spurious (Spitzer, 1987). Taruskin comments: "We already have a small but pernicious paradox involving two meanings of authenticity. The establish-

ment of a work of art as authentic can take the place of authentic critical judgement of it” (Taruskin, 1995, p. 69). He also argues that far too many HIP performers nowadays treat their renditions as “texts” rather than “acts”, which strips away the excitement and personal impact, which embodied the nineteenth-century performance tradition. The other definition of “authenticity” he proposes revolves around integrity of expression and truthfulness to the performer of the work rather than the work itself:

Authenticity (...) is knowing what you mean and whence comes that knowledge. And more than that, even, authenticity is knowing what you are, and acting in accordance with that knowledge. It is having what Rousseau called a ‘sentiment of being’ that is independent of the values, opinions, and demands of others. (Taruskin, 1995, p. 67)

What, according to Taruskin, links these two understandings of the word “authenticity” is both editors’ and performers’ reticence to judge and arrive at independent conclusions (even more so, their fear of being judged), whether related to estimation of the value of a work of art or to decisions regarding its performance (op. cit., p. 70).

The twentieth-century omnipresent need to “clear away accretions” is what Taruskin believes to be a common feature of both mainstream and HIP performers. He sees the HIP striving to arrive at “final” versions of early pieces (which he also calls “establishing the Ur-text”) as contrary to the natural circumstances under which the works were conceived and comments on what an HIP editor believed to have been the “the final version” of the first book of viol pieces by Marais in order to illustrate his point:

To call the edition of 1689 „terminal” is to impute the attitudes of a twentieth-century textual critic to an eighteenth-century performing musician. It changes what the editor’s own research has shown to have been a descriptive notation of the composer’s own fluid performance practice into a prescriptive one, by implication binding and setting limits on performers today (p. 71).

Robert Hill discovers other similarities between the modernist and HIP approaches, manifesting themselves in both of the above communities’ attitudes towards expression. The “raw”, transparent quality of performances, achieved through placement of excessive emphasis on textual fidelity and purity of style, is not “authentic” in the way in which we (performers) might wish for it to be, as we do not acknowledge the expressive values of the music in question (Hill, 2005, p. 42). According to Taruskin, (...)

to reconstruct the sound-wall of past styles of music-making without challenging the expressive values inculcated by modernism is hypocritical’ as we (performers) blindly pursue what we believe to be ‘fidelity’ (or ‘authenticity’) without adjusting our expressive values to the values by which music was perceived and defined at the time. (Taruskin, 1995, p. 40)

He further argues that “an alternative is to admit that how music was experienced in its own time does not interest us enough to cause us to question and change our own expressive values”. The author believes the universal need to criticise and “get away” from what is commonly understood to be “romantic style” resulted in a complete detachment from the pre-nineteenth-century expression, often even an implied denial of its existence:

The surprisingly popular alternative of believing that listeners before the period of *Empfindsamkeit* were reacting strongly to performances that lacked externalised expressive intensity as we think of it, I reject as schematic, based ultimately on a wish for a clean-cut distinction between ‘subjective’, ‘irrational’ romanticism and an imagined ‘objective’, rational pre-romantic performance culture (p. 42).

Robert Hill places a lot of emphasis upon the above discussed listeners’ reaction to the act of music performance and how musicians of each century were perceived and evaluated by their audiences. What gives us the liberty to judge romantic performances according to contemporary standards of perception? Hill explains the misconception:

Even apparently obvious examples of stylistic excess such as the castrato Alessandro Moreschi’s rendition of the Bach-Gounod ‘Ave Maria’, over which it is hard to suppress a giggle the first few times one hears it, begins to assume normal artistic proportions once the listener recognises Moreschi’s ‘heart on his sleeve’ rendition as a craftsmanlike handling of a range of ornamental devices without which his audience would probably have felt deprived. (Hill, 2005, p. 40)

According to Hill, the general suppression of personal expression in performances, which was the main feature of what emerged after the First World War as *Neue Sachlichkeit*, substantially and lastingly increased the distance between performers and their audience. “Our objectivity seems to distance us from our sense of relationship to our audience”. As numerous HIP performances nowadays “betray a disturbingly narcissistic component that seems little concerned with sharing a genuine spiritual quality with the listener”, they bear little relation to any kind of “authenticity” (op. cit., p. 39). The leading factor contributing to the performers’ suppression of personality as seen by Hill is the restrictive treatment of time, which is very distinct from the nineteenth-century manner of perceiving this musical dimension. Hill criticises both mainstream and HIP musicians for their lack of timing flexibility, which he thinks “tends to abstract and de-personalise the music-making, underscoring its absoluteness”. He also reflects on the meaning of strikingly elastic timing of early recordings, such as the Carl Reinecke’s 1905 piano roll recording of Mozart’s *Larghetto* KV 537 (Mozart, 1905).

A similar idea has been expressed by Will Crutchfield, who reflects upon the differences between the renditions of Hogwood, Karajan and Nikisch with regard to Beethoven’s

Fifth Symphony. Through noticing similarities between Hogwood's and Karajan's recordings, Crutchfield challenges the idea of HIP being revolutionary in its approach towards earlier music as well as emphasises the proximity in time between Beethoven and Nikisch (of whom the latter was born in 1855 and recorded the piece in 1913):

How is one to assess the degrees of 'authenticity' these performances possess? Have we been getting over the course of the century? If so, then why do we feel as though the authenticity movement is a revolution? Or do we have a style related in some way to the rationalist composers and strict notation of our day – a style that Hogwood and his players retain even with the original instruments in front of them? (Crutchfield, 1988, p. 21)

Crutchfield challenges the popular notion that the nineteenth-century musicians' level of concern with the issues of "historical style" was one caused by ignorance and implies that the actual performing practice of the time allowed considerably more flexibility and room for improvisation, which links to Taruskin's idea of "authenticity" - one to which neither the "conservatoire normative" nor HIP performance practice do enough justice:

The great benefit of this close, narrow correspondence between contemporary composition and performing style (...) is that the performer can be so confident in the basic grammar and syntax of his stylistic language that true improvisation, true spontaneity of utterance, becomes possible within it. If the thriving triangular relationship between composers, performers and the public had not broken down, historically informed performance would be neither likely nor desirable today. (op. cit., p. 23)

Whilst it is a challenge to examine the extant evidence in the form of acoustic recordings, editions and reviews, what Bruce Haynes calls the "romantic drapery" is likely not to be as thick as it tends to be envisaged. "Exotic" though it might appear to many contemporary musicians, this uncultivated perspective is capable of providing important insights into both romantic and earlier performing practices.

Chapter 2.

The “Classical German Violin School” c. 1830-1920: Attitudes Towards the Performance of “Baroque” Music

2.1. Stylistic and Technical Understandings Amongst the Members of Spohr’s Tradition

This chapter is divided into two sections, which aim at providing an account of the nineteenth-century understandings of earlier music. The first section discusses the stylistic assumptions and editorial approaches of the nineteenth-century German violin school, with a particular focus upon Louis Spohr, Ferdinand David and Joseph Joachim. The second one deals exclusively with Moser’s essay “On Style and Artistic Performance” (Moser, 1905) and aims to evaluate the editors’ intentions as compared to the letter in the context of contemporary knowledge regarding historical performance.

It was not until 1800s that the idea of a repertory of classics began to enter concert halls. (Druce, 2011). Besides the Viennese classics (especially Beethoven) with additions of works of more recent composers (Spohr, Schubert, Mendelssohn, Chopin), the nineteenth century also saw awakened interest in the earlier, pre-1750 repertoire. A high degree of awareness of history and documents came to the western world, which resulted in significant events such as the Paris “Historical” concerts organised by Alexandre Choron and François-Joseph Fétis in Paris as well as Mendelssohn’s centenary performance of St. Matthew Passion in Berlin in 1829. The music of J. S. Bach gained enduring popularity thanks to Mendelssohn, Schuman and Liszt, as well as the first ever scholarly complete edition initiated in 1851 by Breitkopf und Härtel. Subsequent complete Breitkopf editions of baroque music featured Handel, Palestrina, Schütz and Lassus (the last one was never completed). Monumental series devoted to the musical heritages of Germany was created by the end of the century thanks to editorial activities of Chrysander, Spitta, Joachim and Brahms. Alongside large-scale, “clean” publications, containing as few additions as possible, annotated editions aimed at inexperienced students who were new to the repertoire became more and more common. The annotated editions of violin music were therefore designed with the aim of facilitating the performance and comprised solo sonatas with pianoforte accompaniments realised from the figured bass as well as indicated bowings and fingerings. Examples of such editions were amongst others Eduard Delvedez’s *Pièces diverses* (Delvedez, 1858) and Delphin Alard’s *Les Maîtres*

Classiques du Violon (an ongoing series began in 1861 and comprising 56 volumes written over 20 years) in France and Ferdinand David's *Hohe Schule der Violinspiels* (David, 1864) in Germany. A later legacy of German violin school which will frequently be referred to over the course of this chapter is Joseph Joachim and Andreas Moser's monumental treatise on performance, *Violinschule* (Joachim, & Moser, 1905).

Along with changes to the physical parameters of playing the violin (a different posture, bow and bow hold, which varied across countries and schools) new articulation styles and ligatures emerged. The aim is of this one as well as the following to chapters is to illuminate the ways in which the above technical means were used by nineteenth-century editors and teachers to convey the essence of eighteenth-century music. The most important focus, however, is upon the stylistic ideas behind the performance of baroque music adopted by members of German violin school.

Having learnt from Joseph Boehm (1795-1876) and Ferdinand David (1810-1873), Joachim came under a range of influences with pedagogical links going back to Giovanni Battista Viotti (1755-1824) and Louis Spohr (1784-1859). Despite the fact that Joachim saw himself as a direct heir of the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century French Viotti School tradition, his approach was always largely independent, on which Clive Brown commented:

Joachim's pedagogic activities were informed by his lifelong commitment to the basic tenets of that school, yet his fidelity to these aesthetic and technical ideals was not constricted by dry or scholastic conservatism. He was, like his mentor Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and his close friend Johannes Brahms, very much a contemporary artist, whose activities, both as composer and performer, resulted from a progressive response to the issues and concerns of his own day. Joachim's conservatism, like theirs, was of an active kind; he wanted to preserve what was best from the past and to use it creatively in the service of what he regarded as the true path of artistic development. (Brown, 2011).

The 1905 *Violinschule* proves the authors' highly eclectic approach towards the art of teaching. They saw learning to play the violin as a comprehensive process, entailing the acquisition of technique as well as, particularly with regard to earlier repertoire, a proper theoretical background. They both provided an account of the above in the preface. Joachim mentioned students who "(...) had gained readiness which comes from routine, yet the necessary theoretical basis, so essential for the intelligent interpretation of a piece of music, had never been fully explained to them" and criticised other written sources on violin playing by stating that "(...) not enough of conscientious care is taken to develop evenly and uniformly all the qualities, both technical and intellectual, which are required for the correct interpretation of a work of art" (Joachim & Moser, 1905, p. 3). Moser included advice directed at potential teachers on

a range of subjects which might be worth raising, should the student get distracted during the course of the lesson, some of them being “the most important representatives of violin-playing in different countries” as well as “the history of the violin and the art of violin-making”. (op. cit., p. 7). The supplement on “The History of the Violin and its Masters” (op. cit., p. 186) proves the authors’ thorough knowledge regarding music of the preceding century as well as seriousness of their enterprise.

The above-described approach is by no means merely stated as a teaching method. Joachim and Moser’s insight into eighteenth-century performing practices is evident from the preface to the 1908 posthumous edition of *Six Sonatas and Partitas for Violin Solo* BWV 1001-1006 by J. S. Bach (Bach, and Joachim & Moser, 1908), where the editors made a reference to signs of transposition originating from Medieval modes, asserting that “it can do no harm that the performer should be made conscious of Bach’s peculiar position in musical history” (op. cit., p. 2).

Joachim’s aesthetic stance is known to have been largely influenced by Spohr’s *Violin-schule* (Spohr, 1833), which places the violin on top of all other instruments due to its supposedly unique ability to approximate the human voice: “[the violin’s claims to pre-eminence consists] principally its suitability to express the deepest emotions of the heart, wherein, of all instruments, it most nearly approaches the human voice” (op. cit.). A truly artistic performance having its roots in the eighteenth-century *bel canto* tradition was certainly of essence to Joachim and Moser. In his preface, Moser emphasises the importance of being able (and made by the teacher) to sing prior to playing anything on the violin by quoting the celebrated words of Tartini “To play well you must sing well” (Tartini, as cited in Joachim & Moser., 1905, p. 7). Since singing was a prerequisite for a successful performance, Joachim and Moser’s first stopping exercises begin with the D string, as (amongst other reasons) “(...) the notes in the first position on this string correspond to the compass of every child’s voice, whether it be soprano or alto” (op. cit., p. 7). The importance of the singing quality was also referred to in relation to the performance of the *Adagio* BWV 1001, where the editors encouraged practising the melodic line first and only adding the chords once a desired flow of the melody has been achieved, (Bach, and Joachim & Moser, 1908).

Joachim quoted Spohr at the end of the preface to the above Bach edition in relation to tempo observance, asserting that “[Spohr’s instructions] do not only apply to the composition of this great lyric composer, but still more to the rendering of classical works, in whatever

form they may be written”. Spohr’s indication originally referred to his Ninth Violin Concerto and reads as follows:

In the compositions of the author it is but seldom that any acceleration or diminution of speed is necessary for the enhancement of expression. The modification of tempo is, generally speaking, only needed in those compositions which are not cast in the same mould nor conceived of in the same degree of movement. The student should therefore seldom make use of this means of expression, and, when prompted by his feeling to do so, should observe moderation in order that the whole symmetry of the piece may not be lost by the introduction of a strange tempo. (Spohr, 1833)

Two types of accents were distinguished in Joachim and Moser’s *Violinschule* – the rhythmical and the melodic accent. Whilst the rhythmical accent may be directly translated as an accent on what in eighteenth-century terms was known under the name of the ‘good beat’, the melodic accent is defined as “the highest point in a melodic sequence, to which the deeper notes approach step by step” (op. cit., p. 58). The authors maintained that, unless otherwise indicated by the composer, the melodic accent is subordinate to the rhythmical accent. They also warned the performer against incorrect accentuation, using the following words: “In song, an accented word or syllable occurring on the wrong beat of the bar, can entirely alter the meaning of the text in spite of good delivery upon the part of the singer” (op. cit., p. 58). More information regarding Joachim and Moser’s approach to the relationship between music and text can be found in the following section.

Joachim and Moser also provided another, expression-related criterion, according to which the student should adjust their type of accentuation. Depending on whether the piece is “of an energetic, vivacious character” or “written in a quietly melodious or graceful style”, the performer is to apply “firmer accentuation” and “a drawn-out, almost imperceptible dwelling on the principal notes rather than metrical divisions” respectively (p. 59).

The editors’ awareness of rhythm being key to the performance of baroque dances is evident from their instruction regarding the D minor *Chaconne* BWV 1002 in the preface to the 1908 edition. Not only did they talk about the typical emphasis on the second beat of the bar, but they also referred to other features distinguishing this dance, one of them being its fiery character described as “fatalistic energy”.

Joachim and Moser decided to indicate the arpeggio patterns in *Six Sonatas and Partitas* in “the simplest possible form”. Whilst stating in the preface that it was up to the performer to vary the pattern if needed, they warned them “against the use of over-elaborate arpeggios, as being absolutely contrary to the essential spirit of Bach’s music”. Clive Brown quoted

Joachim's letter to Alfred Dörffel at Breitkopf und Härtel in 1879, in which the editor provided reasons as to why he was initially not keen on the idea of making an edition of the *Chaconne* from Bach's D minor Partita for Solo Violin. He referred to such aspects as the quality of strings, bow hair and external factors, but most importantly the fact that he admitted openly to have played the famous arpeggio passage differently on different occasions: "Thus in my opinion it cannot be written down. If one were to do it in one or the other manner, Bach's text would be too subjectively coloured" (Kinsky, as cited in Brown, 2011). It is this highly interesting mixture of performing spontaneity and concern over the original notation of the text that distinguishes Joachim's teaching and editorial approach.

Both Spohr and Joachim referred to the past common practice of the performers embellishing simple melodies without written indications to do so, but stated it was no longer the case at their time for the reason stated below:

In their endeavour to outshine their predecessors and rivals in the display of effeminate and artificial embellishments, singers and virtuosi ultimately carried the matter so far, that the bewildered listener often found himself unable to distinguish the original melody amid the flood of grace-notes poured upon him. (Joachim & Moser, *Violinschule*, vol. 2, p. 144).

More details on Joachim and Moser's approach towards embellishing as well as reasons for the late eighteenth-century increasing trend to indicate ornaments more and more precisely have been discussed in the following section.

Similarly to earlier eighteenth-century treatise writers (Quantz, Leopold Mozart), Spohr specified a need to distinguish between pieces of different characters and *tempi* with regard to the speed of the shake: "In an Allegro and in pieces of a spirited character generally, the shake should be quicker and more powerful than in an Adagio, or in a soft and expressive melody" (Spohr, 1832, p. 144). Again, Joachim and Moser's highly similar stance on this issue has been described in more detail in the second part of this chapter.

Being less "tangible" and therefore much harder to interpret based on written sources, the term "style" contains elements of all of the above-described aspects and techniques. The importance of it was, however, widely acknowledged by nineteenth-century German writers of pedagogical sources on playing the violin. Spohr famously referred to "correct style" and "fine style" and laid out very precise indications on how to differentiate between them. On top of a basic set of skills contained under the name of the "correct style" such as precise intonation or keeping the time, the skills proving a violinist's ability to perform in the "fine style" are:

Firstly, a more refined management of the bow, both with regard to the quality and intensity of tone, - from the strong or even coarse, to the soft and fluty, - as also, in particular, to the accentuation and separation of musical phrases; secondly the artificial positions, which are not employed on account of their facilitating the performance, but for the sake of expression and tone; to which may be added, the gliding from one note to another, and the changing of the finger on the same note, thirdly the *tremolo* in its four degrees; and fourthly the accelerating of the time in furious, impetuous and passionate passages, as well as the slackening of it in such as are of a tender, doleful or melancholy cast. (op. cit., p. 142)

It can therefore be inferred that Spohr regarded effects such as *portamento* and time fluctuation as integral to an inspired and fine performance. According to him, only then “may the hearer be led to understand and participate in the intentions of the composer” (op. cit. p. 142). The same idea was echoed in Moser’s preface to *Violinschule*, where he referred to the point “where mechanical playing ends and artistic performance begins” (op. cit., vol. 1, p. 5). In his preface Joachim also remarked that, despite having provided editorial markings, he did not feel that his version offered “the one sanctified means of performing” the music he edited, as “the individuality of interpretation cannot be captured in technical markings” (op. cit., p. 4).

Along the above-quoted instructions on the individuality of interpretation, nineteenth-century German violin masters emphasised the concept of “the composer’s intention” as key to performance of any music. Very often (see the quotation from Spohr’s *Violinschule* above) fulfilling “the composer’s intention” was a prerequisite to a successful performance. The number and type of editorial markings in the pieces included in the violin methods were conditioned by the authors’ own performing practices, of which Beatrix Bochart gave an account by commenting thus:

The editorial markings in Joachim’s editions show us much about his use of these embellishments as well as about his approach to fingering and bowing in general. To evaluate this evidence, however, it is important to understand Joachim’s attitude towards editing other people’s music. It is clear that this attitude changed radically during the course of his life. Unlike Ferdinand David, Joachim does not appear to have had a need or desire to indicate bowing and fingering in detail for his own use. It seems that the music he played from in performance contained few added bowing indications or fingerings. (Bochart, as cited in Brown, 2011)

Clive Brown sees the reason for Joachim’s reticence in providing performance markings as resulting from “his own spontaneity as a player, as well as a conviction that he did not wish to prescribe a single way of performing a particular piece” as he thought it “contrary to the intentions of the composer” (Brown, 2011). Thanks to the two 1903 recordings (*Adagio* BWV 1001 and *Bourrée* 1002), we may get a taste of the relationship between the editorial markings and performance in Joachim’s musical perception.

Since Ferdinand David's views have not been explicitly stated in a treatise, information regarding his approach to both performance and editing may only be inferred from sources such as letters, editions and other scholarly work. There seems to have been more than one reason behind his general tendency towards providing dense editorial markings as well as varying his editorial attitudes between Baroque and later music. Clive Brown argues that what might be referred to as an overly prescriptive treatment of eighteenth-century music, was in fact thoroughly considered and aimed at making the repertoire in question more accessible to inexperienced students, particularly with regard to the bowing arm (Brown, 2011). The 1863 *Violinschule* may be considered a breaking point in the history of German violin pedagogy, as it was published solely for the purpose of the students and aimed at unifying their performance style. David's inclination towards providing a lot of articulation detail is particularly noticeable in his editions of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century works, which sheds interesting light on the distinction between his approach towards baroque music on one hand and Classical and contemporary works on the other. In spite of providing a vital insight into the editor's need to honour the original source, the 1863 edition of *Six Sonatas and Partitas for Solo Violin* (Bach & David, 1863) contains a variety of articulation markings (e.g. *leggieramente*, *largamente*, *staccato du mileu*), a lot of which cannot be found in David's editions of later music. However, as noticed by Clive Brown, this tendency underwent a change as David's editorial career progressed, which may be proved by the editor's 1845 letter to Mendelssohn about the process of editing his E minor Violin Concerto:

I have also revised it [the solo part], deleting many superfluous fingerings and bowings that I had written in and adding many new ones. Just strike out everything that's superfluous. I know from my own experience and with Beethoven and Bach, that it is not good to send forth a violin piece into the uncultivated world of violinists without all the bowings and fingerings. They don't take the trouble to discover the right ones and would rather say that it is ungrateful and unplayable in places. Therefore put up with anything that your composer's conscience can tolerate. (Eckhardt, as cited in Brown, 2011)

Clive Brown has remarked on another distinction in David's editorial approach, namely his different treatment of chamber and solo music. The considerably greater amount of detail included by David in the concertos he edited was described by Brown as "not merely arbitrary", which may provide a vital indication for our perception of the solo baroque works editions analysed in the next chapter. Brown describes it thus:

David will have been well aware that when Beethoven wrote a string quartet or a violin sonata he took care to provide the bowing and articulation in much greater detail than he did in a concerto (where the composer acknowledged the role of soloists in finding the best way to marry their techniques with the expressive requirements of the music). (Brown, 2011)

The two years spent under Spohr's guidance (1823-1825) are certain to have left a lasting influence upon David's perception of style. Spohr's reputation for rendering musical works of different periods in history in the spirit of their creator can be confirmed by the words of Friedrich Rochlitz after one of Spohr's performances in Leipzig in 1805:

He is almost a different person when he performs, for example, Beethoven (his darling, whom he handles splendidly), or Mozart (his ideal), or Rode (whose grandiosity he knows so well how to assume without, like him, occasionally letting himself verge on scratching and scraping, particularly in producing a big sound), or when he plays Viotti and gallant composers; he is a different person, because they are different people. (Rochlitz, as cited in Brown, 2011)

Unlike Joachim, whose reticence about providing performance indications resulting partly from his spontaneity as a player has been discussed earlier, David was known to have been strongly inclined to write in both fingering and bow markings for his own use in performance. Clive Brown believes the above was a habit which David adopted from Spohr and continued throughout the later years of his career. Brown further asserts that it was only possible for David to complete his editions at such a fast pace during the last decade of his life thanks to the "long-established practice of adding detailed performance marking in all the music he performed" (op. cit.). Furthermore, the multiple revisions of his own editorial indications prove David's unceasing need to search for the most accurate way of annotating the music he edited.

It may therefore be inferred that, despite the very different final effect with regard to the degree of flexibility allowed by their editions, both David's and Joachim's editorial approaches are likely to have been driven by the same element, which was each of the editors' individual approach as a concert violinist. Although closely based upon Spohr's stylistic precepts, Joachim's editorial approach appears to have been a lot freer than the one adopted by David, which may be confirmed by the words: "Spohr's virtues as a composer of extraordinary individuality were equally his faults as a teacher of violin playing" (Moser, 1905, p. 34). Moser further asserted that it was Spohr's "stubborn tenacity of views" which did not benefit certain students' artistic development as much as it could have taken place "under more liberal-minded leadership" (op. cit., p. 34).

2.2. Andreas Moser – “On Style and Artistic Performance” – Comments on the Essay

The author’s view we learn at the very start of the essay is that “a musician of culture must in the first place have had a sound musical training; but to save himself from a narrow one-sidedness, he should also be well acquainted with other matters lying far from his own particular calling” (1905, p. 5). Contrary to the previously-discussed views of contemporary scholars denouncing nineteenth-century musicians’ uniform treatment of earlier repertoire and lack of emphasis upon theoretical knowledge, it is clear that the Moser, following in Joachim’s footsteps, considered a sound musical as well as extra musical education of utmost importance when assessing a performer’s level of musicianship. The idea of the “composer’s intention”, expressed at the very start of the essay is a vital point when dealing with other elements of performance. According to Moser, if the composer and the performer are not the same person, “[the performer] plays the part of a plenipotentiary who fulfills a duty, and is all the more scrupulous in doing so, the greater the work in question happens to be” (1905, p. 5). Apart from purely theoretical elements, such as harmony or structure, the author emphasised the need to adopt distinct approaches towards works of different composers / centuries with regard to musical expression. All of the above is a proof of the nineteenth-century German musicians’ preoccupation with the origin, structure and style of various repertoires, in light of which the previously quoted opinions of modern HIP scholars such as Harnoncourt or Tarling do not appear as innovatory.

2.2.1. *Vibrato*

According to Moser, not only was *vibrato* (“the close shake”) supposed to reflect the character of music and the dynamics, but it was also by no means expected to be applied continuously or based on the level of technical difficulty (p. 6). He regarded an overuse of *vibrato* to be “a mannerism” and in his characteristically combative style argued that “if he [the musician] becomes a slave to mannerisms, he then gives evidence that he is deficient either in taste or intelligence” (p. 7).

The fact that there was a close correspondence between words and music is evident from the example of the opening of Joachim’s *Romanze* op. 2 included in section II of the essay, where the writer recommended adding a German text below the notes as “the safest method of obtaining information with regard to their [the works’] appropriate accentuation” (p. 7). This type of approach towards enunciating words through musical articulation (*vibrato*

being an element of it) does not appear to be very distinct from the eighteenth-century treatment of the text (for example Bach's cantatas or the *Passions*), where instruments were expected to "pronounce" the words sung by the choir or soloists in the *obbligato* arias.

An interesting instance of the use of *vibrato* (which Joachim indicated using parentheses) can be found in his edition of the third movement of Leclair's Sonata in G major op. 1 no. 8, which is a *musette*. According to Moser, another aim of using this technique was to "imitate the sound of certain instruments". It is not entirely clear how the author had envisaged the sound of the *musette* and why the vibrato was supposed to assist in bringing out its characteristic qualities; a plausible explanation may be associated with an "organ stop" kind of an effect.

The essay provides a clear account of the nineteenth-century approach towards tone uniformity achieved through the use of higher positions in order to remain on the same string. As each of the violin strings represented a corresponding vocal register, fingering was used as a means of maintaining continuity of the voicing. Whilst the above approach encouraged the use of *portamento*, the performer was warned against exploitation of this expressive device, (p. 8). Regarding music of the earlier centuries, Moser asserted that:

(...) this peculiarity [maintaining tone uniformity], which results from the build and the stringing of the instrument, was very frequently made use of, even in the early days of artistic violin-playing as a means for enriching and varying a performance by contrasting lighter and darker shades of tone-colouring. (p. 9)

Credit was also given to the *bariolage* technique – Moser described it as "a peculiar style of playing much in vogue in former times" (p. 9). It is worth turning to the works of composers such as Biber, whose "tonal experiments" ventured far beyond the *bariolage*, in order to ascertain the aroque musicians' free approach towards the use of colouristic effects. This type of an approach often had its roots in the inherent symbolic meaning of certain musical figures and keys. Another reason for the naturally decreased timbral coherence in the music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were the tonal differences caused by the early temperaments, which were not any more part of the nineteenth-century performance. Whilst it is all most likely to be a mixture of aesthetic and technical factors, baroque and nineteenth-century manners of rendering polyphony might have had a lot more in common than is popularly believed. The nineteenth-century editors' need to maintain tonal uniformity manifested itself through their frequent choice of higher over lower positions, for instance in the solo music of

J. S. Bach. Due to the lack of fingering and possibly also the much less striking sound of the gut open strings, the continuity of voicing in modern HIP performance is nowadays largely achieved via means more related to the right arm (articulation, emphasis in chords, bowing, phrasing).

2.2.2. Fingering

Considering fingering as an important element of the sound colour and therefore a means of expression, the authors of the essay offered a clear distinction between the composers who “have been practical violinists, and those whose creators have been either very little or not at all acquainted with the treatment of the violin”. As opposed to the latter type, composers who were also practical violinists would have “certain violinistic effects floating before their minds” whilst composing their works. (p. 10). Despite stating that “opinion has always fluctuated regarding what is and what isn’t violinistic”, the authors illuminated the frequent problem faced by performers of music which had been written “against” the technical capacities of the violin:

For on the one hand he [the performer] will be anxious, in as far as he is a genuine artist, to interpret as faithfully as possible the work entrusted to his care, and on the other he will find himself faced by difficulties which, in spite of his technical skill, are either followed by no effect, or are in direct opposition to the whole character of the instrument (p. 13).

It is interesting to observe how different an approach Moser presented towards the act of editing “recognised classical and standard works” (which according to him “cannot be too severely condemned as Vandalism”) and editing music “prior to Viotti” due to few fingering, bowing and expressive indications contained in them. (p. 10). According to the authors of the essay, “the want of marks of expression is explained by the fact that at that time not so much variety of light and shade was used as at a later date” (p. 11). The authors explained that, despite double-stopping being widely in use prior to Viotti, the music itself did not require positions higher than the fifth, with positions 1-3 being by far the most common. Credit for exploring the higher register of the violin was, however, given to Nardini and Locatelli, the latter of whom was (very deservedly) referred to as “extravagant” (p. 11). Not only were there more composers (such as Biber or Vitali) whose music required frequent venturing beyond the fifth position, but there were also many compositions, in which the fourth and fifth positions were needed a lot more than was felt by Joachim and Moser. An interesting remark regarding style was made about the music of Tartini and “of even older musicians [who] will well bear

a treatment in the matter of expression which, while in no way spoiling the uniformity of their style, will correspond more to the sentiment of the present day, than if performed with a timid anxiety to be literally correct” (p. 11). Whilst it is impossible to know what exactly was meant by “a style corresponding to the sentiment of the [writers’] present day”, there are examples to be found in the essay where the authors suggested an optional choice of the sixth or seventh position (no exact fingering has been indicated) for joining sonorities according to phrase in the music of Tartini. Whilst no mention of music prior to Beethoven was made during the discussion of articulation techniques such as *martelé*, *staccato* or *spiccato*, Joachim’s editions of Bach as well as his extant recordings involve their application, which is arguably indicative of the manners in which the editor brought the older repertory closer to the spirit of his time.

2.2.3. Articulation, Phrasing and Tempo

According to Moser, phrasing is “a matter which has the same meaning in music as articulation and punctuation have in speech, *i. e.* the systematic arrangement of musical thoughts into musical *sentences*” (p. 13), which closely resembles the contemporary HIP statements quoted earlier in Chapter 1. Joachim and Moser’s points regarding the treatment of baroque dances prove their high level of engagement with the eighteenth-century style, of which good examples are their notes on the required separation of the quaver upbeat in the *Bourée* in G major HWV 363b as well as the “unbroken connection” between the semiquaver upbeat and the chord on the first beat of the *Allemanda* in B minor BWV 1002. The comments on the execution of the *Chaconne* in D minor BWV 1002 included in the *Preface* to the 1908 edition have already been referred to earlier in the chapter. Not only did the authors draw the performer’s attention to the emphasis falling on the first beat of the *Bourée* HWV 363b, but they also ensured that the beginning of the note was “clear and precise” – an instruction very much in keeping with eighteenth-century manners of articulation. According to Moser, “this [clarity and precision of the first note] is effected by making a pause in the raising of the bow from the string, [which is] taken from the time-value of the first D [the upbeat], just as though that note had a dot placed over it” (p. 14). A separation between two notes of the same pitch seems to have been the rule for Joachim and Moser, as was lifting the bow off the string before the downbeat. The example from Tartini’s Sonata in G major proves the editors’ inclination to indicate the up-down bowing pattern in case of two consecutive notes of the same pitch. Whilst an upbeat functions perfectly well on an up-bow (Handel), the bowing at the beginning of the Tartini sonata results in “the rule of the downbow” being disrupted throughout the entire bar, which is still not impossible in case of Tartini. This type of a bowing pattern

seems to have been popular with Ferdinand David, who perpetuated it throughout his edition of Corelli's *La Folia* op. 5 as well as other works. Regardless of whether it was intended as a big rhetorical gesture (which is likely to have been the case with David's edition of *La Folia*) or maintained in the *piano* dynamic and "executed with a slight up-bow stroke", as instructed by Moser (p. 14), the manner of achieving separation through lifting the bow off the string in order to "land" on a downbow in the execution of the following note appears to have been a popular choice amongst nineteenth-century editors.

The essay presents silence as an articulation device. Apart from the obvious case where the theme returns after a cadenza-like passage and therefore a *caesura* is needed, Moser recommends relying on one's theoretical knowledge and a thorough insight into the laws which govern the formation of musical sentences and melodies' when deciding whether to make use of this device or not (p. 15). Despite not discussing compositions earlier than Beethoven's, the editor referred to the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century term *sospiro* (the rhetorical figure symbolising a sigh) as an earlier equivalent of the *caesura*, which marks a link between the "baroque" and nineteenth-century understanding of rhetoric.

An interesting point has been made regarding the uniformity of bowing in the ensemble. Whilst advocating uniform bowing across *ripieno* parts, Moser stipulated that elements such as "long sustained notes, connected phrases, or long-drawn melodies" should not have bowing marks indicated due to their belief that "every violin-player has his individual habits and tendencies, and that the beautiful illusion of a united legato is best effected by allowing a certain license in regard to the bowing of the more delicate points" (p. 16).

Moser's writing seems to have arrived at a balance between the appropriate treatment of *continuo* on one hand and allowing liberty with regard to time-keeping on the other. The author believed that anybody whose rendition of a piece with *continuo* was similar to their time-keeping in a modern piece, "would certainly not only misrepresent the intentions of the composer, but would also assign to the airs an entirely false physiognomy" (p. 16). He further asserted that "it would be an offence against all musical feeling if the basses, moving forward in notes of equal time-value, were to lose their serious dignity, and in order to keep in with the violin, constantly have to change the *tempo* of their movement" (p. 16). On the other hand, however, the authors warned the readers of a strictly "metronomic" treatment of the baroque repertoire, as despite being "correct", "in regard to expression the effect produced would be one of deadly dullness" (p. 16). Whilst it is impossible to determine the exact recommended amount of tempo flexibility from the text alone, executing a degree of it was surely expected

and believed to prove the performer's "innate musicianship" (p. 16). The highly illustrative instruction to feel the *continuo* as "Freedom's hallowed guard" rather than "a burdensome fetter" achieved through "slackening the rhythmic structure of the bar" (p. 17) along with the notes on rendering older variation forms, such as the *chaconne*, seem to confirm Moser's fundamental approach. Comments on transitions from one *tempo* to another have only been made with regard to music of the authors' time (Mendelssohn, Wagner), to which Moser's advice "the more sensibly, the better" (p. 17) was very relevant. The fact that the author did not provide any instructions regarding *tempo* relations in baroque music might mean their possible lack of preoccupation with this topic. An interesting remark was made on the effect elements such as dynamics, tone-colour and manner of performing small rhythmical values may have upon creating an impression of a particular tempo: "Impassioned development of tone in conjunction with energetic accentuation and tense rhythm produce in most cases the impression of a straining forward of *tempo*: veiled tone-colouring and softly marked rhythm with the use of a gentle tone have, on the contrary, a tranquilising effect" (p. 17).

2.2.4. Embellishments

In the statement which opens the section on embellishments, the author made it clear that "no hard and fast rules can be laid down" with regard to ornamentation. He also emphasised the role of "national taste" as well as the technique of individual instruments in the manner in which the same embellishments were performed (p. 18). Moser's section is largely based upon three eighteenth-century treatises: Quantz: *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen*, 1752, CPE Bach: *Versuch über die wahre Art das Klavier zu spielen*, 1752-62, Leopold Mozart: *Gründliche Violinschule* 1756. Moser sees "cases of fundamental disagreement" resulting in "many diametrically opposing views" presented by their authors as "the product of their [treatise writers'] training and environment" (p. 18).

C. P. E. Bach's instruction based on which embellishments should be applied as they are "shortening notes which on account of their length might otherwise appear empty" was assumed to apply exclusively to the piano, due to the instrument's incapability to sustain long notes. Therefore, despite the validity of many of C. P. E. Bach's instructions, Moser believed violinists were "surely justified in following the teaching transmitted to us by Leopold Mozart the violin-player, rather than that of the flute and piano playing authors" (p. 19). Despite being primarily specialised in the piano and the *traverso*, both C. P. E. Bach and Quantz displayed

a high degree of familiarity with the violin due to the amount of music they had written for it (both solo and ensemble).

Despite featuring as an occasional ornament in the essay and not being marked in the 1908 Bach edition, the termination (referred to as “the turn”) was widely used by Joachim in his 1903 recording of the *Adagio* BWV 1001.

Moser provided examples of trills which were supposed to start on the auxiliary note (repetition of a note under the same slur), on the main note (two consecutive notes under the same slur, the latter one being the one with a trill) and when either option was possible (no slur between the note with the shake and the one preceding it) (p. 20). Interestingly, upon comparing the above examples with Joachim’s renditions of the very same bars, one immediately notices discrepancies, which indicate Joachim’s general tendency to start trills on the main note. For example, in the cadence towards the second beat of b. 2, through breaking the slur down to two quavers, Joachim performs another slur on the trill and starts it from the main note (same thing occurs at the end of bars 12 and 16).

Reference has also been made to certain ornaments in eighteenth-century pieces which “while preserving [their] own archaic character, fit in well with [the writer’s] modern taste”; an example may be found in the final bar of the first movement *Grave* in Leclair’s *Le tombeau* (p. 20). Whilst the turn is not stated in the *facsimile*, its insertion is equally customary in contemporary HIP renditions.

It is interesting that, despite including the table with “Explanations of various signs for the good rendering of certain embellishments” which J. S. Bach supplied in his *Clavierbüchlein von Wilhelm Friedmann Bach, angefangen in Cöthen, den 22. Januar A 1729* where all but three types of embellishments began on the auxiliary note, no distinctions were made by Moser when indicating trills in Corelli, Bach, Tartini and Handel.

Considering all of the above, the author seems to have displayed a strong tendency towards applying more *galant* ornaments, often broken up into short segments, which found better application in later French and Italian music. As Charles Burney said, “Corelli is so plain and simple that he can always be made modern”. Might there have always been a tendency to apply the familiar styles to earlier music? It can be inferred with a degree of certainty that the musicians of German violin school displayed a considerable level of historical awareness, however it dated back to the Viotti tradition they knew well enough and felt comfortable executing – hence the application of later ornaments to earlier music.

Moser attributed the growing nineteenth-century trend to indicate the value of *appoggiaturas* more and more precisely to the “necessities of the orchestra”, i. e. its increasing size (p. 26). It is arguable whether this was the primary reason, as for example the string section of Rameau’s orchestras are known to have had as many as 16 or 17 violins, 6 violas divided into 3 *hautes-contre* and 3 *tailles*, 4 *basses du petit chœur* and 8 or 9 *basses du grand chœur* (Sadler, 1981-1982, p. 52) and yet the *appoggiaturas* were often not indicated in exact note values by Rameau.

Despite having based most of their instructions regarding the length of *appoggiaturas* on C. P. E. Bach’s *Versuch über die wahre Art das Klavier zu spielen*, Moser described the source as “not by any means founded on the character of German people, but according to his [C. P. E. Bach’s] own statement, [one which] merely represents views adopted from the French”. He further commented that:

(...) if applied in the most momentous cases they [CPE Bach’s instructions as to ornaments] entirely fail, and they often violate the healthy character of popular melody; and even where they may be profitably accepted, their observance will depend upon the taste and perception of the performer. (p. 30)

An example of a *coulé* which Moser believed should not be played according to C. P. E. Bach’s instruction is the violin *obbligato* opening of *Erbarme dich* BWV 244: “It was evidently Bach’s distinct wish that, like the voice part, the solo violin also should sound the *third* with the bass on the accented part of the bar, and *not* the octave” (p. 30). Whereas it is definitely a possible interpretation and its reflection can be found upon listening to several renditions of the piece, there appears to be a lot more rhythmical flexibility with regard to the performance of this particular ornament in contemporary HIP than is maintained by the authors of the commentary above. There is anecdotal evidence of Barthold Kuijken’s response to the question of whether to place certain ornaments before or on the beat during a C. P. E. Bach Symphonies project at the Royal Conservatoire of the Hague in 2011 – he always replied “around the beat”, which perfectly portrays the subtle flexibility conveyed only during the act of performance. Another example can be found in Moser’s comment upon the *appoggiatura* at the start of the second bar of the violin part in the same piece: “Like all *appoggiaturas* in the works of J. S. Bach, no matter in what way they are written, the above example must be played proportionately short. It must occupy at the very utmost the time-value of a quaver, and then incline mildly and sensitively towards the principal note” (p. 26). Whilst the choices were arguable, Moser’s concern with the harmony in their treatment of *appoggiaturas* was very apparent. In case of the above described example for instance he advocated that “passag-

es like [this] would bring about friction with the lower parts [F sharp in the violin part against G in the bass], such as Bach could never have contemplated” (p. 26). Moser further commented on C. P. E. Bach’s instructions, however, that, particularly with relation to piano and organ works by J. S. Bach, “opportunity will often enough be found not only to apply them, but to do so with very tasteful effect” (p. 31). The section was concluded with a statement which combines a great deal of performing prerogative with the importance of knowledge and education on the subject. According to the author, “rules in art, no matter from whom they proceed, provide no arguments that cannot be overthrown; it is much more essential to know when and where they should be employed – and when and where avoided!” (p. 31).

Chapter 3.

Nineteenth-Century Approaches to Baroque Music – Analyses of Nineteenth-Century Editions of Corelli’s *La Folia* op. 5

Ferdinand David’s prominent editorial activity began in 1843 with his edition of Bach’s Six Solo Sonatas and Partitas and continued to focus around annotating baroque, classical and contemporary violin works. The relationship between his editorial and performing practices leaves a lot of room for speculation, as frequently noted by Clive Brown (Brown, 2011). David is known to have revised his original editions by marking them in hand for the purpose of his own performance, the earliest known surviving example being his personal copy of Vioti’s *Six Duets* op. 1. Through doing so, he would often inevitably change, adapt and in some sense contradict what was written in the original editions. A likely theory as to why it might have been the case is that he felt a need to adjust his performance based on factors such as space, acoustics and other circumstances. Clive Brown concludes that the *Hohe Schule des Violinspiels* “provides particularly rich evidence of his [David’s] restless mind, always seeking new and more effective ways of presenting the music”, especially considering that “his modifications to the text and to his own printed markings occurred very soon after the editions were published and evidently in connection with performances” (Brown, 2011). It may therefore be inferred that David’s editorial markings as printed were meant to convey to the user an instruction rather than the ultimate interpretation and that despite the meticulousness with which they were made, David allowed for a substantial deal of flexibility during performance. It has been most interesting to analyse his highly descriptive edition of Corelli’s *La Folia* op. 5 with the above conclusions in mind.

According to *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, history of the folia predates the earliest surviving musical sources. It is likely to have originated as a folk dance in fifteenth-century Portugal. Over the course of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the scheme was used for songs and dances and as a subject of variation sets (2001, p. 2053). Needless to say, improvisatory character played a key part in the performance of this genre. Similarly to other dance forms and ostinato types, the *folia*, apart from the basic chord progression, was also characterised by a set of distinctive musical features such as metric patterns, rhythmic and melodic figures, cadential formulae and so forth. The music of Corelli enjoyed particular popularity according to sources as early as J. B. Cartier’s *L’art du violon*

(1797). It is fascinating to observe the changes in editorial approach it underwent over the course of the nineteenth century.

The following section aims at a comparison between what could be referred to as “the core folia style” and the approaches adopted by the editors in question. It is highly interesting to observe the ways in which nineteenth-century musicians were approaching the idea of editing such a free form. Written-out and prescriptive though they may seem, particularly the German School editions aim at achieving variety, which may be seen as an informed and perfectly valid standpoint when analysing the editors’ intentions. Another aspect worth considering is the nineteenth-century way of perceiving the relationship between the letter and the manners of elucidation. Joseph Joachim’s recordings of the pieces of which he was also an editor / composer provide many insights into nineteenth-century performing practices *versus* the constraints imposed by the score.

The following *La Folia* editions will be compared and contrasted: Ferdinand David’s, Delphin Alard’s, Hubert Leonard’s as well as Leonard’s and Henri Marteau’s edition for two violins.

Firstly, I will be looking at bowing markings and techniques – therefore all the aspects ranging from the bow direction through added slurs to articulation signs. The issue of dynamics remains spurious, as dynamics meant as colour are often equally dependent upon both hands – especially given that a lot of nineteenth-century editors seem to have frequently used higher positions on lower strings for a subdued *piano* effect.

Before investigating the above elements in Ferdinand David’s edition, I would like to provide an outline of the changes he had made to the original in terms of added notes, in order to facilitate clarity of reference during further analysis. It is worth highlighting that David’s version is strikingly recomposed and comprises a lot of entirely new material which cannot be found with Corelli. David began with discreet additions, i. e. changing the two notes (a minim and a crotchet) in the original edition into a whole-bar dotted C sharp minim as well as the added *appoggiaturas* on the first beats of bars 10 and 40, however his written-out improvisations become more and more elaborate as the piece progresses. Already the second half of the first variation marked *Allegretto* in David’s edition (bar 25 onwards) is embellished as opposed to Corelli’s version, which continues with two crotchets per bar. The scale at the end of the third variation (bar 48) is an editorial addition, as are the interventions in sections B (bars 2, 4, 6, 8 of that section) and C (bars 2 and 4), all of which are originally a minim and

a crotchet rest. The penultimate note of letter C in David's edition is a semiquaver, as opposed to a quaver in Corelli's version. In the fifth variation (letter E in David's edition), the second one of the original two crotchets per bar (*arco*) has been changed into a *pizzicato* quaver. The triplets, which appear halfway through the variation as well as the dotted rhythms of the three penultimate bars are editorial additions. All of sections D and E in David's edition have been further annotated by David himself – according to the CHASE commentary on the annotation, David might have been considering changing the order of variations at that point. (CHASE, 2011). Similarly to the last bar of letter D, the last bars of letters E, G and T in David's edition are all florid *arpeggios* ending on either the second or the third beat. In all those cases, Corelli only wrote a dotted minim.

The section marked G in David's score is one of the most elaborately recomposed variations. In Corelli's version, it is a bass variation with continuous semiquavers throughout whilst the violin only plays a minim and two crotchets in alternating bars. David's version echoes the melody of the main violin theme, but is further developed by the addition of double stops, syncopations, dotted rhythms and chords. Corelli's repeated figure of two slurred quavers in the following variation (letter H in David's edition) has been changed into a quaver and a semiquaver plus a semiquaver rest by David. David adds a chord at the beginning of every bar in letter I, whilst with Corelli it is only the top note. The ornaments added throughout letter K are mostly trills and grace notes, therefore I will be discussing them in detail in the section on left-hand embellishments (same applies to letter N a little later). David adds double stops to the semiquavers in bars 9-13 of the K variation as well as changes the tempo relation between this one and the next variation, marked *Meno mosso* in his edition (Corelli marks it *Allegro* in 3/8 and goes straight into it from the preceding E minim. Letter M in David's score marked *Adagio* (*Andante* in Corelli's original) is an elaborated version of Corelli, teeming with rhythmic alterations such as syncopations, as well as a shift down an octave for the second half of the variation. Letter O ends with a lead-in to the following variation (letter P), which is a written-out melody – as opposed to Corelli's static, mostly tied-over dotted minims ending with a simple cadential figure (needless to say, Corelli would have expected this passage to be heavily improvised upon). The long double-stops of the following variation (letter Q) are filled with left hand tremolo (whilst keeping the double stops). David changed the metre into 9/8, however he also indicated *L'istesso tempo* in order to maintain the tempo relation. The following two variations (letters R and S in David's edition) have not been

changed extensively in terms of notes. All the chords (R) and double stops (S), which appear halfway through the variations respectively, are editorial additions.

David often maintains the first part of a variation intact and then moves on to introduce a change to it on the repeat – such is the case with letter V, where the triplets turn into a melody in thirds with a lot of dotted rhythms. In this way, David combined two separate variations in Corelli's score (the triplet one in 9/8 and the following minim one in 3/4, each meant to be repeated) into one. Again, as is the case in letter G, the editor has made the violin part more melodically active over a basso continuo variation. The last two variations have been radically transformed into much more elaborate versions. The penultimate one (letter W) maintains Corelli's rhythmical structure (continuous semiquavers), whilst alternating between the original register and an octave lower one. The variation does not end on a dotted minim D minor chord as it does with Corelli, but instead keeps the semiquaver texture and climaxes into what is the last variation in Corelli's edition (letter X marked *Meno mosso*). Yet again, the originally "accompanying" last variation in the violin part is very florid in David's edition, with rhythmical figures such as thirty-twos triplets or semiquaver sextuplets. The cadence *ad libitum* at the end is also an editorial addition.

The sheer volume of the comments above illustrates how elaborated David's version is compared to Corelli's original. It certainly contains substantially more additions than any other edition described in this chapter. There is likely to be an argument here between 'letter' and 'intention'. Whilst to some David might appear to have acted in the spirit of nineteenth-century virtuosity, I am inclined to think he created a kind of a pedagogical version, just like Corelli or Telemann did with their own music in the eighteenth century. It is even more fascinating to look at the performing tradition of those works in the nineteenth century. As discussed earlier in Chapter 1, Corelli's or Telemann's version were not by any means supposed to be followed to the letter. Might it have been the case that David felt the same way about performing from his edition? Could some of the embellishments he wrote have been meant as 'optional' and intended as teaching material?

Interestingly, David started the piece on an up-bow, as a consequence of which the second measure of bars 1, 3, 5, 7 (and analogically 11, 13, 15 – bar 9 is an exception) naturally received an emphasis (this bowing pattern is continued through slurring the first beat of the above stated bars onto the dotted minims preceding them, which deprives the first beat of marked articulation). David has marked the repetition of the theme (bar 9) *pp dolce* and indicated the third string (D) in order to enhance the *piano* effect. The last two semiquavers of

bars 3 and 11 are detached in David's edition as opposed to Corelli's version where the second and third beats are slurred. The slurs in the first variation (*Allegretto* in David's score) are an editorial addition – they start up-bow and continue as it comes, which mirrors David's dynamic plan of *piano* (up-bow) and *crescendo* (down-bow) alternating. The ornamented part of the first variation is presented with the same bowing pattern, which dynamically starts a level down – from *pianissimo*. It then crescendos, however, into a *forte* beginning four bars before the end of it (start of letter A). Noticeably, the B flat dotted crotchet, which is certainly a good note in the Baroque understanding, receives an up-bow too. David generally tends to develop dynamics over long stretches of the musical material. Good examples of this are to be found much later in the piece - in letters Q and W (*p* to *ff* over the entire variations, which are 16 bars long). He usually uses hairpins for shorter dynamic gradations, however their application in Q is more ambiguous – he writes hairpins over dotted minims, whilst the whole section is subject to a gradual *crescendo* written in words underneath [fig. 1].



Fig 1. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, letter Q, ed. by David.

The second variation (letter A in David's score) is interesting in terms of both bowing and articulation markings. The entire passage, which with Corelli consists of only detached quavers (with the exception of two slurs in two penultimate bars reinforcing the hemiola), can clearly be divided into two halves – the first one (*piano*), marked with daggers (both under one slur and separate ones) and the second one (*forte*), less detached, employing a slightly irregular bowing pattern. David uses the *sf* sign for the first time in the penultimate bar of letter A, on the second beat marked with a trill. The first half of the following variation (letter B) abounds with *sforzato* markings. Interestingly, it begins *fortissimo*, yet despite that each of the consecutive *sf* signs is preceded by a *crescendo* hairpin – as there is not much more that can be done starting with a *fortissimo* dynamic, the *sforzatos* might signify an accent followed

by going back a dynamic step in order to continue getting louder further. The second half of the variation (letter C) is marked *leggieramente* in David's edition and the triplets have dots written above them. Despite the piano dynamic, however, the dots become daggers halfway through the variation. Both *sforzandos* and daggers have been employed throughout letters D and E in a manner described previously in relation to earlier variations. An interesting bowing style can also be found on the first beats of the penultimate bars of letters D and E. All of them contain a note marked with a dagger played on the same bow as the note / notes preceding it (David uses this bowing pattern a lot later, for example in letters G and R) [fig. 2].



Fig. 2. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, letter D, last bar, ed. by David.

In letter K (*scherzando*), he makes a distinction between daggers (*forte*) and horizontal lines (*piano*). David indicates daggers on the same up-bow in letter N, which is then repeated with dots in letter O. Whilst the latter is marked *saltato* and, as the same-bow staccato was a very popular articulation technique in the nineteenth century, it is easy to envisage how the passage might have been played. The same-bow daggers in letter N, however, appear much more curious in terms of their execution. Letter N has also got accents on the fourth quaver of each bar, which, along with the slur between the fourth and fifth quavers, makes the whole structure sound slightly syncopated [fig. 3].



Fig. 3. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, letter N, ed. by David.

David employs accent markings throughout the piece and they usually accompany *piano* or *pianissimo* dynamics. The first six bars of letter H (*pp*) start with an accent on the first beat, which is then followed by the second and third beats both indicated up bow. It makes the structure very regular and results in the first beat receiving even more emphasis. In letter S (*pp dolce*) the accented notes are slurred, which was most probably meant as an index finger emphasis without stopping the bow [fig. 4].



Fig. 4. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, letter S, ed. by David.

An interesting, bowing pattern (embodying what appears to be a rhetorical re-take instruction) occurs at letter I (*largamente*) – four down-bows on the four quavers on the second and third beats across the first six bars of this section. As the dynamic is forte and the chords on the first beats of the bars in question have been marked with horizontal lines, this bowing style was clearly meant as very broad and aiming for a big gesture [fig. 5]. It is not the only place in the piece where David applied this technique – we can also find it in the very last variation (letter X), here too accompanying a passage marked *largamente*.



Fig. 5. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, letter I, ed. by David.

There are a number of ways in which David indicates the *staccato* technique. Letter F consists of semiquavers only and it has been marked by David *pp staccato sempre* – there are, however, no articulation markings other than that over the notes. As the tempo has also been changed to *Poco meno mosso* by the editor, it seems likely that David would have wanted the player to stay on the string for this section. Another instance of indicated staccato can be found in letters V (the word *staccato* written under the triplets in *pp*) and W, where the semiquavers have been marked with dots.

As mentioned in the introductory section, the chords included in every second bar of letters B and C are editorial additions. They are two distinct types of chords, however, differing not only with regard to the bow direction (up-bow in letter B, down-bow in letter C), but also in the manner in which they have been written down – whilst the ones in section B are regular chords, the ones in letter C (notated with “grace notes”) clearly indicate a kind of an *arpeggio* [fig. 6 & 7].



Fig. 6. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, letter B, ed. by David.



Fig. 7. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, letter C, ed. by David.

Another notated *arpeggio* can be found much later in the piece, in letter R, where it has been indicated by means of a waving line. The chords appearing halfway through letter R (*con fuoco*) are all marked *sf*, which makes their character very distinct from the previously described *arpeggio*. The last variation (letter X in David's score) has got certain minim chords notated in an interesting way – the chords in the second, fourth bars of it have been written as minims in only the top two voices, whilst the bass and middle voices are only quavers. This would suggest breaking the chord two-and-two and playing only the top two notes together on the beat [fig. 8].



Fig. 8. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, letter X, ed. by David.

The following section will focus on two *Folia* editions which bear very close resemblance to each other – one by Leopold Lichtenberg from 1901 and the other one by Hubert Léonard from 1910 (both published by Schott). As Léonard's arrangement was first published in 1877, the Lichtenberg's edition of 1901 is likely to have been based upon it. It states the composers

as A. Corelli-Léonard, therefore Léonard's work may be seen as a relatively free arrangement of Corelli's composition. It contains only variations 1, 2, 5, 7, 12, 13, 17, 18, 10, 15 and 20 (in that order) and is followed by a 71-bar virtuoso *cadenza* and a final statement of the theme. Lichtenberg used exactly the same musical material, with occasionally changed bowings, fingerings and expression markings. There is another version of the piece to which I will be referring to in this section – Léonard's and Henri Marteau's version for solo violin with accompaniment for a second violin (1910), which claims to have been made from Léonard's original manuscript. Again, certain changes have been introduced as compared to Léonard's original bowings, but more importantly, there is a lot of articulation detail, which is worth analysing. Interestingly, the piece has a second part of the title *Variationen über ein Thema von Farinelli*, upon which Clive Brown commented:

The statement, under the title of the edition, that the theme came from Farinelli ignores the fact that the famous castrato was only 10 years old when Corelli died and that Corelli's op. 5 was published before Farinelli was born! Other sources attribute the melody to a composer named Broschi, an uncle of Farinelli. (Brown, 2011)

As there are no letters in any of the editions in question, bar numbers will be used as reference points (all the three editions contain 264 bars). Regarding the musical material of the solo violin part, changes to Léonard's text have only been made after the virtuoso *cadenza* (which is included in both Léonard-Marteau version for two violins and in Lichtenberg's edition). The edition for two violins splits the first part of Léonard's final statement of the theme in octaves (b. 249-256) between the two violin parts, whilst adding some chords into the second violin part. The last eight bars of the piece are in the C5 octave in the solo violin part (an octave below Léonard's original version), with a second violin polyphonic accompaniment an octave lower. Lichtenberg left the piano part by itself after the *cadenza* (b. 249, second beat to bar 256), which is subsequently followed by the very final, unaccompanied restatement of the theme in the solo violin part (also in the C5 octave).

All three editions follow a very similar dynamic plan. Whilst the bowing and articulation markings tend to be based closely upon Léonard's 1877 edition, there are a number of differences, some of which are pronounced than others. Léonard changed Corelli's minim and a crotchet C sharp in bar 8 into a dotted minim C sharp, which resulted in the first beat of bar 9 being an up-bow and the material that follows it until the end of the theme being contrary to Corelli's original bowings [fig. 9 & 10].



Fig. 9. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, bars 1-13.



Fig. 10. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, bars 8-9, ed. by Léonard.

In all three editions, the original hemiola between bars 14 and 15 is lost through the added slur in bar 14 (as opposed to David, who maintained the original hemiola). The abandonment of the hemiola is also very clear from the Léonard & Marteau's edition, where the second violin mirrors the slur in the first violin part and plays a strong, wide interval of a minor 10th at the start of bar 15 [fig. 11].



Fig. 11. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, bars 9-15, ed. by Marteau.

Similarly to David, Léonard has slurred the crotchets in bars 17-22 by two (whilst in Léonard's violin solo as well as in Lichtenberg's editions this section starts down-bow, it is an up-bow with Léonard's / Marteau's). The second half of this variation (b. 25-31) is also similar in all three editions; interestingly, the original rhythm of a crotchet rest followed by two crotchets played with separate bows has been changed into a crotched and a minim (slurred). The minor differences in bowing across bars 30-31 all bear close resemblance to Corelli's original.

In all three editions, the second variation is divided into two halves in terms of bowings and articulation – the first half 'marked' and the second one *dolce*. Whilst Léonard used

dots in bars 32-38 (in both the solo violin and the two violins edition), Lichtenberg changed the articulation into daggers and marked the section *point* in order to indicate which part of the bow to use. Interestingly, similar instruction can be found in Léonard’s / Marteau’s edition (*martellato, an der Spitze ohne die Saite zu verlassen* – “at the point, all on the string”). As the instructions for playing dots and daggers are quite similar, the difference in execution of the two is likely to have been subtle. The second half of the variation (last beat of b. 39 until b. 47) has irregular, long slurs, which are quite typical of the nineteenth-century composing and editing aesthetic [fig. 12].




Fig. 12. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, bars 32-47, ed. by Marteau.

It is worth noting that all the editors in question (including the previously discussed one by David) display the editors’ need for introducing a certain degree of variety (especially of articulation) halfway through each of the variations, which possibly mirrors the eighteenth-century treatment of them – despite having been obviously indicated in a very distinct manner.

The following variation (no. 5 in Corelli’s score) follows a pattern of one detached quaver marked *tenuto* and the remaining five quavers slurred all the way until bar 55. The second half of it (b. 56-62) introduce a modified triplet material, including chromatic movement in bars 56, 58 and 60 [fig. 13].



Fig. 13. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, bars 54-61, ed. by Léonard – Lichtenberg.

The *tenuto* on the first beat of each bar is maintained throughout bars 57-60 in all three editions, whilst each beat of bar 61 as well as the first beat of bar 62 have been marked with ac-

All three editors have added slurs and accents into the following variation (no. 10 in Corelli's music consisting of detached quavers only). Whilst Léonard maintained the pattern of two *staccato* quavers on the same bow and to *legato* quavers alternating, Marteau and Lichtenerg only kept the slurs, which resulted in the accents falling on both down and up-bows. The second half of the variation (last quaver of bar 98 onwards, marked *dolce*) contains long slurs, involving a lot of string-crossing in all three editions.

The abbreviated variations of what are nos. 17 and 18 with Corelli have been joined into one variation (b. 103, *Allegro*) and have slurs and articulation markings added to them; the character, however, remains very close to the original. Bar 110 in Léonard's edition appears very interesting, due to the off-beat accents as well as the last accented quaver of the bar marked down bow [fig. 16].



Fig. 16. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, bars 108-110, ed. by Léonard.

The variation no. 10 in Corelli's score has been changed quite substantially by the addition of long slurs spanning half a bar (Corelli only wrote detached semiquavers) as well as the introduction of some new musical material in the space of the original rests, where a dialogue between the violin and the bass part takes place in Corelli's version. The slurs seem very 'plastic' and varied – some of them were marked *tenuto*, others span over a *crescendo* hairpin. An interesting slur occurs in bar 126 – a *diminuendo* over a slur across the entire bar. Curiously, Léonard notates '*crescendos*' using a hairpin and then uses the word '*diminuendo*'. Might the hairpins therefore suggest anything more / else than just a *crescendo* – e.g. rhythmic flexibility? We come across a similar, if not more revealing, situation in bars 162-163 of Léonard's edition, where a *crescendo* hairpin and the word *diminuendo* alternate across the same passage [fig. 17].



Fig. 17. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, bars 161-166, ed. by Léonard.

The following variation (no. 10 in Corelli's work) has been heavily ornamented by Léonard. Similarly to David's version discussed earlier, it presents a lot of rhythmic and articulation

variety, including syncopations, accents and, interestingly, detached, repeated semiquavers on the same note (b. 147). Most probably out of place in the context of Corelli's music, the latter is likely to have been an attempt at achieving bow *vibrato* [fig. 18].



Fig. 18. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, bars 143-149, ed. by Léonard.

The music then proceeds straight onto Corelli's variation no. 20, where slurs across two bars are an editorial addition. The last phrase is then elaborated upon and taken through a descending progression, which leads into the *Cadenza*.

Léonard's *Cadenza* (which was also adopted by Lichtenberg and left unchanged) abounds with articulation techniques, including chords, arpeggios and various accents. It is also here that the biggest tempo fluctuations over the shortest stretch of music take place – multiple *rallentandos* and *animatos*, *Più lento* (b. 215), *Adagio* (b. 223), *Più vivo* (b. 230). Furthermore, the improvisatory character of the *Cadenza* suggests a lot of it would have been played quite *Ad libitum* regardless, which can be confirmed upon examining the recordings of Lukas David, Sebastian Bohren and Joseph Szigeti.

The last arrangement of the piece which is going to be discussed is by Delphin Alard. The collection *Les Maitres classiques du Violon* was published in 1863 and comprises forty most outstanding, according to the author, eighteenth-century pieces written for the violin. Alard remains faithful to Corelli's original in terms of the text, and the slight changes he had made were restricted to bowings and articulation. In this case, the absence of something seems to be equally interesting as its presence and although no definite answer can be provided, it is highly engaging to compare Alard's approach with the editions discussed above.

Alard often changes bowings / articulation in the second half of a given variation, which could also be observed with David and Léonard. Relevant examples can be found in variations: 1 (slurs from b. 25 onwards), 6 (*staccato* from b. 105 onwards), 18 (slurs from b. 273 onwards) and 22 (*staccato* from b. 321 onwards). Articulation-wise, Alard only indicates *du talon* in two *Allegro* variations (starting b. 160 and 185), both in combination with dots.

This edition is also particularly "clean" in terms of the dynamics. Although all the dynamic markings are editorial additions, they seem quite intuitive and "conventional" – fre-

quent echos on the repeats, *forte* reserved mostly for the more fiery variations marked *Allegro* or *Vivace* and *piano* for the subdued, slower ones marked *Adagio* or *Andante*. Alard uses *crescendo* / *diminuendo* markings very sparingly: hairpin swellings across bars 29-31, 292-295, three one-bar hairpin *diminuendos* in bars 215, 231 and 248 as well as a few *crescendos* (bars 229, 245, 300 marked with a verbal term).

It is immediately noticeable how little had been added by Alard as compared with editors of the German violin school. The issue, however, remains whether in the nineteenth century that sort of a phenomenon meant familiarity or detachment from the eighteenth-century repertoire and tradition.

With regard to the left hand technique, Alard's version again contains the fewest obvious *portamento* places and hardly ever ventures into positions higher than the third (Alard uses fourth finger extensions into positions 4 and 5 in the all-semiquaver variations starting in bars 145 and 265 in order to avoid string crossing) [fig. 19].



Fig. 19. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, bars 145-154, ed. by Alard.

He generally displays a tendency towards remaining on the same string until the end of a phrase / unit – for example, the entire presentation of the theme (bars 1-16) are to be played on the A string [fig. 20]. The same approach was adopted as far as possible with regard to shorter fragments - the two-crotchet units in the first variation (bars 17-32) and slurs (the *Adagio* variation starting in b. 129). Despite his tendency to remain in low positions, Alard avoids the second one, which in the first variation results in a potential *portamento* (bars 25 and 28).




Fig. 20. A. Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5, bars 1-23, ed. by Alard.

Alard's faithfulness to the original text is particularly striking in his treatment of the *Adagio* variation in bar 201, where he maintains the sustained notes without adding any ornaments. It is worth considering whether Alard would have imagined this section improvised upon (as Corelli surely would) or whether he might have wanted it plain, just as written. Here again, it is equally plausible to have been a sense of familiarity with the Italian baroque style as it might be a possible detachment from this performing tradition.

Alard's manner of handling cadential trills deserves some attention and might be indicative of the relation between what is written and what should be performed. As he writes only four cadential trills (bars 31, 59, 296 and 347), whilst not indicating them in many other obvious places, such as bars 15, 47, 63, 79, 95, 184, 215, 231, 312, 345, one is inclined to think he might have only wanted them where indicated.

Léonard's approach towards the left hand technique is far more distinctive. He often uses the same finger for two consecutive notes separated by both small and large intervals. Particularly where the intervals are larger than a semi- or a whole tone and the notes in question slurred, a *glissando* is certain to happen (examples can be found in bars 17, 18 and 19). Léonard seems to have deliberately been choosing the same fingering consecutively also for double stopping (bars 87, 88), particularly over a slur, as well as in case of two notes out of which the second one is a harmonic (bars 17, 61, 140). *Portamenti* occur a lot in this edition too, and again it is very apparent that the effect was deliberate – it can be noted particularly clearly at the start of the *Adagio* variation in bar 135, where Léonard uses the third position only in order to descend after one note, which could have easily been marked '4' in the first position on the same string. Other obvious *portamento* places can be found in bars 20, 140 and across bars 145-146.

Léonard's interest in various shades and colours was expressed through his use of high positions on lower strings. Here, with the exception of places such as bars 135-146 or the very last presentation of the theme on the G string (bars 257-264), the imperative to remain on one string over one phrase / musical motive is not as strong as it is with Alard. Léonard does not evade colour changes, on the contrary – he appears to have been using them as an expressive tool (for example in the *dolce* section starting in bar 98).

Léonard's edition is very prescriptive both in terms of the previously discussed articulation and the left hand technique. He specifies numerous trills, grace notes as well as such techniques as the left hand *tremolo* (*Cadenza*, bars 209-211). Other noteworthy indications include the continuous trill despite the bow direction change (bars 213 and 214) and octaves added to the theme after the *Cadenza* (bars 249-256). Interestingly, the Léonard's / Marteau's version for two violins offers more detail in terms of the execution of trills. There are three types of trills which have been used in this edition: a regular trill without any *apoggiaturas* or terminations (the only one employed by Léonard in his version for violin solo, which can here be found in bars 3 or 11), one preceded by a short *apoggiatura* (e.g. bars 133, 259) and one preceded by two grace notes (an ornament characterising rather later styles, e.g. the first beat of bar 46).

Ferdinand David's approach to the issue of fingering is meticulous, which is obvious already from the "Explanation of the signs" section he includes on the first page. As we find signs for instructions such as to place the fifth, stop the bow or keep the finger on the string, it is clear that this edition was meant for educational purposes.

David's edition is very consistent in the matter of alternating between the strings as least as possible. Not only does the editor indicate the same string for lyrical lines, frequently in order to change the colour into a more subdued, *dolce* character (for example in bars 9-16), but he also consistently marks the fingerings on the same string for fast passages, which requires particular precision, especially when fourth finger extensions are employed. It is clear that David uses the same string (even if it involves an extension at a fast speed) for the sake of the unity of colour and not in order to facilitate the right hand technique; fourth finger extensions may be found even in places where the articulation is short, therefore string crossing would not create any problems (for example the fifth bar of letter C, the last bar of letter F).

Finally, David is the only one of the discussed editors who includes terminations at the end of certain trills (first bar of letter K, all the trills in letters N and U). He also writes short

appoggiaturas before notes which do not have a trill (bar 25, all the grace notes in letter P), occasionally two grace notes instead of one (the seventh bar of letter U) or even a long, fully written out *apoggiatura* (the theme, bar 10). Perhaps he might have envisaged a trill following it in performance regardless of not having indicated it.

Chapter 4.

Nineteenth-Century Approaches to Baroque Music – Analyses of Nineteenth-Century Editions of J. S. Bach BWV 1001 in G minor, mvt. I *Adagio*

The relative brevity of this chapter is a result of two factors. Apart from the self-evident fact that the works in question differ in length, I believe there is also a more intricate reason, which has to do with the veneration of Bach's music as early on as in the nineteenth century. The works of J. S. Bach gained popularity thanks to such figures as Mendelssohn, Schuman and Liszt, as well as the first ever scholarly complete edition initiated in 1851 by Breitkopf und Härtel. Alongside large-scale, "clean" publications, containing as few additions as possible, annotated editions aimed at inexperienced students, who were new to the largely unknown repertoire, became more and more common. It is, however, possible to make a clear distinction between the Corelli editions analysed in the previous chapter and the editions of J. S. Bach's works for unaccompanied violin edited by the same authors. The nineteenth-century Bach editions are "cleaner", with far fewer added slurs, articulation and expression markings. There appears to be a commonly accepted kind of a "reverential attitude" towards Bach's music (especially the unaccompanied works) amongst HIP performers nowadays. It is probably largely due to the meticulousness with which Bach himself had marked his music (slurs, written-out ornaments). Could another reason be that the works in question have entered "The Canon" in the form in which they were written and there is simply no established tradition of further embellishing and improvising upon them? What was it, however that prevented nineteenth-century editors from adopting as prescriptive an attitude as they did when editing works of other composers of the same period?

Both Ferdinand David and Joachim / Moser included what they thought to have been the manuscript version on the stave below their performing version. Whilst Joachim and Moser some years later indeed had access to Bach's autograph, in his edition of 1843 David used a version believed to be the manuscript at the time. Clive Brown asserts that it was "either a copy by Anna Magdalena Bach, or one by an unknown copyist, both of which were obtained by the Royal Library in Berlin in 1841 from the estate of the Hamburg music teacher and Bach collector Pölchau." (Brown, CHASE, Ferdinand David as editor <http://mhm.hud.ac.uk/chase/article/ferdinand-david-as-editor-clive-brown/>). Still, the mere

intention of including the original text proves a very educated approach adopted by the editor. Despite being known to have firmly believed that the language of Baroque music needed more explanation than the one of Classical music, he left the students freedom, stating on the title page: For those who want to mark up this work themselves, the original text, which is taken with the greatest exactitude from the composer's original manuscript, is added in small notes". Brown believes David's decision to include the composer's text unaltered on the stave below had been influenced by Mendelssohn, who "had become increasingly strict in his attitude towards editing and adapting Baroque music for contemporary use". (C. Brown, 2011, <http://mhm.hud.ac.uk/chase/article/ferdinand-david-as-editor-clive-brown/>)

Joachim's approach towards David's editorial output in Bach remains quite ambiguous. Having taken lessons from him in Leipzig in 1843, Joachim must have certainly been inspired by David's pedagogical methods. However, he considered David's editions of Bach far too prescriptive, which is best portrayed by his words below:

And there we are unfortunately at the sore point with regard to the majority of present day editors (I may confess to you here), for instance even David's in many respects highly meritorious work suffers to some extent, so that I always strive to play from other versions than his. (Brown, Joachim as editor, not sure how to reference).

Joachim and Moser's edition of J. S. Bach's compositions for Solo Violin was published posthumously in 1908. It contains a preface written by Moser, where the editor explains his and Joachim's intentions and ideas regarding their edition of the famous collection. Moser states that, thanks to the access to Bach's manuscript facilitated by dr. Erich Prieger, they were able to "produce an entirely independent work which is not based on any previous edition". Joachim and Moser's thorough concern with the baroque performing practice is evident already from the preface, where the editors refer to signs of transposition originating from Medieval modes, as well as to features of particular baroque dances. They also make an important statement on arpeggiation, using the the D minor *Chaconne* to illustrate their point. In their edition Joachim and Moser use the simplest possible pattern to indicate *arpeggio*, but make it clear in the preface that "(...) the performer is at liberty to substitute others if those which are given should not seem to him sufficiently effective". It echoes the idea from the third volume of *Violinschule*, where they commented regarding shakes that "a player will do well, in spite of Emmanuel Bach and Leopold Mozart, not to bind himself too strictly by the rules [*Vorschrift*], but to let himself be governed by his sense of what's artistic [*Kunstverstand*]." On the other hand, they warned the performers of potentially overusing (...) over-elaborate arpeggios as being absolutely contrary to the essential spirit of Bach's music".

(Joachim & Moser, ..., Preface, trans. by M.Radford). It is clear from the above-quoted passage too that the editors were greatly concerned about preserving the original spirit of the composer's music without being dogmatic.

Having referred to Joachim's remark about David's edition of Bach being too prescriptive, I believe it should be particularly interesting to compare those two editions first. Curiously, they do not appear to be very different, and they seem to complement each other with regard to the number of written-in indications throughout this movement. Except for the word *Cantabile* marked at the beginning by David, as well as a text difference at the very end of bar 1 (four semidemihiemiavers in David's edition vs a semidemihiemiavers followed by two hemidemihiemiavers in Joachim and Moser's edition), the dynamic plan as well as the bowings in the first phrase (one and half a bar) are identical. [fig. 21 & 22].




Fig. 21. BWV 1001, 1st mvt, bars 1-2, ed. by David



Fig. 22. BWV 1001, 1st mvt, bars 1-2, ed. by Joachim & Moser.

Interestingly, in his 1903 recording of the piece Joachim plays David's version of the end of bar 1, although the version with a semiquaver followed by two hemidemihiemiavers the one that is compatible with Bach's manuscript (and the one Joachim and Moser included in their edition), [fig. 23].




Fig. 23. BWV 1001, 1st mvt, bar 1, ed. by Joachim & Moser.

When discussing slurs in this particular piece (as well as violin and cello sonatas and partitas in general), “Bach’s original slurs” should be referred to with a degree of caution, as, despite having been written out meticulously by Bach himself, the slurs may be interpreted in a variety of manners. Not only are many of them unclear, but the issue of whether or not Bach had envisaged them different in analogical places remains quite spurious. Changes to the “original slurs” are a common phenomenon and many contemporary HIP performers introduce them in their search of the best rendition. In this section I will therefore be examining the intention behind the slurs rather than the mere fact of the editors altering them.

Despite the overall similarity between David’s and Joachim & Moser’s editions, there are some differences in the editors’ approach towards adding slurs and expression markings. The slurs in David’s edition appear to have been treated more equally, with most irregularities caused by detached notes in the manuscript version “smoothed out”. Although, as mentioned earlier, the base for this edition was not Bach’s autograph, David introduced slurs on top of the version he considered to be the manuscript, especially ones spanning a beat. Good examples of this approach can be found in bars: 5 (2nd beat), 8 (2nd beat), 9 (3rd beat) [fig. 24].



Fig. 24. BWV 1001, 1st mvt, bars 3-5, ed. by David.

Joachim and Moser, on the other hand, seem to have aimed at more variety in their choice of bowings and retain the original “irregularities” in the instances mentioned above as well as similar places, which is not to say that their edition lacks any added slurs. It is fascinating to contrast their edition against Joachim’s 1903 recording of this piece and notice how

many of the long slurs he broke up in performance. Knowing Joachim's flexible approach towards performance markings in general (see Clive Brown's comments in chapter 2), it is worth evaluating his perspective upon the relationship between the letter and performance, and once again testing it against the eighteenth-century lack of added bowings. Might the degree of performing flexibility represented by those two approaches have been similar?

Joachim and Moser seem to have been fond of the two consecutive downbows pattern, which appears in their edition six times, each time on two consecutive chords. David used this type of bowing only once, on the third beat of the penultimate bar of the piece. In both editions it is a wide gesture, which accompanies a *forte* dynamic. Correlation between the choice of bowings and indicated dynamics (down-bow for *forte* and upbow for *piano*) is apparent throughout both editions, a good example of which is the beginning of bar 14 (a *piano* up-bow in both editions).

The editions present a similar overall dynamic plan, although David tends to have introduced larger dynamic changes over shorter stretches of music. Examples of the above effect can be found in bars: 3-4 (changes between *forte* and *piano* over one beat), 13 (a *crescendo* from *piano* to *forte* over the second beat) [fig. 25].



Fig. 25. BWV 1001, 1st mvt, bar 13, ed. by David.

Whilst both editors used *crescendos* and *diminuendos* mostly according to *tessitura*, it does not seem to have remained the rule. The presentation of the first phrase (the first one and half bars) is exactly the same in both editions, with the first and third beat emphasised by means of a *forte* dynamic and *crescendos* towards it (despite the second beat of bar 1 being a descending line) [see fig. 21 & 22]. Whilst Joachim and Moser do not go beyond *forte* or *piano*, David introduces a more extreme dynamic scope (*fortissimo* in bars 18 and the last).

Both David and Joachim & Moser employ *portamento* in their editions – interestingly, in his 1903 recording Joachim performs more *portamenti* than have been indicated in the edition. Same-finger *portamentos* were mostly executed with the first finger [fig. 26], however

second-finger slides were also employed [fig. 27]. Far fewer fingerings were marked in David's edition; the ones which were, seem to have been used in order to avoid crossing over more than one string (bar 7, beat 2, 2nd half) or to avoid frequent string crossing, especially only in order to play a small number of notes (bar 14, beat 3, bar 16, last beat). Based on the last example [fig. 27], an inclination towards avoiding fourth finger trills should also be noticed.




Fig. 26. BWV 1001, 1st mvt, bar 14, ed. by Joachim & Moser.




Fig. 27. BWV 1001, 1st mvt, bar 18, ed. by Joachim & Moser.



Fig. 28. BWV 1001, 1st mvt, bar 16, ed. by David.

Whilst David's approach towards fingering seems more focused around the technique, Joachim and Moser's idea of each string representing one vocal part seems evident from their

edition. The editors aimed to mark the use of the same string as far as possible in order to maintain the colour of individual melodic lines (bar 6, last note, bar 8, 3rd beat) [fig. 29]. A very clear correspondence between their choice of the string and the dynamics is also noticeable.



Fig. 29. BWV 1001, 1st mvt, bar 8, ed. by Joachim & Moser.

The third edition from outside the German School of Leipzig comes from *Les Maitres Classiques*. Although it only differs slightly from the previously discussed two editions, it contains certain editorial elements worth emphasising. Alard makes general comments on the performance of the Sonata with regard to detached notes, *staccato*, long and short grace notes [Vorschlägen] as well as the tempo. Interestingly, he remarks that “In general it is common among the old Masters to take very slow tempos” [„Im Allgemeinen ist die Bewegung bei den alteren Meister sehr mässig zu nehmen”]. Having said that, he indicated a quaver = 54 for the *Adagio*, which is relatively fast. He marked metronomic tempos for the rest of the movements too and whilst the *Fugue* and *Presto* are marked very fast (crotchet = 88 and dotted crotchet = 80 respectively), the *Siciliana* (quite surprisingly, as it is a dance) received a tempo indication of a quaver = 66.

In comparison to David’s and Joachim & Moser’s editions, Alard’s bowing patterns are the most “regular” of the three with detached notes appearing very unfrequently. Bars such as 4 or 17 are clearly divided into 4 beats (with beats 1 & 3 on a downbow and 2 & 4 on an upbow) [fig. 30].



Fig. 30. BWV 1001, 1st mvt, bars 3-4, ed. by Alard.

In terms of the left hand technique, Alard indicates use of the fourth finger by far the most often. An interesting example of this practice can be found in bar 6, where the fourth finger was used in the second position on the G string, despite the resulting need for a large string-crossing [fig. 31].



Fig. 31. BWV 1001, 1st mvt, bars 5-6, ed. by Alard.

Instances of the fourth finger indicated on two consecutive notes include bars: 7, 12, 6 and 19 (the last two feature a 4th finger harmonic followed by a regular stopped note).

All three editions use the exact same fingering in the second half of bar 18, which results in two pronounced *portamenti*. Might this and the similar overall dynamic shape be kind of a formed performing tradition of this piece?

It can be inferred from the above analyses that musicians' of German violin school approach towards editing the music of Corelli differed substantially from their take on J. S. Bach. Whilst one of the primary reasons for this is very likely to have been Bach's own descriptiveness regarding his music, the analysed editorial approaches towards the music of Corelli prove that a lot more variety and editorial input was introduced by the musicians of German violin school. Although the exact ideas behind the analysed editorial practices are impossible to establish with full degree of certainty, it is worth investigating the relationship between the letter and the intention, which might shed different light upon the seemingly prescriptive German violin school editions and their implications on performance.

Conclusions

The case studies and textual analyses conducted as part of this dissertation seem to confirm the hypothesis that nineteenth-century musicians of German violin school were more aware of historical styles than is commonly supposed. Not only did they perform eighteenth-century repertoire in quantity, but they also displayed a very high degree of concern over stylistic issues, such as bowing and fingering techniques, tempo flexibility and ornamentation. There was inevitably a lot of variety also within German violin school itself, of which the best examples are the figures of David, Joachim and Moser. The issue of nineteenth-century musicians' perception of "historical style" is immensely complex, but it may be said with a degree of certainty that the musicians of the learned environment of Leipzig did have knowledge regarding early sources, treatises and performing practices.

Despite having based their aesthetic stances upon the teaching of Spohr, both David and Joachim displayed individual approaches towards the issues of editing, teaching and all the stylistic aspects described in chapters 3 and 4. This thesis argues through its analysis of the editors' application of bowing techniques and ornamental devices that there are obvious links there going back to the Viotti tradition. Despite the substantial concern over the period in which the repertoire in question was written (and hence the editors' attempts at varying their approaches according to period and style), they evidently displayed a higher degree of familiarity with the later *galant* style. The resulting "limitations" were therefore primarily apparent in their treatment of early eighteenth-century music, although instances such as the addition of terminations to most trills in Bach could also serve as an example of the above-discussed "Tartini-style" approach. Essentially, however, they are most likely to have been largely focused upon "deciphering" Baroque music (i.e. David's recomposed version of *La Folia* op. 5) with the aim of making it accessible to students and audiences of their time. This thesis has shown that there is a varying level of congruence between the approach of David and Joachim to eighteenth-century sources and contemporary HIP attitudes. However, their approaches to various repertoires were arguably by no means uniform or devoid of reflection.

It can be inferred that nineteenth-century approaches are not necessarily as far from contemporaneous "historical" interpretations as one might suppose. Whilst not suggesting that nineteenth-century performance is similar to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century performance, the analysed sources suggest more commonality than is often thought. This might bring us to the view that nineteenth-century performance should be seen as a set of aesthetic

principles in its own right - neither “irrelevant” to earlier music, nor “superseded” by later stylistic changes.

Nineteenth-century methods of description and codification are significantly more detailed than the ones of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and are certainly distorting if done without enough circumspection. In keeping with Taruskin’s argument, these later methods may help us to distance ourselves from excessively dogmatic readings of performances of the past. There is as much continuity with earlier practices as there is divergence, and the nineteenth-century methods illuminate forgotten aspects and attitudes towards performance.

This pilot study creates scope for much further work and research. If it results in present day HIP making peace with nineteenth-century performance, we can seek a more open-minded approach to the topic. The standardised, crude understanding of “Romanticism” sets apart stylistic concepts and features which are not likely to have diverged from the earlier styles as much as one might think. The better we understand what “Romanticism” actually is and means, the better we are able to appraise the past and sow seeds for a more experimental and open-minded performance future.

List of References

Books:

- Brown, C. (2004). *Classical & Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*. Oxford University Press
- Brown, H. M. (1988). *Pedantry or Liberation? A Sketch of the Historical Performance Movement*. In N. Kenyon (Ed.). *Authenticity and Early Music* ed. by Nicholas Kenyon (pp. 27-56). Oxford University Press
- Butt, J. (2002). *Playing with History*. Cambridge University Press
- Butt, J. (1990). *Bach Interpretation*. Cambridge University Press
- Crutchfield, W. (1988). *Fashion, conviction and performance style in an age of revivals* In N. Kenyon (Ed.). *Authenticity and Early Music* ed. by Nicholas Kenyon (pp. 19-26). Oxford University Press
- Dahlhaus, C. (1928). *Nineteenth-Century Music*. (J. Bradford Robinson Trans.). University of California Press
- Dahlhaus, C. (1989). *Between Romanticism and Modernism: Four Studies in the Music of the Later Nineteenth Century*. (M. Whitthall Trans.). University of California Press
- Dahlhaus, C. (1983). *Foundations of Music History*. (J. B. Robinson Trans.). Cambridge University Press
- Dart, T. (1963). *The Interpretation of Music*. HarperCollins
- Dolmetsch, A. (2005). *The Interpretation of the Music of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* with an introduction by R. Alec Harman. (original work published in 1915). Dover Publications
- Donington, R. (1992). *The Interpretation of Early Music*. W. W. Norton & Company
- Flesch, C. (1958). *The Memoirs of Carl Flesch*. The Macmillan Company
- Harnoncourt, N. (1995). *Baroque Music Today: Music as Speech: Ways to a New Understanding of Music*. Amadeus Press
- Haskell, H. (1988). *The Early Music Revival*. Dover Publications
- Haynes, B. (2007). *The End of Early Music: A Period Performer's History of Music for the Twenty-First Century*. Oxford University Press
- Hill, R. (2005). „Overcoming Romanticism”: *On the Modernization of Twentieth-Century Performance Practice*. In B. R. Gilliam (Ed.). *Music and Performance during the Weimar Republic* (pp. 37-58). Cambridge University Press

- Kivy, P. (1993). *The Fine Art of Repetition – Essays in the Philosophy of Music*. Cambridge University Press
- Kramer, L. (1986). *Music and Poetry: The Nineteenth Century and After*. University of California Press
- Landowska, W. (1964). *Landowska on Music*. Stein and Day
- Milsom, D. (2003). *Theory and Practice in Late Nineteenth-Century Violin Performance 1850-1900*. Ashgate.
- Milsom, D. (2020). *Romantic Violin Performing Practices. A Handbook*. The Boydell Press, Woodbridge
- Nietzsche, F. (1983). *On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life*. (E.J. Hollingdale Trans.). Cambridge University Press
- Philip, R. (2014). *Performing Music in the Age of Recording*. Yale University Press.
- Tarling, J. (2001). *Baroque String Playing for Ingenious Learners*. Corda Music Publications
- Taruskin, R. (1995). *Text & Act: Essays on Music and Performance*. Oxford University Press
- Taruskin, R. (1998). *The Pastness of the Present and the Presence of the Past*. In N. Kenyon (Ed.). *Authenticity and Early Music* ed. by Nicholas Kenyon (pp. 137-210). Oxford University Press
- Tomlinson, G. (1988). *The Historian, The Performer, and Authentic Meaning in Music*. In N. Kenyon (Ed.). *Authenticity and Early Music* ed. by Nicholas Kenyon (pp. 115-136). Oxford University Press
- Wagner, R. (2005). *On Conducting*. Turtle Point Press

Music Treatises:

- Cartier, J. B. (1798). *L'art du violon*. Paris. Decombe.
https://ks4.imslp.info/files/imglnks/usimg/b/bc/IMSLP333435-PMLP538968-lartduviolonouco00cart_cartier.pdf
- Geminiani, F. (1751). *The Art of Playing on the Violin*. London.
https://ks.imslp.net/files/imglnks/usimg/4/42/IMSLP05501-Geminiani_art-of-playing.pdf
- Joachim, J. & Moser, A. (1905). *Violin School in 3 Volumes* (A. Moffat Trans.). Simrock. (Original work published in 1905)

- Léonard, H. (1877). *Ancienne école du violon*. Paris. Richault.
[https://imslp.org/wiki/Ancienne_%C3%A9cole_italienne_du_violon_\(L%C3%A9onard_%2C_Hubert\)](https://imslp.org/wiki/Ancienne_%C3%A9cole_italienne_du_violon_(L%C3%A9onard_%2C_Hubert))
- Moser, A. (1905). *On Style and Artistic Performance* (A. Moffat Trans.). Simrock. (Original work published in 1905)
- Mozart, L. (1985) *A Treatise on the Fundamental Principles of Violin Playing* (E. Knocker Trans.). Oxford University Press (Original work published in 1756)
- Quantz, J. (2001) *On Playing The Flute* (E.R. Reilly Trans.). Northeastern University Press (Original work published in 1752)
- Spoehr, L., (2012) *Violin School* (J. Bishop Trans.). HardPress Publishing. (Original work published in 1833)
- Tartini, G. (1758). *L'arte del arco*. Leclerc.
[https://imslp.org/wiki/L'arte_del_arco_\(Tartini%2C_Giuseppe\)](https://imslp.org/wiki/L'arte_del_arco_(Tartini%2C_Giuseppe))

Music editions:

- Alard, D., (1862-1883). *Les maîtres classiques du violon*. Mainz
- Bach, J. S., & Joachim, D., & Moser, A. (1908). *Sonaten und Partiten für Violine allein von Joh. Seb. Bach*, Bote & Bock.
- Bach, J. S. & David, F. (1863), *Sechs Sonaten für die Violine allein von Joh. Sebastian Bach*. Neue Ausgabe
- Bach, J. S. & Manze, A. & Wollny, P. (2004) *Six Sonatas for Violin and Obbligato Harpsichord BWV 1014-1019*. Bärenreiter Urtext Editions

Grove:

- Follia. (2001). *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. Gerbino & Silbiger

YouTube recordings:

- Academy of Ancient Music. (2019). *Bowing With Bojan - An Introduction to the Baroque Bow - Bojan Cicic*. [video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i_C-8TyjFgI&t=882s

- Bach, J. S. (2015), *Bach Agagio in G* (sic). [video]. YouTube.
https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=joachim+bach+1001+prelude
- Bach, J. S. (2018), *Bach - Violin Partita no. 2 in D minor BWV 1004 – Sato*. [video]
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pnK6R5ej6Hg&t=140s>
- Bach, J. S. (2016), *Violin Sonata No. 1 in G Minor, BWV 1001: I. Adagio*. [video].
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DBm21EOhd8A>
- Bach, J. S. (2016), *Violin Sonata No. 1 in G Minor, BWV 1001: III. Siciliana*. [video].
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hP42wZIJNhM>
- Bach, J. S. (2016), *Violin Sonata No. 1 in G Minor, BWV 1001: II. Fuga*. [video].
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=szxLn4hUTi4>
- Bach, J. S. (2016), *Violin Sonata No. 1 in G Minor, BWV 1001: IV: Presto*. [video].
https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=perlmann+bach+g+minor+presto
- Corelli, A. (2020), *Arthur Grumiaux & Riccardo Castagnone - La Folia (Arcangelo Corelli)*. [video]. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KviqFZGyrDI>
- Corelli, A. (2018), *Corelli - Violin Sonatas Op.5 / Follia Variations + Presentation (Century's rec. : Trio Sonnerie)*. [video].
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A9fneLooRpU&t=830s>
- Corelli, A. (2018), *Corelli - Violin Sonatas Op.5 / Follia Variations + Presentation*. [video].
 YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A9fneLooRpU&t=658s>
- Corelli, A. (2014), *Follia*. [video]. YouTube.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cRZU5gbqyJg>
- Mozart, W. A. (2014), *Carl Reinecke performs Mozart Larghetto KV 537 (rec. 1905)*. [video].
 YouTube.

Online articles:

- Brown, C. (2011). *The decline of the 19th-century German school of violin playing*. CHASE.
<http://mhm.hud.ac.uk/chase/article/the-decline-of-the-19th-century-german-school-of-violin-playing-clive-brown/>
- Brown, C. (2011). *Ferdinand David as editor*. CHASE.
<http://mhm.hud.ac.uk/chase/article/ferdinand-david-as-editor-clive-brown/>
- Brown, C. (2011). *Joseph Joachim as editor*. CHASE.
<http://mhm.hud.ac.uk/chase/article/joseph-joachim-as-editor-clive-brown/>

- Brown, C. (2011). *Physical parameters of 19th and early 20th-century violin playing*. CHASE. <http://mhm.hud.ac.uk/chase/article/physical-parameters-of-19th-and-early-20th-century-violin-playing-clive-brown/>
- Brown, C. (2011). *The Evolution of Annotated String Editions*. CHASE. <http://mhm.hud.ac.uk/chase/article/the-evolution-of-annotated-string-editions-clive-brown/>
- Brown, C. (1993). *Dots and Strokes in Late 18th- and 19th-Century Music*. *Early Music*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 593-597+599-610. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3128368?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Brown, C. (2013). *Rediscovering the Language of Classical and Romantic Performance*. *Early Music*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 72-74. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43306801?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Brown, C. & Druce, D. (2011). *Bowing and Fingering Instructions in String Music during the 18th and Early 19th Centuries*. CHASE. <http://mhm.hud.ac.uk/chase/article/bowing-and-fingering-instructions-in-string-music-during-the-18th-and-early-19th-centuries-duncan-druce-clive-brown/>
- Brown, C. & Kennaway, G. (2011). *Ferdinand David: Die Hohe Schule des Violinspiels*. CHASE. <http://mhm.hud.ac.uk/chase/article/ferdinand-david-i-die-hohe-schule-des-violinspiels-i-clive-brown-george-kennaway/>
- Coorevits, E. & Moelants, D. (2016). *Tempo in Baroque Music and Dance*. *Music Perception: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, Vol. 33, No. 5. pp. 523-545. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26417332?seq=1>
- Dreyfus, L. (1983). *Early Music Defended against its Devotees: A Theory of Historical Performance in the Twentieth Century*. *The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 69, No. 3. pp. 297-322. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/742175?seq=1>
- Druce, D. (2011). *Baroque String Music in the 19th Century*. CHASE. <http://mhm.hud.ac.uk/chase/article/baroque-string-music-in-the-19th-century/>
- Gross, H. (1968-69). *Reopening the Case of Wagner*. *The American Scholar*, Vol. 38, No. 1. pp. 114-126. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41209635?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Hogwood, Ch. (2013). *Urtext, que me veux-tu?*. *Early Music*, February 2013, Vol. 41, no. 1, p. 123-127. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43306812?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Holloway, J. (1996). *Corelli's Op. 5: Text, Act and ... Reaction*. *Early Music*, Vol. 24, No. 4. pp. 635-640+642-643. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3128060?refreqid=excelsior%3A1c1458bf8833d0e5f00ddb9276c28bb6>
- Kennaway, G. (2011). *The Publication and Dissemination of Annotated Editions*. CHASE. <http://mhm.hud.ac.uk/chase/article/the-publication-and-dissemination-of-annotated-editions-george-kennaway/>

- Leech-Wilkinson, D. (1984). *What We are Doing with Early Music is Genuinely Authentic to Such a Small Degree that the Word Loses Most of its Intended Meaning*. *Early Music*, Vol. 12, No. 1. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3127147?refreqid=excelsior%3A611b9a7ea34604dee9c59698b6ee7c6c>
- Levin, R. (1993). *Improvised Embellishments in Mozart's Keyboard Sonatas*. *Early Music*, Vol. 20, No. 2. <https://academic.oup.com/em/article-abstract/XX/2/221/459501?redirectedFrom=PDF>
- Planer, J. (1989). *Sentimentality in the Performance of Absolute Music: Pablo Casals's Performance of Saraband from Johann Sebastian Bach's Suite No. 2 in D Minor for Unaccompanied Cello*. *The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 73, No. 2, pp. 208 – 220. <https://academic.oup.com/mq/article-abstract/73/2/212/1038714?redirectedFrom=fulltext>
- Sandler, G. (1981-1982). *Rameau and the Orchestra*. Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association, Vol. 108. pp. 47-68. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/765953?seq=1>
- Spitzer, J. (1987) *Musical Attribution and Critical Judgement: The Rise and Fall of the Sinfonia Concertante for Winds, K.297b*, *Journal of Musicology*, pp. 319–356. <https://online.ucpress.edu/jm/article-abstract/5/3/319/63696/Musical-Attribution-and-Critical-Judgment-The-Rise?redirectedFrom=fulltext>
- Talbot, M. (2000). *The Musical Work: Reality or Invention?*. *Liverpool Music Symposium*, Vol. 1, p. 268, Liverpool University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5vjcnv>
- Walls, P. (1996). *Performing Corelli's Violin Sonatas, Op. 5*. *Early Music*, Vol. 24, No. 1. pp. 133-138+141-142. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3128454?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Winzenburger, W. P. (1972). *Metre and Tempo Indication in Music of the Early Baroque*. *Bach*, Vol. 3, No. 1. pp. 13-21. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41639839?seq=1>
- Zaslaw, N. (1996). *Ornaments for Corelli's Violin Sonatas Op. 5*. *Early Music*, Vol. 24, No. 1. pp. 95-116. <https://www.sjsu.edu/people/gordon.haramaki/courses/performance/s1/Zaslaw.pdf>

CD albums:

- Bach, J. S. (2016). *Sonatas & Partitas for Solo Violin* [Album recorded by Pavlo Beznosiuk]. Linn Records.
- Bach, J. S. (2006). *Sonatas & Partitas Vol. I* [Album recorded by Rachel Podger]. Channel Classics NL.
- Bach, J. S. (2007). *The Sonatas & Partitas for Violin Solo* [Album recorded by John Holloway]. ECM Records.

Corelli, A. (2013). *Op. 5 Violin Sonatas* [Album recorded by The Avison Ensemble]. Linn Records

Appendices

I. Arcangelo Corelli, *La Folia* op. 5

1. Gasparo Pietra Santa, n. d. [1700]

The image shows a musical score for the piece 'Folia' by Arcangelo Corelli. The score is written for a single melodic line and a basso continuo line. The title 'Folia' is written in a large, decorative font at the beginning. The tempo is marked 'Adagio' for the first section and 'Allegro' for the second section. The score is divided into measures, with measure numbers 62, 14, 30, 44, and 54 indicated. The 7-measure rhythmic pattern is clearly visible throughout the piece. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and ornaments.



Musical score system 1, measures 63-105. The system consists of five staves. The top staff is the treble clef, and the bottom four are bass clefs. Measure numbers 63, 72, 74, 86, 98, and 105 are indicated on the left. The music features complex rhythmic patterns, including triplets and sixteenth notes. A 'Volta' marking is present at the end of the system.



Musical score system 2, measures 109-148. The system consists of seven staves. Measure numbers 109, 113, 120, 127, 138, and 148 are indicated on the left. The music includes dynamic markings such as *Adagio* and *Vivace*. The notation is dense with sixteenth and thirty-second notes.

156 *Allegro*

160 *Andante*

181 *Allegro*

189

197

204 *Molto*

209 *Adagio*

224

234 *Allegro*

245

258

271
280
289
305
313

Volta

This system contains measures 271 through 313. It features a complex melodic line in the upper staves and a highly rhythmic bass line with many triplets and sixteenth notes. Measure numbers 271, 280, 289, 305, and 313 are clearly marked. The word "Volta" appears at the end of the system.

321
328
335
343
350

Fine

This system contains measures 321 through 350. It continues the complex melodic and rhythmic patterns from the previous system. Measure numbers 321, 328, 335, 343, and 350 are marked. The word "Fine" is written at the end of the system.

2. Ed. by Ferdinand David, Breitkopf & Härtel, 1867.

2

FOLIES D'ESPAGNE
VARIATIONEN
für Violine mit beziffertem Bass
von
ARGANGELO CORELLI
(geb. 1653, gest. 1713.)
für
VIOLINE UND PIANOFORTE
bearbeitet von
FERD. DAVID.

☐ Herunterstrich.
∨ Hinaufstrich.

VIOLINE.

Adagio.

Allegretto.

Allegro moderato.

p leggieramente

Stich, Druck und Verlag von Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig. 11301

2
VIOLINE.

3

D più Presto.

p
p saltato
tr
E *pizz. ad libit.* *arco pizz.* *arco pizz.* *arco pizz.* *arco pizz.* *cresc.* *pizz.* *pizz.*
arco pizz. *arco pizz.* *arco* *arco*
fp *f* *fp* *fp* *fp* *fp*
F Poco meno mosso.
pp staccato sempre.

mfp *mfp*
G *f con calore*
ff

11301

4 **H** Andante. VIOLINE.

pp

f **I** *argamente*

3 **K** Vivace. *f scherzando p f p*

f fp fp fp

f p f p f p f p

L *Meno mosso. cresc. f p poco ritard.*

M *Adagio. p e molto espressivo cre scen do*

N *Allegro ben moderato. pp*

(Die Viertel wie vorher die Achtel.)

VIOLINE.

Handwritten musical score for Violin, page 5. The score consists of ten staves of music. The first staff begins with a treble clef and a key signature of one flat. It features a melodic line with trills (tr) and a dynamic marking of *p saltato*. A red box labeled 'O' is placed above the staff. The second staff continues the melodic line with a dynamic marking of *mf martellato*. The third staff features a melodic line with a dynamic marking of *sf*. The fourth staff begins with a red box labeled 'P' and the tempo marking 'Adagio. 4^{ta}'. It includes the instruction 'ritard.' and a dynamic marking of *p espressivo*. The fifth staff continues the melodic line with a dynamic marking of *f* and the instruction 'pp dolce'. The sixth staff begins with a red box labeled 'Q' and the tempo marking 'L' istesso tempo.'. It includes a dynamic marking of *f* and the instruction 'p'. The seventh staff features a melodic line with a dynamic marking of *mf* and the instruction 'cresc.'. The eighth staff continues the melodic line with a dynamic marking of *f* and the instruction 'cresc.'. The ninth staff features a melodic line with a dynamic marking of *ff* and the instruction 'cresc.'. The tenth staff continues the melodic line with a dynamic marking of *ff* and the instruction 'sempre più f'. The score includes various musical notations such as trills, slurs, and dynamic markings. There are also some handwritten annotations in blue ink, including numbers and markings on the staves.

2

VIOLINE.

7

mf cresc.

f p

poco a poco cresc.

f sf

sf sempre cresc. sf

Meno mosso. sf largamente

poco più tranquillo

rit.

Cadenza ad lib.

f

cresc.

11301

x ball touch

3

3

1

x

3. Sonata "Folies d'Espagne", Variationen über ein Thema von Farinelli, ed. by Hubert Léonard & Henri Marteau, 1910

Violino

13 C

La Follia
Sonata „Folies d’Espagne“ (1700)
Variationen über ein Thema von Farinelli



Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von
Hubert Léonard und Henri Marteau

Arcangelo Corelli
opus 5 No. 12

Période I
Adagio
mf espressivo

11 *espressivo*
pp

21 *espress.* *cresc.* *f*

Allegretto
de la pointe sans quitter la corde
an der Spitze, ohne die Saite zu verlassen
pmartelato

40 *dolce* *cresc.* *f*

Un poco più lento
mf *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.*

55 *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.*

60 *f* *ten.* *tr*
Largement, détaché de la pointe
(Breit, abgestossener Strich an der Spitze)

65 *f*

69 *cresc. largement*

© B. Schott's Söhne, Mainz, 1930 · © renewed 1958

Printed in Germany

ED 1542

Das widerrechtliche Kopieren von Noten ist gesetzlich verboten und kann privat- und strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.
Unauthorised copying of music is forbidden by law, and may result in criminal or civil action.

4

Période III

135 **Adagio**
p espressivo
 143 *cresc. f*

150 **Allegro moderato**
p espressivo mp mf mf dolce

160 *mp p dim. p*

165 *cresc. dim. dim.*

175 *poco rall. tutto l'arco f*

182 *leggiere p*

190 *animato cresc. rall.*

195 *fien. ten. Ossia pp dolce f f*

201 *p cresc.*

207 *f* *tr.* *cresc.* *f* *rall.*

215 *Piu lento* *pp* *rall.* *Adagio* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *pp*

221 *ben marcato il canto*

226 *espress.* *dim.*

230 *Piu vivo* *p* *p* *p* *cresc.*

234 *f* *animato*

237 *ten.* *ten.* *ad libitum* *flargamente* *accelerando*


240 *pp* *sempre pp*

244 *cresc. poco rall.* *Adagio* *ff sostenuto*

254 *ppdolcissimo* *cresc.*

4. Sonata "Folies d'Espagne", Variationen über ein Thema von Farinelli for violin solo with a second violin accompaniment, ed. by Hubert Léonard & Henri Marteau, 1930

La Follia
 Sonata „Folies d’Espagne“ (1700)
 Variationen über ein Thema von Farinelli



Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von
 Hubert Léonard und Henri Marteau

Arcangelo Corelli
 opus 5 No. 12

Periode I
 Adagio

Violino I
mf *espressivo*

Violino II
p

9 *p* *pp* *espressivo*

19 *sostenuto* *espressivo* *cresc.*

29 *f* *pp* *martelato*
 de la pointe sans quitter la corde
 an der Spitze ohne die Saite zu verlassen

36 *dolce* *p*

42 *cresc.* *f*

Un poco più lento

48 *mf* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.*

54 *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.*

59 *f* *ten.* *ten.*

Largement, détaché de la pointe
 (Breit, abgestoßener Strich an der Spitze)

63 *f* *p*

67

71 *largement* *mf*

75 *f* *poco rall.* *poco rall.*

4
Periode II
Andante

79 *cresc.*
sosten. espressivo
mf

83 *p*
sostenuto

88 *cresc.*
p

93 *poco rall.*
cresc.
poco rall.
espressivo
p

97 *dim.*
dolce

Allegro (non troppo)
101 *poco rall.*
dim.
poco rall.
p ben marcato
pizz.

107

arco

113

cresc. *restez.* *poco rall.* *a tempo*

poco rall. *a tempo*

Allegro moderato

119

ten. *risoluto* *ten.* *ten.*

f.

122

ten. *ten.* II

125

dim. *restez.* V

129

poco rall. *f* *poco rall.*

6 Periode III
Adagio

135 *p* *espressivo* *pp*

144 *cresc.* *f*

150 *Allegro moderato* *p* *mp* *mf* *mf dolce* *mp*

161 *p* *dim.* *p* *cresc.*

170 *dim.* *poco rall.*

177 *Cadenza in Tempo* *f*

189 *leggiere* *animato* *cresc.* *rall.* *ten.* *f* *ossia*

196 *ten.* *pp* *dolce* *f*

203 *p* *tr* *cresc.* *f* *cresc.*

212 *f* *pp* **Più lento** **Adagio**

221 *rall.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *pp* *ben marc. il canto*

226 *dim.* *espr.* *IV* *3* *2* *1*

230 **Più vivo** *p* *p* *p* *cresc.*

234 *f* *ten.* *animato* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.*

237 *ad libitum* *f* *ten.* *largamente* *accelerando* *ten.* *tr* *ff*

241 *ten.* *pp* *sempre pp*

245 *cresc. poco rall.*

249 **Adagio** *ff sostenuto* *ff*

256 *pp dolcissimo* *cresc.* *pp*

5. Ed. by Hubert Léonard, 1910

LA FOLLIA

VIOLINE

Neubearbeitung von Fritz Meyer

A. Corelli-Léonard

Adagio

p espressivo

8 *pp* V II

15 *mp espressivo* V I

22 *espressivo* *cresc.*

29 **Allegretto** *f* *mf*

35 *dolce*

41 *cresc.* *f*

Edition Schott No. 08851

VIOLINE

Un poco più lento

48 *ten.* *più f* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.*

54 *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *sempre f*

58 *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *f* *IV*

62 *Quasi allegro* *f*

65

68 *cresc.*

71 *con tutta forza*

75 *f* *poco rall.* *III* *IV*

79 *Andante sostenuto* *mf espressivo* *p*

86 *mf sosten.* *cresc.* *p*

VIOLINE

93 *cresc.* *poco rall.* *dim.* *a tempo* *p* *espressivo* *p* *dim.*

98 *dolce* III IV II III IV II III IV *dim.* *poco rall.*

103 **Allegro** *f* *ben marcato*

108 *sempre f*

113 *cresc.* *poco rall.* *a tempo*

Allegro moderato

119 *ten.* *f* *risoluto* *ten.* *ten.*

122 *ten.* *ten.* II

125 *dim.*

128

131 *f* *poco rall.*

VIOLINE

135 *Adagio*
p con molto espressione

143 *cresc.*
f

150 *Allegro moderato*
p espressivo
dolce

161 *dim.*
p

170 *f*
dim.
poco rall.

177 *Cadenza a tempo*
f

186 *leggiere*
p Fr.
animato
cresc.

193 *f*
ten.
ten.
pp dolce
f

200 *cresc.*

207 *f*
cresc.
rall.

VIOLINE

215 Più lento
pp

221 Adagio
ten. ten. ten. ten.
rall. ben marcato il canto

226
espressivo
dim.

230 Più vivo
p p p cresc.

234
f animato

237
ten. 0 4 2 ten. 0 3 2
f

240
pp sempre pp

244
cresc. poco rall.

248 Adagio
f

257 sostenuto
p IV. rit. cresc.

La Folia.

Variations sérieuses.

Edited and fingered by
Leopold Lichtenberg.

Violin.

A. CORELLI.

Adagio.

8

15

22

29

35

41

espressivo

p

pp espress.

espress. *cresc.*

Allegretto. *p point*

dolce

cresc. *f*

Violin.

un poco più lento
mf *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.*

48

54 *ten.* *ten.* *ten.s* *ten.*

58 *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *f*

62 *f largamente*

65

68

71 *largamente*

75 *f* *poco rall.*

79 *Andante.* *sosten. espressivo* *p*

86 *p* *sosten.* *cresc.* *p*

Violin.

93 *cresc.* *dim.* *poco rall.* *p espresso* *p* *dim.*

98 *dolce* *poco rall.* *dim.*

103 *Allegro.* *p ben marcato*

108

113 *cresc.* *poco rall.* *a tempo*

119 *Allegro moderato.* *ten.* *f ten. risoluto* *ten.*

122 *ten.* *ten.*

125 *dim.* *pos.*

128

131 *f poco rall.*

Violin.

135 *Adagio.* *espressivo*
p *V* *A* *0*

142 *cresc.*

148 *Allegro moderato.*
f *p* *espressivo* *0* *1*

156 *dolce.* *dimin.*

164 *p* *4* *0* *0* *0* *0* *1*

172 *poco rall.* *Cadenza*
dimin. *f* *a tempo*

179

186 *leggiere*
p *animato* *cresc.*

193 *f* *ten.* *ten.* *pp* *A & D.* *dolce.* *f*

200 *cresc.*

14989

Violin.

207 *f* *cresc.* *f* *rall.*

215 *Piu lento.* *pp* *pp*

221 *rall.* *Adagio.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ben marcato il canto*

226 *espress.* *dimin.*

230 *Piu vivo.* *p* *p* *p* *cresc.*

234 *f* *animato* *ten.* *ad lib.*

238 *f* *largamente.* *pp*

242 *sempre pp*

246 *cresc. poco rall.* *Adagio.*

257 *Solo.* *p sosten.* *cresc.*

7. Ed. by Delphin Alard, 1863

— TITOL.
A POUSSÉZ.

SONATE XII.

FOLLIA.
VIOLON.

1700 CORELLI. Op. 5.

Adagio. $\text{♩} = 69.$
dolce.

8

15 *mezzo forte.* $\text{♩} = 80.$
sostenuto.

24 *p*

Allegro. $\text{♩} = 152.$

33


39

45

51

56 *p*

17122.



VIOLON.

2

61 *cresc.* *f*

67

73

79

88

97 *f*

101

105 *p*


109 *cres* - - - *cen* - - - *da.* *f*

115

125 *p* Adagio. ♩ = 69.

133

VIOLON.

139 

145 *Vivace.* ♩ = 144. 

150 


155 

160 *Allegro.* ♩ = 100.
du taton. 

168 


177 *Andante.* ♩ = 60. 

184 *Allegro.* ♩ = 152.
du taton. 

189 

193 

196 

198 

4 Adagio. $\text{♩} = 72.$

VIOLON.

201 *p*

212

221 *creso.* *p* *creso.*

231 Allegro. $\text{♩} = 158.$ *f*

237 *p*

245 *creso.* *p*

251

257

263 *f*

268

302 *p*

306 *creso.* *f*

VIOLON.

310 *p* *ritard.*

319 *tr*

327 *cresc.*

331

335 *f*

343

347

351 *p*

355 *cresc.* *f*

361

371 *tr* *ritard.*

I. Johann Sebastian Bach, *Sonata for Violin Solo in G minor BWV 1001*

1. Manuscript.

The image shows a page of handwritten musical notation for the first movement of the Sonata for Violin Solo in G minor BWV 1001 by Johann Sebastian Bach. The title at the top is written in cursive: "Sonata G^{mo} a Violino Solo senza Basso di J. S. Bach". The music is written on ten staves, with measure numbers 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, and 21 marked on the left. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and slurs. The handwriting is in dark ink on aged paper. At the bottom of the page, there is a signature "J. S. Bach" and some additional markings.

2. Ed. by Ferdinand David, 1863.

2

SONATA I.

Cantabile.

ADAGIO.

1285

12

Musical score for measures 12-13. The piece is in a minor key. Measure 12 features a piano (p) dynamic and includes a trill (tr) and a crescendo (cres.) marking. Measure 13 features a forte (f) dynamic and includes a trill (tr).

14

Musical score for measures 14-15. Measure 14 starts with a piano (p) dynamic and includes a trill (tr). Measure 15 features a forte (f) dynamic and includes a mezzo-forte (mf) dynamic marking and a breath mark (v).

16

Musical score for measures 16-17. Measure 16 features a piano (p) dynamic and includes a trill (tr). Measure 17 features a forte (f) dynamic and includes a breath mark (v).

18

Musical score for measures 18-19. Measure 18 features a piano (p) dynamic and includes a breath mark (v). Measure 19 features a mezzo-forte (mf) dynamic.

20

Musical score for measures 20-21. Measure 20 features a piano (p) dynamic and includes a crescendo (cres.) marking. Measure 21 features a forte (f) dynamic and includes a trill (tr) and a crescendo (cres.) marking.

3. Ed. by Joseph Joachim & Andreas Moser, 1908.

2

SONATA I.

Adagio.

The musical score consists of five systems of piano music, each with a grand staff (treble and bass clefs). The key signature is one flat (B-flat major or D minor). The tempo is marked 'Adagio'. The score includes various musical notations such as dynamics (f, mf, mp, p, dimin.), articulation (accents, slurs), and ornaments (trills, trills with grace notes). Measure numbers 2, 3, 6, 8, and 10 are indicated at the beginning of their respective systems. The notation is dense, featuring many sixteenth and thirty-second notes, often beamed together.

U.S.A. Copyright 1908 by Ed. Bote & G. Bock, Berlin.

Eigentum der Verleger

B. & B.
46195

Ed. Bote & G. Bock, Berlin.

Musical score system 1, measures 12-13. The system consists of two staves. The upper staff begins with a first finger trill (tr) and contains dynamic markings *f*, *p*, *dimin.*, and *p*. The lower staff contains various rhythmic accompaniments.

Musical score system 2, measures 14-15. The system consists of two staves. The upper staff features a trill (tr) and dynamic markings *f* and *mf*. The lower staff continues the accompaniment.

Musical score system 3, measures 16-17. The system consists of two staves. The upper staff includes a trill (tr) and dynamic markings *espr.* and *f*. The lower staff continues the accompaniment.

Musical score system 4, measures 18-19. The system consists of two staves. The upper staff includes dynamic markings *dimin.* and *mp*. The lower staff continues the accompaniment.

Musical score system 5, measures 20-21. The system consists of two staves. The upper staff includes dynamic markings *f* and *allargando*. The lower staff continues the accompaniment.

E. & B.
16195

4. Ed. by Delphin Alard, 1867

□ Tirez.
△ Poussez.

SONATA I.

J. SEBASTIEN BACH.

Adagio $\text{♩} = 54$ VIOLON.

1
3
5
8
10
12
14
16

f *p* *f* *f* *f* *p* *f* *f*

tr *tr* *tr* *tr* *tr* *tr* *tr* *tr*

cresc. *decresc.* *cresc.*

2

VIOLON.

Musical score for Violin, measures 18-20. The score is written on two staves in treble clef. Measure 18 begins with a treble clef, a key signature of one flat (B-flat), and a 4/4 time signature. The music consists of a series of eighth and sixteenth notes, some beamed together. Dynamic markings include *p* (piano) and *cresc.* (crescendo). Measure 19 continues the melodic line with similar rhythmic patterns. Measure 20 starts with a *cresc.* marking, followed by a *f* (forte) dynamic, and ends with a *tr* (trill) marking. The score includes various musical notations such as slurs, ties, and fingerings.