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ABSTRACT

Scholars past and present identify a widespread shift in aesthetics and philosophy across Europe following the First World War. The declaration „Down with Romanticism“ was noted in artistic circles by Leonid Sabeneev in 1928 to summarise the departure from the values of intense individualism and emotional expression which had dominated the late-nineteenth century. Happening concurrently within musical performance practices during this time was a trend towards objectivity of interpretation and emotional restraint which closely mirrored these broader aesthetic changes. However, the Romantic aesthetic is also recognised by scholars as a pervasive force in music throughout history; hence this shift was not met without opposition by critics, audiences and performers. Whilst studies which address the aesthetic shift in musical performance practices of this era focus primarily on violin and keyboard practices, the response of cellists to these issues during the period remain comparatively unexplored. By drawing upon treatises, articles and sound recordings of the period, this thesis addresses this lacuna by discussing the changing aesthetics of the period, the extent to which these aesthetics represented a decline in Romanticism and the extent of their manifestation in cello performance practice practices during the period 1920 to 1960.

The study examines this central aim in five parts. Firstly, a general summary is made of the changing aesthetics of Western art music and in particular the decline of late-nineteenth-century Romanticism. Secondly, this aesthetic shift is examined in relation to general music performance. Thirdly, written sources which specifically describe cello performance aesthetics are consulted in relation to the major pedagogical lineages to examine the extent to which the Romantic aesthetic declined within individual schools of playing. Fourthly, this discussion is continued with reference to recordings of cellists of the period. Analysis focuses on the deployment of rubato, vibrato and portamento allowing some conclusions to be drawn about the extent to which individual performers - and by extension the pedagogical lineages to which they belong - were affected by the decline in Romantic aesthetic discussed in the previous chapters. Finally, the critical reception of cello performance practice in prominent publications will be examined, thus situating the practices of cellists within the wider context of general instrumental performance practices. The conclusions of the study contribute to an understanding, not only of the music and emotional climate of the time, but of the inherited influences of such aesthetic changes present today.
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INTRODUCTION

In 1928, musicologist and music critic Leonid Sabaneev declared “Down with Romanticism” to be the common adage across all art forms in recent decades, referring particularly to the rejection of the aesthetics of individualism, personal expression and the celebration of human achievement which had dominated the late nineteenth century.¹ The changes in performance practices which coincided with this rejection similarly sought to restrain the expressive freedom of the performer and are described by Robert Philip as a gradual shift “towards greater power, firmness, literalness, clarity and control and evenness of expression, and away from informality, looseness and unpredictability.”² However, writings of the period reveal that this shift was far from straightforward and observe tensions between practitioners of the old and new styles as well as resistance to the claim that Romanticism was no longer a viable aesthetic.

Whilst changing performance practices are explored extensively in studies of keyboard and violin practices, less attention has been devoted to exploring the extent to which the changing aesthetics of the period were responsible for it, and less still afforded to the practices of cellists. Furthermore, it should not be assumed that the performance aesthetics of cello playing were identical to those of the violin due to the differences in the size of the cello and its history as a solo virtuoso instrument. For example, the longer fingerboard of the cello as compared with the violin necessitates larger shifts between notes: thus portamento is obligatory on the cello far more than on the violin.

The proposed study aims to address the lacuna of cello performance practice literature by examining the extent to which the decline of the Romantic aesthetic affected cello performance from the emergence of Modernist performance practices in the 1920s until the advent of the historical performance movement around 1960. In doing so, it will contribute to the current understanding of the “modern” style of playing inherited by many present-day performers. Specifically, it will focus on changes in the deployment of the use of vibrato, portamento, rubato, dynamics and phrasing as expressive devices and how these reflected the emotional and intellectual climate of the time. In order to elucidate these historical performance practices, the study will draw upon relevant scholarly literature, as well as primary sources such as letters, concert reviews, articles, treatises and sound recordings from the period.

Literature Review

The field of early twentieth-century performance practice has been explored in detail by some scholars in relation to violin and piano performance practices. Though less attention has been afforded to performance practices on the cello, studies focused on those of other instruments offer a methodological framework and historical context for the present study. The work of Robert Philip, David Milsom and Neal Peres Da Costa which examines performance practices as evident in early recordings has been important in providing methodological models for such a study. Milsom’s research is solely concerned with violin performance practices and Peres Da Costa’s with piano practices in relation to the application of rubato; however Philip analyses some of the most prominent cello recordings and is therefore of particular interest to the present study.

Literature that deals exclusively with cello performance practices of the early twentieth century is also uncommon. Scholars who provide the best examples of literature in this field are Valerie Walden, Robin Stowell, Wilhelm Joseph von Wasielewski and Elizabeth Cowling who examine the history of the cello, including its rise as a virtuosic instrument. All of these studies emphasise the significance of the early twentieth century as a period in which cello performance - and especially pedagogy- gained equal status with the violin. George Kennaway’s study deals with the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and is thus the only scholar whose study of cello playing includes this period. Kennaway discusses the representation of expressive devices such as vibrato and portamento in cello treatises and articles of the period as well as their practical application in early recordings. However he does not discuss rubato, one of the most characteristic traits of the Romantic performing style. The present study will build

upon the foundation of this research through the investigation of the application of
tempo rubato, as well as the use of vibrato and portamento and the aesthetics which
informed the performing style of cellists documented by Kennaway.

This investigation has also been informed by the work of several scholars who discuss
the links between aesthetics of the time and performance practices. Robert Hill,11
Richard Taruskin12 and Bruce Haynes13 examine the transition from the Romantic to the
Modernist performance style during the early twentieth century. Central to their
discussion is the idea that Modernist performance practice actively rejected its
Romantic predecessor in response to a broader sociological outlook, which came about
through drastic socio-economic change in European society at the time. Sohyun
Eastham offers a conceptual framework in her study of the manifestation of
Romanticism in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century violin playing.14 Again,
however, these scholars place an emphasis on orchestral, violin and keyboard practices
with little mention of those of the cello.

Aims and Methodology

The study will address the following focus questions:

- What were the dominating general aesthetic values during period 1920-1960 and
  how did they depart from the Romantic aesthetic of the late nineteenth century?
- What changes in performance practices occurred as a result of these changes in
  aesthetic values?
- How did the shift in aesthetic values in the early twentieth century develop
  within different pedagogical lineages of cello playing?
- What was the public and critical reception of developments in cello performance
  practices?

In order to carry out this investigation, the study has drawn on the literature mentioned
above as well as numerous primary sources such as treatises and method books in order

---

Practice,” in Music and Performance during the Weimar Republic, ed. Bryan Gilliam (Cambridge:
12 Richard Taruskin, Text and Act: Essays on Musical Performance (Oxford: Oxford University Press,
1995).
14 Sohyun Eastham, “The Role of the Violin in Expressing the Musical Ideas of the Romantic Period and
the Development of Violin Techniques in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries” (Doctoral
to discern the practices and aesthetics of the time. With regard to the approximate period 1920 to 1960 as the focus time frame for the present study, it should be recognised that the departure from Romanticism had occurred in some artistic circles even in the late nineteenth century. However, as with any historical period, aesthetic change is fluid and the suggestion that the events of any one year could precipitate this change is incorrect. Thus, the earliest date of 1920 has been chosen based on observations of present-day scholars such as Edward Lippmann\textsuperscript{15}, Haynes\textsuperscript{16}, Hill\textsuperscript{17} and Taruskin\textsuperscript{18} that discussions by contemporary scholars about the departure from Romanticism were most intense during these years. Whilst these discussions become less common by the middle of the twentieth century, the latest date of 1960 has been chosen based on the fact that many prominent cellists who were active during this period of aesthetic change were unable to record works until after 1945 due to the disruption to their careers by the Second World War.

Analytical approaches to the study of period recordings have been based on the work of Kennaway, Philip, Peres Da Costa and Richard Hudson\textsuperscript{19} in their studies of the expressive devices of tempo rubato, vibrato and portamento. Philip’s descriptive terminology for vibrato and portamento has been used and Kennway’s method of notating audible left hand slides between two notes on a score has also been replicated, with some modifications. The slides of each performer were notated on individual scores, with different colours representing the type of slide according to Carl Flesch’s terminology of two types, L, B and single fingered slides as outlined by Philip.\textsuperscript{20} The number and direction of each type of slide for each performer was then collated into a table for the purposes of comparison.

\textsuperscript{15} Edward Lippman, \textit{A History of Western Musical Aesthetics} (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 398.
\textsuperscript{16} Haynes, \textit{The End of Early Music}, 50.
\textsuperscript{17} “Since the First World War, “conscionable” standards of musicianship have come to be equated with the avoidance of “romantic behaviors in musicianship.” Hill, “Overcoming Romanticism,” 38.
\textsuperscript{18} Taruskin outlines features of an “anti-romantic” style which, he observes, “has been a contender since the 1920s, dominant since the 1930s, virtually the only one since the 1950s and as revamped and re-outfitted with a new instrumentarium- the one called “historical” (or “authentic”) since the 1960s.” \textit{Text and Act}, 111.
\textsuperscript{20} “[Flesch] examines the methods of achieving a portamento, and distinguishes between three basic types: 1. An uninterrupted slide on one finger [single finger slide] 2. A slide in which one finger slides from the starting note to an intermediate note, and a second finger stops the destination note [B portamento] 3. A slide in which one finger plays the starting note, and a second finger stops an intermediate note and slides to the destination note [L portamento]. Flesch calls the second method the „B portamento” and the third method the „L portamento”, after the „beginning and „last finger”…” See: Philip, \textit{Early Recordings}, 144.
The examination of rubato was divided into three stages. Firstly, a brief formal analysis was conducted for each work. Using a digital stopwatch, the first bar of each major section of the piece was timed to the millisecond. Five trials were recorded and the average was used to calculate a metronome marking thus identifying tempo changes for each section and thus determining the extent of tempo flexibility for each performer. The average tempo of each performance was calculated by dividing the number of beats in each work, accounting for all repeats or cuts, by the duration of the performance to the nearest second. Secondly, a passage of approximately eight bars in each work was selected on the basis of the expressive opportunity it provided each performer for rubato. Each bar within the passage was timed five times and the average of the trials was calculated and recorded in a table. A grey scale was applied to the timed value for each bar according to its deviation from the shortest timed value, thus allowing a graded visual as well as numerical comparison of timing deviations within the passage. The third stage identified the treatment by performers of other minor aspects of rubato such as dislocation between the solo line and accompaniment, agogic accents and rhythmic alteration.

The focus works were chosen in order to compare these elements represent a variety of emotional characters, genres and styles. They are as follows: the first movement of Antonin Dvořák’s Cello Concerto in B minor, Op. 104, the first movement of Beethoven’s Sonata in A major, Op. 69 and the Bourrées from the Suite III, BWV 1009 by J.S Bach. To contextualise the detailed analysis of these recordings, a brief survey of recordings from before 1920 is included to illustrate the style of cellists belonging definitively to the „old school”, and who therefore represent the Romantic performance practices of the late nineteenth century. Recordings included in this survey are extracted from the 1993 Pearl Records anthology, *The Recorded Cello*, an extensive collation of cello recordings collected by the English cellist Keith Harvey.

**Limitations**

The process by which some recordings were accessed meant that the depth of recording analysis, especially in relation to tempo rubato, was partially limited due to the medium of the recordings. Milsom explains that recordings made before the advent of editable tape in the 1950s were restricted to roughly four minutes per side. This would inevitably have influenced some performers to alter the tempo of a performance, thus some
recordings may not have been representative of performer’s actual interpretive tendencies in live performance.\textsuperscript{22} Live recordings and short pieces, such as the Bach Bourrées, were therefore invaluable in examining this discrepancy.

Limitations of this methodology also arise due to an element of subjectivity, especially in relation to judgements made about the width and speed of vibrato and portamento. Whilst more precise measurements may be made of the width of vibrato with the use of equipment such as an oscilloscope, used for the study of violin vibrato by Maureen Mellody and Gregory Wakefield,\textsuperscript{23} such apparatuses was unavailable for the present study.\textsuperscript{24} Furthermore, while every attempt has been made by the researcher to contextualise the recordings, the analysis is naturally from the perspective of a modern performer; therefore some bias to this style may be unavoidable.

**Chapter Summary**

The central aim of the present study is to examine the extent to which the aesthetic changes during the period 1920 to 1960 affected cello performance practices. In Chapter One a general summary is made of the Modernist aesthetic, its emergence in the cultural and artistic realms and the ways in which it conflicted with the Romantic aesthetic of the late-nineteenth century. Chapter Two will examine how this shift in aesthetics was manifested in music performance in general. Chapter Three will examine written accounts of cello performance aesthetics in relation to the major pedagogical lineages existing during the period, in order to examine the extent to which the Romantic aesthetic declined within individual schools of playing. Chapter Four will continue this discussion in reference to recordings of cellists of the period. Analysis will focus on the deployment of the vibrato, rubato and portamento, allowing some conclusions to be drawn about the extent to which individual performers - and by extension the pedagogical lineages to which they belong - were affected by the decline in Romantic aesthetic discussed in the previous chapters. The final chapter will examine the critical reception of cello performance practice in prominent publications, thus situating it within the context of the general instrumental performance practices discussed in


\textsuperscript{24} The existence of the spectrogram software Sonic Visualiser came to my attention only after completion of this thesis.
Chapter Two and the aesthetic changes discussed in Chapter One. The conclusions made by the present study will contribute to the current understanding of the „modern” style of playing inherited by many contemporary performers and the aesthetic foundations from which it has evolved.
CHAPTER 1

Romanticism in Decline 1920-1960

The decline of Romanticism during the early twentieth century was manifested in a number of ways. Sources of the period are unanimous in describing a profound aesthetic shift greater than any experienced by artists of the past three centuries. In 1933, William Fisher emphasises the universality of these changes:

Like it or not, mourn it or not, the old order is gone, done for...we are passing silently through a silent revolution involving tremendous changes. The dynamic of this revolution leaves no-one untouched, no institution is above the wash of its current and every supposedly settled fundamental of life is turned into an interrogation point.25

Aaron Copland in 1945 similarly reflects on the past fifty years as being far less "patently emotional," more "objective and concise." "Romanticism," he writes, "now seems over-expressive, bombastic, self-pitying, long-winded."26 Present-day scholars present a pessimistic view of the emotional climate of the times which reached a turning point at the end of the First World War. Hill observes that the rapid industrialisation and mechanization of society during this time accompanied a "dark side; ultimately ... the alienation of man from himself, his environment, his fellow man."27 Taruskin attributes the same qualities to the entire twentieth century, adding to this a "sense of withdrawal, marginality, parasitism, and opposition."28 This chapter will discuss the changes which occurred within musical aesthetics of the period 1920 to 1960 partially as a result of this shift and the ways in which these changes departed from late nineteenth-century Romanticism.

The reaction against Romanticism, though prevalent since the final years of the nineteenth century, was consolidated by the 1920s. Edward Lippmann attributes this to the over-intensification of Romantic emotionalism and realism in the late nineteenth century which culminated in the Expressionist movement of the 1910s.29 Eastham writes that the Romanticism of the late-nineteenth century pervaded all art forms and emphasised "sentimentality, emotional expression and personal feeling."30 By the 1920s, however, Lippmann observes that form and structure assumed paramount importance,
far above programmatic or emotional content. In 1929, André Cœuroy describes the aesthetic of contemporary music as an "episode in the vast revolt of modern thought against the "romantic confusion of the arts", in which "each art, isolated, pursues its conquest of the Absolute…Poetry eliminates discourse, Painting eliminates the subject, Music eliminates expression." Ferruccio Busoni describes similar concepts in his personal philosophy of "Young Classicism" which eschewed "personal feeling" in favour of "Music which is absolute, distilled, and never under a mask of figures and ideas which are borrowed from other spheres." However, in contrast to Cœuroy’s description of contemporary music, Busoni does not seek to abandon emotional expression entirely but wishes to convey the human experience – rather than individual sentiment – with restraint and "within the limits of what is artistic.”

Busoni’s views foreshadow those of composers in the 1930s, when artists adopted a more sociological stance and their work became more intertwined with this new, bleak worldview. Whilst the Romantic artist sought to express intensely personal emotions, art of this period became intimately linked with the emotional climate of its society. Adolf Weissmann explains this development as resulting from the sudden and widespread revelation of "the close connection between art and world economics.” Fisher writes that, typically, the Modernist composer justifies his art to conservative critics by arguing that he is finding new idioms of expression in order to "come to terms with life." In fact, Alan Bush recognises that "modern” music should be judged, "not by subjective standards, but rather…whether or not it serves the interests of the life of mankind and in consequence, art and cultures in general.” Colin McAlpin also describes music apart from other art forms as "the sociological art” and the rational voice of humanism and human aspirations.

Raymond Leppard attributes a renewed interest in the values and aesthetics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, represented by Neo-Classicism to the loss of faith

32 Lippmann, A History of Western Musical Aesthetics, 399.
in the upward progress of humanity during the period. For example, Cœuroy observes an obsession with “the notion of “going back”, more particularly “back to Bach””. He describes a dispute in the French music magazine Revue Musicale between the composer Charles Koechlin and the aesthetcian Boris de Schloezler regarding the perception of the revival of early music. Koechlin is scathing of the movement, describing it in mocking tones as inexpressive and “an austere cult, a musical flagellation, absolving us from the sins engendered by the „Nocturnes” and the „Chanson de Bilitis””. Schloezler is, in contrast, more forgiving and concedes that whilst the time may yet come when the emotionalism that is undeniably present in Bach’s music is sought for, the present, „post-war musicians need the Bach of the Allegros…their continuous movement, their inexorable development, that seem to forbid all intrusion of psychological elements into this sonorous weft…”

Thus where late Romantic music had revelled in fantasy of form, Neo-Classicism reinvented the well-known forms of the earlier music in a modern harmonic vocabulary in an effort to reclaim order and clarity in the language of the time. Igor Stravinsky’s ballet Pulcinella, which is based on music attributed to the eighteenth-century composer Giovanni Pergolesi, is one such example. Stravinsky’s advocacy of objective performance practice is well documented in his 1936 autobiography and is cited in the following chapter.

However the early twentieth century also witnessed a widening gap between the artist and the general public, with new works commonly met with resistance by audiences who still clung to Romantic aesthetics. Sabaneev observes that whilst contempt for Romanticism may be fashionable in artistic circles, “the bulk of the people who listen to music, remains faithful to the old musical covenants.” Copland echoes this view, lamenting that despite immense change in artistic expression, audiences are generally unaware of the significance and context of these changes and thus, „the lay listener has remained antagonistic, confused, or merely apathetic to the major creations of the newer composers.” J. Ingpen, writing as one such „lay listener”, agrees that whilst contemporary music should indeed be „an expression of the thought and feeling of the

---

39 Ibid.
41 Ibid, 113.
42 Copland, Our New Music, v.
contemporary outlook”, modern music presents a „fundamental difficulty for the listener who is not musically trained.”

In fact, the irrepressibility and pervasiveness of the Romantic spirit within art is acknowledged by several scholars. Rather than being a „definable style”, Eastham describes Romanticism as a „spiritual attitude” which can therefore be applied to music of any era. Furthermore, as Frederic Dorian writes, the essence of Romanticism, that is, the „subjective emphasis on the emotional, the fantastic, and the virtuosi element” is in fact present in all eras of the performance of music, since these are qualities which ultimately represent „a more humanized way of playing.”

In 1929 W.R. Anderson insists upon the immortality of the Romantic aesthetic and denies the existence any aesthetic change at all:

There is lively interest in modern doings, and plenty of sympathy for all except the manifestly foolish extremists, but the old tags about romanticism being out of fashion are already becoming hoary, and never were true…I go up and down the country and can find no signs of the decay of romanticism. Human nature does not change with such rapidity as that.

Whilst Anderson’s disbelief may represent an extreme attitude, the publication of his views in The Gramophone, a reputable and widely circulated music magazine, indicates the currency of the issue and the debates which surrounded it in the 1920s. Anderson’s comment illustrates that the decline of Romanticism was not a straightforward affair, nor did it occur without opposition. To some artistic circles, the First World War signalled that the Romantic aesthetic was perhaps no longer a viable means of expression. New idioms were sought to suit a new and drastically different emotional and artistic climate which prioritised objectivity, form and a unified human experience over fantasy, beauty or individual expression. However the profundity of the changes occurring within music often alienated audiences who clung to the „old musical covenants” of Romanticism. The pervasiveness of the Romantic spirit in conflict with these changes placed the performer in the role of mediator between composer and audience, desiring to convey the intentions of the composer as well as express their own individuality, and also to please their audiences. This had important implications for the

---

44 Eastham, “The Role of Violin,” 15.
style of performance which emerged during this era as well as the perception of the role of the performer. These issues will be explored in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 2

Aesthetics of Performance Practice

Beginning in the 1920s, scholars identify a gradual departure in instrumental performance practices from the style of the nineteenth century, coinciding with the rejection of Romantic aesthetics discussed in Chapter One. In 1924, R.W.S. Mendl specifically links new trends in performance aesthetics to the concurrent objective revolt observed by Lippmann:

A school of thought has arisen which, starting with the belief that the true province of music is not to express emotion, builds upon that basis the theory that the interpretive artist ought not to play (or sing) with feeling.47

However, Mendl’s view describes only an extreme Modernist approach to performance. Present-day scholars discuss this trend to regulate emotional expression. Taruskin characterises the emerging style of the period as „text centred, hence literalistic“ and „impersonal, hence unfriendly to spontaneity.“48 Bruce Haynes similarly characterises the Modernist style by its „formal clarity, emotional detachment, order and precision“ and is disparaging of the Romantic style’s „excessive rubato, its bluster, its self-indulgent posturing and its sentimentality.“49 Philip’s examination of early recordings also identifies how these values were manifested in performance as a move „towards greater power, firmness, literalness, clarity and control and evenness of expression, and away from informality, looseness and unpredictability.“50 These changing aesthetics of performance practice had important implications for how devices such as vibrato, portamento and tempo rubato were employed as well as the perception of the role of the performer. This chapter will therefore discuss these changes and the ways in which they reflect the values and aesthetics described in Chapter One.

The rejection of the intensely individualistic aesthetic of the nineteenth century is mirrored in instrumental performance practices by the promotion of a greater fidelity to the score, and thus a lesser emphasis on personal expression in interpretation by some performers. Whilst recent research into nineteenth-century performance practices reveals that they were governed to some extent by conventions, especially regarding the

48 Taruskin, Text and Act, 111.
49 Haynes, The End of Early Music, 49.
50 Philip, Early Recordings, 229.
application of rubato, this latter trend of objective, text-centred interpretation is noted by scholars of the time as being particularly prevalent in the twentieth century; indeed Frederic Dorian in 1940 deems it be one of the most distinguishing features of the performance practice of his era. He writes that this approach requires the performer to possess „unconditional loyalty to the script“, sacrificing „personal opinion“ and „individual feelings“ for one cause: „to interpret the music in the way the author conceived it.“ J.A. Fuller-Maitland expresses support for the complete resignation of the performer to the composer’s intentions, citing the piano playing of Charles Hallé in the 1860s as his ideal since, in Hallé’s performance,

Beethoven was allowed to speak directly to the hearers, not obscured by any idiosyncrasy of the player. It was interpretation in the truest sense…real artists come between the composer and the listener as little as possible. Virgil Thomson similarly praises the pianist Josef Lhevinne’s literalist interpretations in 1940: „Not one sectarian interpretation, not one personal fancy, not one stroke below the belt, not a sliver of ham, mars the universal acceptability of his readings.“ Erwin Stein entirely rejects the very term „interpretation“, since he finds that it „implies too readily that the performer is at liberty to add ideas of his own to the composer’s…. Stravinsky advocates objective interpretation even more passionately, expressing his desire to eliminate any artistic input from the performer entirely:

…music should be transmitted and not interpreted, because interpretation reveals the personality of the interpreter rather than that of the author, and who can guarantee that such an executant will reflect the author’s vision without distortion?

However, just as the modernism adopted by composers faced opposition by the general public, inexpressive playing was widely condemned by performers and music critics still allied with the Romantic style. For example, the conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler considers the rejection of romanticism and emotional expression to be symptomatic of a „fear of oneself,” which is detrimental to the art of making music. Arthur Salmon counters Fuller-Maitland’s views by expressing frustration at the purely technical piano

---

52 Dorian, The History of Music in Performance, 224.
53 Ibid, 27.
playing of his era which is at odds with his own philosophy that „technique is the letter, emotion is the spirit,” and describes those who adopt this approach as „nothing but flesh-and-blood pianolas.” Similarly, Erik Brewerton, discussing the state of vocal performance in 1925, is alarmed by the „growing intellectualism” and abandonment of Romantic emotionalism, the effect of which is to „degrade the artist to the level of the craftsman.”

In fact, the reality of the popularity of the „objective” approach is perhaps best illustrated by the cellist Gregor Piatigorsky, who writes that despite the „fashion” for conductors to view themselves as „just a servant who tries to obey what is printed in the score,” most conductors often felt a degree of ownership of the work they were interpreting. Piatigorsky recalls the approach of Arturo Toscanini, whose reputation as an especially objective conductor was widely known, as an example:

| It is believed that Maestro Toscanini was responsible for the tradition of strict adherence to the score, yet he would not trade a musical thought for the dot over a note. I once asked him if he ever misunderstood a composer. “Yesterday, today, every day,” he shouted. “Every time I conduct the same piece I think how stupid I was the last time I did it.” |

Indeed, for most performers, the shift in performance aesthetics did not mean abandoning emotional expression, but rather expressing the composer’s emotions rather than their own. Dorian summarises this ideal approach as incorporating both the „ego of the interpreter” and the composer’s score so that „creative inspiration may be translated into musical reality.” This also is articulated by Theodore Normann, who describes the ideal method of interpretation as being

| …not a matter of snap judgement or of spontaneous inspiration; nor is it the result of emotional fervour alone, important as any of these may be…It is rather, the culmination of long hours of conscientious study and analysis fired by the glow of a definite ideal, a conviction of what the composer intended to express, and the re-creation through performance, of his vision. |

Hence, interpretation was viewed as an intellectual endeavour, with expressive decisions being reached rationally and through research. This contrasts with Grigory Kogan’s description of the Romantic attitude to interpretation, for which „thinking was

---

the job of the scientist, not an artist.”\textsuperscript{64} Thus, just as composers sought to represent, with restraint, the experience of humanity rather than the individual so too were performers required to suppress their own artistic personalities to some extent, in order to communicate the intentions of the composer.

Neo-Classicism was mirrored in musical performance through a rising interest in music of the Baroque and Classical eras, and whilst early music revivals were not unique to the early twentieth century, the period 1920 to 1960 saw an unprecedented emphasis on emotional restraint and objectivity in the performance of music from this time. Hill reasons that artists found solace in the objectivity and clarity of expression of the pre-Romantic era, in which composers such as Bach and Handel represented an “incorrupt authority that would confirm to us our differences from the world that had been shattered by the First World War.”\textsuperscript{65} The departure from personal expression especially in the realisation of music of the past is alluded to by Albert Jarosy, who laments that in being required to master every style and era of music, the modern artist is “obliged to suppress his individuality.”\textsuperscript{66} This is also evident in Gerald Hayes’\textsuperscript{67} praise of the Dolmetsch Foundation, which was founded in 1928 and dedicated to the reproduction of early music on historical instruments. Hayes compliments the Foundation’s research-orientated approach to performance, free from “romantic bias,” “preciousness” and “the mists of sentiment.”

Objectivity in early music performance is criticised by Wanda Landowska, another eminent pioneer of the early music movement, for its rejection of “any personal involvement.”\textsuperscript{68} Landowska’s\textsuperscript{69} critique highlights the irony that, in an attempt to reimagine the music of the past, performers who espoused this objectivity in fact revealed far more accurately the aesthetic values of their own time. Taruskin articulates this issue in relation to the early music movement of the 1960s:

…[A]s we are all secretly aware, what we call historical performance is the sound of now, not then. It derives its authenticity not from its historical verisimilitude, but from its being for better or worse, a true mirror of late twentieth-century taste.

\textsuperscript{65} Hill, “Overcoming Romanticism,” 38.
\textsuperscript{68} See: Haynes, \textit{The End of Early Music}, 91.
The regulation of personal expression was especially manifested in the regulation of the expressive devices which had been used according to individual tastes in the late nineteenth century. The decline of the use of portamento was one way in which performers showed emotional restraint. Philip observes that such restraint in the use of portamento, and its perception as a device "requiring delicate treatment," was widely established across instrumental practices by the 1930s.\textsuperscript{69} Adrian Boult describes the emergence of this trend as sudden in string playing:

People didn’t talk about it… It just happened. And one suddenly realized after a few years that the string playing was much cleaner and uh…musical than it had been, and this sloppy portamento just disappeared…like vibrating, it was a way of conjuring up, putting up, bringing tears to the eyes of young ladies.\textsuperscript{70}

Leech-Wilkinson similarly observes a decline in the device following the First World War and its "sudden disappearance" after the Second.\textsuperscript{72} He hypothesises that the innate association of portamento with the emotions of security and naïveté\textsuperscript{73} made the device fundamentally unsuited to post-War perceptions of music as an intellectual and sociological art form:

[A] possibility to consider is that this really quite radical change in performance style and reception involved a new seriousness about music-making and listening, a realization that music had to become something other than a comfort, that it was there to involve us in ways that were not just uncritically emotional, still less sentimental.\textsuperscript{74}

The implication that the trend in portamento was precipitated by the desire for emotional restraint is confirmed in writings of the period which, whilst ascribing emotional value to the portamento, are wary of its overuse. In string playing, Harold Harvey describes portamento as a "beautiful effect" adding "a special intensity" to an interval, but advises the adaption of the device in the same manner as singing\textsuperscript{76} for which an excessive application of portamento was frequently criticised. Reviews by Herman Klein of singers in the 1920s often caution against the overuse of portamento as

\textsuperscript{69} Philip, \textit{Early Recordings}, 143.
\textsuperscript{70} Haynes, \textit{The End of Early Music}, 52.
\textsuperscript{73} Leech-Wilkinson explains the association of portamento with infant-directed communication and that its effect therefore relies on the listener "switching back on our earliest emotional responses to musical sounds"; generally these are feelings of security, love and warmth. (Ibid, 248)
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid, 249-250.
a mark of sentimentality and exaggeration.\textsuperscript{77} Klein advises that it is the „correct‟ employment of the device, both in its ascending and descending movements, that is one of the most significant features of the accomplished vocalist.\textsuperscript{78} Seashore’s study of portamento in singers is perhaps one of the most telling concerning signs of the intellectualism and tendency towards objectivity at the time. He seeks to scientifically quantify the features of „great singing‟ by calculating the percentage of portamento found in the performances of critically-acclaimed artists. He finds that it is the most common form of transition between notes and indeed, „one of the media for artistic abandon in which singers indulge.‟\textsuperscript{79}

The use of tempo rubato also became more restrained during this period. Stravinsky, representing the most extreme Modernist point of view, links rubato with Romanticism, Romantic performance practice, and hence everything he opposes.\textsuperscript{80} Feste similarly calls for a revision of ideas regarding rubato, which he complains has become excessive. In particular, he criticises the characteristically Romantic keyboard practice of melodic rubato which he deems to be the „studied avoidance of anything like time and rhythm indicated by composers.‟\textsuperscript{81}

However, whilst present-day scholars observe a „greater adherence to strict tempo,‟ Hudson notes that rubato was never abandoned, but rather evolved to suit the „spirit of the times.‟ He characterises Romantic rubato as one of „…anticipation or of delay…of lengthening or shortening note values…of displacement between parts or hands…which steals from one note and gives to another.‟ This contrasts with the Modern rubato which he describes as „an accelerating or retarding rubato.‟\textsuperscript{82} Emotional restraint is again supported by the definition of „rubato‟ in the 1927 edition of \textit{Grove’s Dictionary of

\textsuperscript{77} Sample reviews from Herman Klein, “The Gramophone and The Singer,” \textit{The Gramophone}: Lucrezia Bori”s recording of Mozart”s aria \textit{Deh vieni, „…she is too free with her portamento and plays sad tricks with her rubato and rallentandos – flitty little touches that this, of all music, positively will not stand.” (January 1925, 277); soloist Arthur Jordan in in Handel”s \textit{Elijah}, „…there is no need for excessive portamento or for the sentimentality which disfigures the whole return to the subject of the air.”(February 1925, 320); Joseph Hislop in Wagner”s „Prize Song” from \textit{Die Meistersinger} and „Lohengrin”s Narrative” from \textit{Lohengrin}, „in both pieces, the cantilena is sustained with effortless smoothness and an art free from needless portamento or any other kind of exaggeration.” (February 1930, 410).
\textsuperscript{78} Klein, „The Gramophone as the Vocal Instructor”, \textit{The Gramophone}, May, 1932, http://www.exacteditions.com/browse/345/365/32617/3/5/0/the%20gramophone%20as%20the%20vocal %20instructor (accessed 10 October, 2014).
\textsuperscript{80} Hudson, \textit{Stolen Time}, 384.
\textsuperscript{82} Hudson, \textit{Stolen Time}, 356.
\textsuperscript{83} Ibid, 441.
Music and Musicians which permits its use in all works written „from Weber downwards‟, but „in the case of the older masters, it is entirely and unconditionally inadmissible.‟  

However, Hudson notes that the performance of all music was equally dominated by „the neo-classical concern that performers keep strict time and avoid subjective interpretation.‟

The trend towards continuous vibrato is also observed by present-day scholars. Philip cites varied opinions on its use in string playing throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and notes that by the 1920s, the absence rather than the presence of vibrato was valued as an expressive effect, indicating that continuous vibrato was common by this decade.

Indeed, Edwin Pain in 1930 excoriates singers who employ the absence of vibrato for expressive effect, writing that such an application is only „the high-water mark of cheap and undignified affectation.” His support for continuous vibrato is based on the view that it is a natural physiological property of the human voice and should therefore not be suppressed for expressive purposes.

In 1937, Carl Seashore also advocates constant vibrato, writing that „no good artist can sing without it” and that string players should imitate singers of „good taste” in the natural occurrence of vibrato on every note.

Boulût’s assessment of vibrato as a „way of putting tears in the eyes of young ladies” makes it curious that it should be encouraged as a constant feature when portamento became more restrained. Indeed, complaints against continuous vibrato are often motivated by conflicting reasons. In contrast to Pain‟s view, Ferrucio Bonavia argues that it is the excessive rather than the selective use of vibrato which results in „gush and insincerity,” and deplores its use by students who fail to discriminate between „sentiment and sentimentality, between that which is good and that which is meretricious, between art and charlatanism.”

H.J. King also criticises continuous vibrato which he observes in the singing of his time, but deems it to be „monotonous and unmusical”, rather than excessively sentimental, and adds that his opinion is


Hudson, Stolen Time, 443.

Philip, Early Recordings, 101.


supported by „expert professors.“

Thus, whilst each of these sources confirms Philip’s observation of a trend towards continuous vibrato, they are united in the condemnation of unmusicality and sentimentality, but divided about the means through which this is achieved with vibrato.

Discussions of instrumental performance practices during the early twentieth century reveal tensions between allies of „old“ and „new“ performing styles. As composers avoided personal expression in their art, performers sought objectivity in their interpretations and prized fidelity to what they saw as the composer’s intentions. Whilst a select few critics and performers espoused a militant objectivity which condemned emotional expression altogether, the dominant aesthetic of the time favourable the restrained expression of the composer’s emotions, rather than those of the performer. These principles were particularly enforced in the performance of early music, and manifested in the regulation of the expressive devices in an effort to avoid sentimentality and exaggeration. Literature of the time recommends the selective use of portamento and also the restrained use of rubato. The style of rubato also changed to emphasise the direction of the phrase rather than spontaneous „give and take“ of time and note values. Vibrato evolved into what was considered a feature of beautiful tone, such that its absence, rather than its constant presence, created stronger emotional power. However, these trends to apply rubato and vibrato are observed by most present-day studies in the performance practices for the violin, piano and singing. The extent of their manifestation in cello performance practices will be examined in detail in the Chapter Three.

---

CHAPTER 3

Cello Performance in Literature

The early twentieth century was a significant period for cello performance during which the cello’s public status as a solo virtuoso instrument equal to the violin and piano began to be consolidated. Sources of the period unanimously celebrate a revolution in cello playing, implying a departure from the dominant style of the late nineteenth century. Furthermore, the dissemination of performances through radio and the increased ability of international travel allowed cellists to foster their own style and technique with numerous influences, from fellow cellists as well as other instrumentalists. This complex exchange of knowledge, illustrated to some extent by the diagram of pedagogical lineages in Appendix D, makes it difficult to separate distinct national “schools” of playing. Hence, this chapter will discuss the development of cello performance practices in terms of pedagogical lineages of cello playing represented by some of the most influential figures of the period. Within each lineage, it will examine the ways in which cellists responded to the decline of the Romantic aesthetic discussed in the previous chapters.

During the early twentieth century, cello pedagogy was predominantly led by the German teachers Hugo Becker at the Hochschule für Musik in Berlin from 1909 to 1929 and Julius Klengel at the Leipzig Conservatory from 1881 until his death in 1933. Of both cellists, David Johnston notes that Becker was more aware of the aesthetic changes occurring during his lifetime and it was he who therefore moved more decisively towards modernising cello technique. Becker’s 1929 treatise in collaboration with physiologist Dago Rynar, Mechanik und Ästhetik des Violoncellospiels, emphasises the importance of understanding the physiology of technique, especially in relation to bowing, as well as Becker’s desire to elevate this understanding to equal standing with the subjective realm of artistic expression. Consistent with the sources consulted in Chapter Two, Becker also makes recommendations to regulate the use of expressive devices to avoid overly sentimental

92 This assumption is based on information that Becker’s fifty year anniversary at the Conservatory was commemorated with a concert by Wilhelm Furtwängler in 1931.
playing. For example, similar to the views of Bonavia expressed above, Becker deems
the excessive use of vibrato especially by cellists to be responsible for the cello’s
reputation for „melancholy and sentiment.“ Instead, he recommends a colouristic and
varied vibrato appropriate to the emotion being evoked:

The intensity and rate of speed of the vibrato should therefore be determined and applied only in
agreement with the relative affect... Just as we cannot succeed in dynamics with forte and piano
alone, but employ every additional shade of force, just so little can we satisfy ourselves with one
single kind of vibrato.  

Overuse of vibrato is to be particularly avoided in the music of Bach which he says
„calls for a sense of style, for nobility and dignity.“ Furthermore, as Philip observes in
writings about the use of vibrato in general instrumental practice, Becker advocates the
absence of vibrato and its powerful emotional effect:

If the deepest sorrow no longer has tears, stiffens to some extent into stone, then the depicting of
this condition can be achieved only by an absolute absence of vibrato.

He establishes three main rules for the execution of portamento. Firstly, every
portamento should be accompanied by a diminuendo which is more essential for large
intervals and slow left hand slides. Secondly, consecutive portamenti are prohibited and
thirdly, vibrato should accompany a descending portamento „wherever great passion,
sorrow, deep emotion or the expiration of vital force is to be illustrated.“ Becker’s
section on rubato is one of the most substantial in the book and indeed the first detailed
discussion of the device in cello literature perhaps reflecting an attempt to regulate its
use which had been pushed to its extremes by the height of his own career. He
emphasises the importance of rhythm as the foundation of music and advocates the
manipulation of tempo and pulse in accordance with the character of the phrase.
Accelerandi should occur at the climax of the phrase to evoke the character of
„storming, driving or of a situation of fleeing„ whereas ritardandi may occur at points
of rest, signifying „reflection, reserve, hesitation, deliberation“, or in preparation for the
climax to illustrate struggle.

---

96 Ibid, 249-250.
97 Ibid, 253.
98 Ibid, 251.
99 Ibid, 251.
100 Ibid, 244.
101 Ibid, 200.
Students of Klengel recall his teaching approach as primarily fostering a sense of individuality amongst his pupils, in contrast to the „authoritarian” and „pedantic” approach of Becker. Klengel’s ideas regarding technique may be deduced mainly from the substantial output of studies and technical exercises which emphasise left hand agility but have little to offer on the subject of interpretation. This may explain why the approaches to interpretation by his pupils varied widely. Emanuel Feuermann, one of Klengel’s most prominent pupils, places far greater emphasis on technical accuracy than his mentor. Annette Morreau first observes a distinct departure from the „lugubrious slides and slow vibrato” of his mentor’s „old style” in Feuermann’s 1927 recording of Chopin’s E flat Nocturne, which demonstrates cleaner articulation, a finely focused sound, more accurate intonation and selective use of portamento. In fact, Feuermann expresses concern for the condition of German music pedagogy in the 1930s, in particular, the tendency to revere music as an art form at the expense of technique. Instead, like Becker, he advocates the importance of great technique as a vehicle for great artistry. Feuermann’s views also conflict with the Romantic privileging of personal expression. He writes:

Is not the composition the property of the composer, which is handed to us, the players, only for the purpose of realization, an alien property that we must look after with the greatest conscientiousness and love and input of all our mental and material powers?...Every intentional emphasis of one’s own personality is a crime against the composition in which only one personality must intentionally be expressed: that of the composer.

In contrast to Feuermann, Gregor Piatigorsky studied both with Klengel and briefly with Becker but was far more influenced by Klengel’s emphasis on individuality and the importance of personal feeling in successful performance. Piatigorsky writes:

What an absurdity to say, “Here is a performer who excludes himself” or to insist, “A performer plays Beethoven well only if he himself disappears.” If he disappears, he is a corpse. No-one disappears. The performer is a human being. His judgements may be right or wrong but through them he is always there.

---

104 This is most evident in the three volumes of Klengel’s *Daily Studies* (Moscow: Muzgiz, 1939, http://imslp.org).
105 Arranged for cello by Frederich Grützmacher.
107 Without this approach, Feuermann warns that „the student will be constantly reminded of the seriousness, the majesty, the nobility of the artistic profession, while technique or mechanism will be rejected with contempt.” Ibid, 273.
108 Ibid, 277.
Piatigorsky’s advice regarding the use of expressive devices similarly encouraged the individuality of the performer, especially with regard to vibrato which he considered to be the means through which this individuality could best be conveyed. Thus, he advises performers to use the device according to personal taste but with sensitivity to the context in which it is used:

But one cannot vibrate successfully without having a definite musical idea behind the vibrato...He who has only one vibrato for all types of expression is certainly grossly underdeveloped.\(^{110}\)

He offers similar advice regarding portamento, writing that the device may again be used according to personal taste, but „the musical phrase must guide the decision.”\(^{111}\) However, as a student of his recalls, Piatigorsky’s interpretations were not completely subjective; rather, they were additionally informed by his study of the score:

He was a very gifted and instinctive player, and always played from his heart, but he was also very interested in finding original editions and manuscripts. He strove to play in an „authentic” manner, way before it was fashionable.\(^{112}\)

Becker and Klengel’s contemporaries in England were William Whitehouse and Herbert Walenn.\(^{113}\) Margaret Campbell summarises Walenn’s approach as involving „minimal technical instruction and concentration more on musical matters.”\(^{114}\) In his 1930 memoir, Whitehouse rarely expresses his views on playing style; however he repeatedly praises the late-Romantic style of the violinist Joseph Joachim, especially for his interpretations of Bach but criticises the decline of the free use of rubato in contemporary performances:

(Bach) must have been an out and out revolutionary virtuoso! and (sic) not a dry-as-dust person as some would have us believe. Hence the argument in favour of a warm elastic impulsive playing of his works, subject of course to a due sense of proportion- in place of the machine-like regularity that some players adopt!\(^{115}\)

This contrasts with Becker’s views on playing Bach, discussed above, which condemn such elasticity and impulsiveness, suggesting that Whitehouse’s style was exactly what Becker opposed.

\(^{110}\) King, Gregor Piatigorsky, 259.

\(^{111}\) Ibid, 259.


\(^{113}\) Walenn founded the London Cello School which, as well as being a training facility for aspiring professionals and soloists, accepted young beginner cellists and amateurs as his students. Whitehouse taught at three major institutions: the Royal Academy of Music, Royal College of Music and King’s College, Cambridge.


In France, Paul Bazelaire was another important influence and a prolific writer of pedagogical texts on the cello technique and the condition of cello pedagogy.\textsuperscript{116} In his treatise *Scientific Instruction in the Violoncello*, published posthumously in 1960, Bazelaire echoes the Modernist view that intellect and reason should be the driving forces in interpretation, whereas "emotion and sensitivity breed impulsiveness; impulsiveness bars the door to reason."\textsuperscript{117} His insistence on the expressive power of the bow is also consistent with Becker’s views, and this appears to have informed Bazelaire’s students to a great extent. Bazelaire observes that earlier literature is focused on the left hand but that the French school in recent times are at the forefront of the "revolution" regarding bow technique:

For the bow is our glory. It is the true conqueror in the eternal battle of spirit and clay…Let us show no false modesty about the part played by France in this advance.\textsuperscript{118}

This idea is inherent in the philosophies of Bazelaire’s pupils André Navarra and Pierre Fournier. Fournier cites violinists Fritz Kreisler and Jascha Heifetz as those whom he most wishes to emulate in performance:

For me to give much expression is not only to play with much vibrato but first of all to speak to the right hand…playing with …violinist and viola players [Heifetz and Kreisler] I try to reach the same wonderful range of colours given by the bow technique.\textsuperscript{119}

Navarra, in an instructional video about the fundamentals of cello technique, similarly places great importance on the role of the bow in string playing, equating it to the voice of a singer. Furthermore, just as every singer possesses a unique voice, the student cellist should aim to develop "his personal and natural sound."\textsuperscript{120}

Felix Salmond, named by Whitehouse as one of his best students, mainly influential in North America.\textsuperscript{121} Bernard Greenhouse and Leonard Rose regard Salmond as one of their most significant mentors, but admit to being more indebted to the tuition and ideas of Casals. In fact, both Rose and Greenhouse, whilst expressing admiration for Salmond’s musicianship, criticise his comparative neglect of technique. Greenhouse’s views on technique are informed by a keen understanding of anatomy and physical

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{116} Bazelaire taught at the Paris Conservatoire alongside Louis Feuillard.  
\textsuperscript{118} Bazelaire, *Scientific Instruction in the Violoncello*, 3.  
\textsuperscript{121} Salmond taught at Juilliard School and the Curtis Institute until 1942 following his migration from London in 1922.
\end{flushright}
efficiency at odds with Salmond’s views, a conflict which prompted Greenhouse to study with Feuermann, Alexanian and eventually Casals. Rose, highlighting the distinction between his and Salmond’s teaching approaches, places technical training as his first priority. He describes Casals’ ideas regarding style and technique as definitive innovations for cello playing:

“The cello was rather late in developing as a solo instrument. ... We had to wait for Pablo Casals to come along to really master and improve the contemporary techniques, fingerings and of course style- he was a great artist and musician.”

Indeed, present-day scholars are unanimous in appointing Pablo Casals as the most innovative and influential cellists of the early twentieth century, with most treatises, including Bazelaire’s, using Casals’ support as justification for their ideas. Furthermore, Casals’ longevity and active international performing and recording career allowed him to transmit his ideas across several generations of cellists until his death in 1973. This is supported by the diagram in Appendix D, which shows that almost every prominent cellist of the period came into contact with his ideas either directly or through one of his students. Whilst Casals did not write a method book, his ideas are explored by David Blum, Juliette Alvin, David Cherniavsky and Diran Alexanian, whose treatise is discussed in detail below. Philip describes Casals as being the most successful in synthesising both the old and new styles, and this perhaps accounts for his popularity. Like Becker, he insisted that interpretation must go beyond the score, expressing frustration towards the purely objective approach emerging at the time:

“...How curious this fetish of objectivity is! And is it not responsible for so many bad performances? There are so many excellent instrumentalists who are completely obsessed by the printed note, whereas it has a very limited power to express what the music actually means.”

Regarding the use of expressive devices, Casals advocated the application of vibrato according to the mood sought in the music and said that it may be omitted entirely on some occasions: “A big vibrato in an energetic forte – wonderful, but the sound without vibrato is very beautiful also, particularly in piano and pianissimo.” Casals is also

127 Philip, Early Recordings, 105.
128 Corredor, Conversations with Casals, 183.
129 Blum, Casals and the Art of Interpretation, 134.
credited by many scholars, including Blum, Alvin and Cherniavsky, with the innovation of left hand extensions connecting hand positions on the fingerboard, thus reducing the need for shifting and permitting a more selective use of portamento. The overwhelmingly positive response to this innovation by cellists of the period reflects dissatisfaction with the “old style” of fingering rather than a desire to limit expression. The violinist Carl Flesch remarks that Casals’ demonstration of the distinction between technical glissandi, and expressive and necessary glissandi” has allowed contemporary cellists to “give more artistic satisfaction than ever before.” Alvin also celebrates the greater possibilities of expression as a result of technical advances enabled by Casals who, she writes, has achieved balance between “the musical needs of the artist, the physical possibilities of the hand and the inherent nature of the instrument.” Feuermann believes such developments herald a new era in cello playing:

Nobody who ever heard him play can doubt that with him a new period for the cello began. He has shown that the cello can sing without becoming overly sentimental, that phrasing on the cello can be of highest quality. He adopted a technique according to the musical requirements. The enormous reaches seem to have disappeared; so have the ugly noises theretofore [sic] considered an integral part of cello playing.

Blum praises Casals’ use of portamento which was “infinitely variable – in timing, speed, distance, direction, intensity, coloration – in Casals’ hands it could reflect any one of a thousand nuances of mood.” He notes that Casals also cautioned against consecutive portamenti in opposite directions. Greenhouse’s summary of Casals’ approach to phrasing recalls Hudson’s description of modern rubato: “Casals emphasised the arch in music making. Each phrase has a beginning, reaches the top in a beautiful arching way, and then comes down to a starting point.”

Students of Casals were also less divided in their approaches than those of Klengel. For example, Guilhermina Suggia in her article Violoncello Playing echoes Casals’ philosophy that technique should be a means to “interpret the ideas that have animated the composer”, and that intensity and quality of vibrato should be determined first and foremost by the character and mood of the piece, urging the performer to be sensitive to

131 Alvin, “The Logic of Casals’ Technique,” 1078.
132 Philip, Early Recordings, 151.
133 Blum, Casals and the Art of Interpretation, 126
occasions in which vibrato may be omitted.\textsuperscript{135} An extensive exploration of technique and interpretation is provided by Alexanian, who was Casals’ student and assistant at the École de Normale. Casals’ preface to Alexanian’s treatise, \textit{Traité théorique et pratique du violoncelle}, praises the volume for its unprecedented modernising of cello technique and debunking many of the „superannuated prejudices” of previous treatises:

[N]owhere in it is there to be found a precept of which the application, sustained by artistic taste, would not contribute to the formation of a technique...capable of adapting itself to the subtle diversity of expression of the same instrumental formula, according to its various “musical situations”.\textsuperscript{136}

Alexanian presents the most detailed modern account of portamento and also is the first to explain how to avoid sliding in ways other than simply shifting quickly.\textsuperscript{137} He recommends exercises for when the shift is on two strings, when there is a change of bow and for both ascending and descending intervals. Portamento between large intervals should be used only if the interval is ascending and even then, „very parsimoniously, and only in case a musical necessity demands it.”\textsuperscript{138}

Alexanian advocates Casals’ varied use of vibrato, but is more emphatic than Casals about its continuous use which he recognises as a departure from the „old school”.\textsuperscript{139} He permits its absence in only three situations: fast passages where it is not possible to vibrate on every note, situations requiring a „dull sonority” and when providing a harmonic voice which would interfere with the melodic line if coloured. He also offers more regulated instructions for its use than Piatigorsky: „spaced and supple” for a piano dynamic, and „rapid and nervous” when playing forte, with a reduction in width of the vibrato as the register ascends.\textsuperscript{140}

The influence of Casals and Alexanian was profoundly felt by many twentieth-century virtuoso performers, including Paul Tortelier, Maurice Eisenberg, Antonio Janigro, Gaspar Cassadó and Edmund Kurtz. Literature concerning the interpretation and technical approach of Janigro and Kurtz is limited; however Eisenberg echoes many of Casals and Alexanian’s ideas in his 1957 treatise \textit{Cello Playing of Today}, for which

\textsuperscript{136} Alexanian, \textit{Traité Théorétique}, 4.
\textsuperscript{137} Kennaway, “Cello Techniques,” 146.
\textsuperscript{138} Alexanian, \textit{Traité Théorétique}, 57.
\textsuperscript{139} Alexanian maintains that the „old” perception of the vibrato as a symptom of „the lack of control of the pureness of sound” was „based upon an inexactitude”. Instead, he writes that „The vibrato is an expressive undulation; principally on the violoncello, this undulation allows of the singing of a phrase, with the charm and intensity of a warm and well-colored voice.” Ibid, 96.
\textsuperscript{140} Ibid, 96-97.
Casals’ endorsement is once again used as an assurance to the reader of the quality of the publication. Casals provides the foreword in which he writes that

…this book should be invaluable to advanced, talented students, who will find within its pages much that will help them to comprehend the reasons for actions which, although, perhaps, accomplished by them instinctively, require conscious understanding if they are to be applied to the utmost advantage…I like especially, the way in which the technique is considered in relationship to interpretation, the recurring emphasis laid on such points as phrasing and vocalization, and the use of the illustrations to clarify details without unnecessary verbal explanation.¹⁴¹

Tortelier’s views are also thoroughly documented in Blum’s *Paul Tortelier: A Self-Portrait* which concludes an entire chapter dedicated Tortelier’s relationship with Casals. Tortelier also echoes Casals’ views on objective interpretation:

Over the last decades there has been a tendency towards „authenticity“, towards „respect“. Sometimes a critic throws a brick at you for doing something that’s not marked in the score or that’s not orthodox…We mustn’t be too afraid of making the music ours. We should know that we are participants; otherwise there will always be a barrier between the composer and ourselves.¹⁴²

Hence, during this period of profound aesthetic change numerous attitudes towards interpretation and the use of expressive devices evolved amongst cellists. Advances in technique were formalised in treatises such as those by Becker and Alexanian, and widely disseminated in the playing and pedagogy of international artists, allowing cellists to draw from varied influences. Overall, it is clear that no prominent cellist of this period advocated the aggressively objective approach to performance endorsed by Stein or Stravinsky; rather, cellists embraced unanimously the idea of technique, now modernised and perfected, in the service of the composer’s vision. This vision was to be realised, not through confinement to the score, but through investigation, a high level of technical skill and the sensitive and considered use of vibrato, tempo rubato, portamento and bowing. However treatises vary in the prioritisation of each device as a means of expression. The expressive power of the bow is addressed particularly by Becker and the French school of Bazelaire, Fournier and Navarra as having been neglected by nineteenth-century literature and now being deserving of attention in the twentieth century. Furthermore, the Romantic notion of artistic personality and individuality is perpetuated to conflicting degrees in the philosophies of the most significant soloists and pedagogues. The following chapter examine these textual discussions of cello performance practices in light of the more empirical evidence provided by early

recordings in order to show consistencies or highlight disparities between the two sources of information.
CHAPTER 4

Cello Performance in Practice

This analysis will explore the extent to which the attitudes towards performance aesthetics expressed in writing by cellists of the period are consistent with recordings by the same performers. This will give some indication about the extent to which the changes in aesthetics discussed in Chapters One and Two affected cellists in actual practice. It will compare the expressive devices of vibrato, tempo rubato and portamento in recordings by cellists of three works that were staples of the cello repertoire in the early twentieth century: the Bourrées from Bach’s Suite III in C major, BWV 1009, the first movement of Dvořák’s Concerto in B Minor, Op. 104, and the first movement of the Sonata in A major, Op. 69 by Beethoven. A list of the recordings consulted can be found in Appendix A. Recordings of the examples referred to can be accessed via YouTube links provided in Appendix B. Tables which display data from all the selected recordings are referred to throughout this discussion and can be found in Appendix C.

Analysis of Recordings Pre-1920

Whilst a dichotomy of “old” and “new” styles is dangerously simplistic, due to varied practices throughout the period, some main features of the late nineteenth-century style are identified by present-day scholars. The purpose of this section is therefore to summarise these features and identify them with reference to cello recordings produced before 1920. This will provide context to the subsequent detailed analysis of recordings from the period 1920 to 1960 and better illustrate the development of performance practices during this period.

Recordings before 1920 reveal striking variation in the use of vibrato, indicating that performance aesthetics were already in flux during this period. For example, Herbert (1912) and Becker (1908) only apply vibrato to long notes at the ends of phrases. In contrast, continuous vibrato is used by van Biene (1911), Gruppe (1914) in the slow sections of the Dvořák Rondo and Heinrich Kruse (1915) in Schubert’s Fantasie über Sehnsucht. There is also noticeable variation in the width and speed of vibrato.

143 Kennaway notes that divergent practices existed throughout nineteenth and early-twentieth century cello playing and that the question of “which performance practice?” should be asked rather than attempting to generalise the entire era. “Cello Techniques,” 344.
Whitehouse (1907) and Wierzbilowicz (1904) employ a very fast and narrow vibrato, whereas that of van Biene and Joseph Hollman (1916) is slower and more audible.

In general, early recordings favour liberal use of slow portamento and the many occurrences of this device run counter to the recommendations of Casals and Alexanian outlined in Chapter Three. This is most evident in August van Biene’s 1911 recording of his composition *The Broken Melody* in which he employs portamenti at almost every opportunity, as evident in the annotated excerpt in Figure 1:

![Image of the Broken Melody excerpt](image_url)

**Figure 9: The Broken Melody, August van Biene, bars 1-21**

The excerpt also shows the use of consecutive portamenti in opposing directions (bar 17) as well as in the same direction (bar 20), with descending portamenti often accentuated with a swell in the bow. These features also occur in William Whitehouse’s 1907 recording of *Sing me to Sleep* and also of Ludwig Lebell’s 1911 recording of Schubert’s *Ständchen*, shown below:

---

Hudson describes the late nineteenth century as a „high-point of freedom for the performer” during which all performers „felt they had a right, if not a duty, to apply all manner of rhythmic flexibilities”, even to the point of departing from the composer’s score. Early cello recordings reflect this through the deployment of some of the traits which Peres da Costa identifies in late nineteenth-century rubato in piano performance, such as dislocation, small-scale rhythmic alteration and tempo modification which in contrast to the style of rubato common today, appears as „exaggerated temporal waywardness.” For example, Paolo Gruppe’s recording of Dvořák’s Rondo exhibits sudden tempo changes, especially in the coda section in which the cello and piano alternate contrasting slow and fast entries. Dislocation occurs in Victor Herbert’s 1912 recording of his own composition Petite Valse. The traditional waltz meter and tempo are often unclear and whilst Herbert and the pianist Rosario Bourdon synchronise the ends of phrases, dislocation of their respective parts occurs within most phrases. Sudden shortening and lengthening of notes as well as sudden changes of tempo within the cello part, as well as in cello and piano dialogue, give the impression of spontaneous expression rather than considered and coordinated phrasing. Dislocation is also a feature of A.V. Wierzbilowicz’s 1904 recording of Davidov’s Romance sans Paroles.

145 Hudson, Stolen Time, 300.
146 It should be noted, however, that the execution of rubato in the nineteenth century was not based on the whims of the performers alone, but rather was subject to certain conventions. These were often specified by the composer in the score in ways which would be interpreted differently by contemporary performers, thus giving the effect of a departure from the score. Peres Da Costa cites the testimony of Fanny Davies, who heard Brahms”playing on a number of occasions, and reported that the sign „< >” was often used by Brahms to signify a hurrying and subsequent retarding of tempo in addition to the swell in dynamic that would typically be understood by performers today. (Off the Record, 263)
148 Peres Da Costa, p. 45. „Dislocation is described as a momentary separation between the left and right hands….The usual method is to delay a melody note in the right hand, placing it directly after the corresponding accompaniment note in the left hand. In fewer cases, the right hand precedes the left.” See: Off the Record, 45.
149 Ibid,195. „Small-scale alteration describes any rhythmic modification made to one or a few adjacent notes. Sometimes this causes adjacent notes of equal value to become significantly unequal by creating dotted or triplet figures and so on. At other times, dotter figures are, so to speak, ironed out into equal-note figures.”
150 Ibid, 252. Peres Da Costa also notes that „earlier pianists generally make larger and more noticeable changes from bar to bar, whereas pianists more recently make consistently far less variation.”
Wierzbilowicz also alters the rhythms notated in the score; for example, in bars 36 to 38 of the excerpt below, he plays the two quavers as a dotted quaver and semiquaver.

![Musical notation]

Figure 11: Romance sans Paroles, Karl Davydov, bars 33-40

**Analysis of Recordings 1920-1960**

The following section will examine the selected recordings in light of these observations about performance practices before 1920 and thus illustrate the shift in, and subsequent development of, cello performance practices between 1920 and 1960. Two main factors account for the recordings being heavily weighted towards the late end of the period 1920 to 1960. Firstly, the disruption of World War II temporarily suspended the careers of many musicians who were therefore unable to produce recordings until the end of the war in 1945. Secondly, due to the favouring of violinists and pianists for contracts with major recording companies especially at the beginning of the twentieth century, the bulk of early cello recordings consist largely of short, „salon“ works with a relative paucity of „serious“, multi-movement repertoire that would permit a more comprehensive comparison. Nonetheless, the performers whose recordings are presented here were all prominent and active orchestral, chamber and solo artists throughout the period 1920 to 1960, whose playing style was formed and consolidated during this time.

**Vibrato and Tone**

As written sources suggest, performers vary the width and intensity of their vibrato in accordance with dynamic as well as the emotional and harmonic context of the passage being played. However, the use of vibrato in relation to dynamic contradicts Alexanian’s recommendations for a „spaced and supple“ vibrato for a piano dynamic and a „rapid and nervous“ vibrato for a forte dynamic. Instead, performers generally increase the width and speed of vibrato as the dynamic increases. This is especially evident in Cassado’s (1950s)\(^{151}\) performance of the second subject in the Dvořák.\(^{152}\)

\(^{151}\) See Appendix A for explanation of date.
This is also relative to each performer’s overall style of vibrato. For example, in the Dvořák, vibrato generally becomes increasingly wider and slower when recordings are arranged by the age of the performer rather than chronologically. Cellists born before 1910 such as Casals, Mainardi, Feuermann, Kurtz, Piatigorsky generally employ narrower vibrato when compared with their younger contemporaries, such as Rostropovich, Janigro, and Navarra.¹⁵³

The absence of vibrato is also used as an effect in passages of least harmonic tension, as recommended by written sources. Amongst all performers, there is also a tendency to omit vibrato at the ends of phrases, on weak beats or notes which resolve suspensions or cadences. However, it is difficult to identify chronological trends as to the extent to which this occurs. For example, in the excerpt shown below, open strings and harmonics are used most extensively by Casals (1937),¹⁵⁴ followed by some of the later recordings of the period by Rose (1945) and Navarra (1954). During this period the most continuous vibrato is heard in the playing of Cassadó (1935 and 1950s), Mainardi (1955) and Feuermann (1929).¹⁵⁵

![Figure 12: Dvořák, bars 136-157](image)

Whilst the scope of the present study does not permit a detailed analysis of the use of bowing nuances in the selected recordings, it is valuable to briefly identify some of the trends which emerged regarding its use. Recordings of the excerpt of the Bach Bourrée below illustrate a chronological trend towards more variation in articulation and

¹⁵² See Track 1, 5:40.
¹⁵³ Compare especially Feuermann’s vibrato (Track 2, 4:35) with Rose’s (Track 3, 5:10).
¹⁵⁴ See Track 4, 5:00.
¹⁵⁵ See Mainardi (1955), Track 5, 5:50.
dynamics. Slurs become more sustained and legato playing is more common in later performances. Later performances also feature more emphatic accentuation of strong beats especially of the last chord which is sustained. This is particularly evident when comparing Casals’ (1938) interpretation of the passage\textsuperscript{156} with Janigro’s (1954).\textsuperscript{157}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure13.png}
\caption{Bourrée I, bars 21-28}
\end{figure}

However, whilst this may be interpreted as a change in the prioritisation of different expressive devices, advances in recording technology which allowed the representation of articulations and dynamics with increasing accuracy may have also influenced interpretive decisions.

**Portamento**

**Style and Frequency of Portamenti**

Tables 1a and 1b compare the number, type and direction of portamento in recordings of the Beethoven and Dvořák respectively. Consistent with writings on the subject of portamento in both general instrumental and cello performance practices, and in particular, with Leech-Wilkinson’s observations of portamento following the Second World War,\textsuperscript{158} the frequency of portamenti declines throughout the period with a marked difference after 1945.\textsuperscript{159} This trend is most obvious in the Beethoven, for which the earliest recording by Casals (1930) reveals 19 portamenti, whereas the latest recording by Janigro (1953) contains only seven. However, a chronological decline in the number of portamenti is unclear in the Dvořák, with extensive and also sparing portamento used at opposing ends of the period. The fewest portamenti are used by Starker (1956), Mainardi (1955) and Cassadó (1950s) and Feuermann (1929) whilst the largest number is used by Rose (1945) and Piatigorsky (1946).

Multiple recordings by the same performer reveal a more consistent decline in the use of portamento. In the Beethoven, Casals reduces his number of portamenti from 19 in 1930

\textsuperscript{156} See Track 6, 1:10.
\textsuperscript{157} See Track 7, 57: 35.
\textsuperscript{158} See footnote 72.
\textsuperscript{159} The continuous, scalic motion and occasional polyphonic writing of the Bach makes it unsuitable for the application of portamento and thus it is omitted in this section of analysis.
to 12 in 1958. In the Dvořák, Cassadó’s 1935 recording contains 19 portamenti, while the number is drastically reduced in his second recording, which contains only five. Piatigorsky, who is one of the most liberal employers of portamento in both his recordings, similarly reduces the number of portamenti from 32 in 1946 to 24 in 1960. However, Fournier is an exception: he increases the number of portamenti from 18 in 1949 to 31 in 1954.

There is also a departure in later recordings from the old style of portamento observed in pre-1920 recordings. Recordings after 1945 reveal much faster portamenti which are not emphasised by a deceleration of tempo or agogic accents, and which also tend to occur on a new bow stroke. These factors contribute to a subtler, cleaner and more delicate use of the device than is evident in earlier recordings; indeed, in the case of recordings of the Dvořák by Nelsova (1951) and Janigro (1955),

160 it is unclear whether some slides are intended as a portamento at all or if they are merely audible slides when executing necessary shifting between positions. Individuals also favour different types and directions of portamenti. The ascending single-fingered slide is favoured by all performers except Navarra and Fournier, who generally favour descending portamento.

Use and Placement of Portamento

Tables 2a and 2b reveal some uniformity in the way performers use portamento in each work. For example, the excerpt of the Beethoven shown in Table 2b reveals that all performers, except Feuermann (1937), use portamento in bar 140. In the Bach which, as mentioned previously offers little opportunity for portamento, some portamenti are used in Bourrée II, again, with uniform placement. Rose (1947) and Feuermann (1939) both place a portamento between the E flat in bar 8 and the repeat of bar 1 and between the C and D in bar 22, shown respectively in the excerpts below.

![Figure 14: Bourrée II, bar 22-24](image)

160 See Janigro (1955), Track 1, 5:25.
Figure 15: Bourrée II, bar 6-8

Rose’s portamenti are faster and subtler than Feuermann who employs a relatively slow single finger slide. This contradicts Feuermann’s own advice that “[s]mall slides, ritardandi and crescendo” are better suited to the serenade or air but “have no place in a composition by Bach or Beethoven.”

Feuermann’s use of rubato in the Bach is also at odds with this statement and this has implications for how recorded evidence regarding the employment of such expressive devices should be regarded by present-day scholars. This will be discussed in the following section.

Performers consistently colour certain intervals in the Dvořák; however, there is also the greatest variety in the placement of portamento in this work, perhaps due to the prevailing attitude that permitted a greater degree of personal expression in Romantic music than in Bach or Beethoven. As shown in Table 2b, portamento is consistently applied by all performers in bars 136 and 137. However, from bars 150 to 157, no two performers apply portamento in the same way. Elsewhere in the movement, Navarra (1954) is especially original in his placement of portamenti; for example, he is the only performer to use portamento from the E to the B flat in bar 191, shown below, and when the motif returns in bar 318.

Figure 16; Dvořák, bar 191-192

Tempo Modification

Tables 3a to 3c allow comparison between different metronome speeds for structurally significant bars in each work. The extent to which performers subscribed to the Modernist notion of text fidelity is evident in their adherence to metronome marks present in the scores. Again, recordings of the Dvořák display the greatest individuality

---

161 Morreau, Emanuel Feuermann, 277.
162 See Track 2, 7:25 and 12:40
of tempi, with none of the performers adhering to the metronome markings present in the only scores which were available to performers during this time: the first edition published by Simrock (1896)\textsuperscript{163} and a later edition by SNKLHU (1955).\textsuperscript{164} Feuermann’s recording (1929) is the closest to these markings; however his performance is extremely fast compared to the other performers, suggesting that these tempi were aberrant, and not representative of performance traditions of the Dvořák. In the original score, the second subject and development are marked the same tempo (crochet=100) and this is adhered to by most performers within a deviation of ten points, faster or slower. Navarra (1954) has the most deviation between his tempi for the two sections: he has both the fastest tempo of all performers in bar 140 at 96 and the slowest in bar 224 at 61.

Not surprisingly, recordings of the Bach again display the least deviation in tempi. Cassadó’s recording is distinctive for its similarity in average tempo to Casals, suggesting his indebtedness to Casals” mentorship and legacy of recording and popularising the Suites.

Recordings of the Beethoven exhibit the most similarity in choice of tempi, with the fastest and slowest average speeds within 13 points of each other: Fournier (1947) plays at the fastest average speed of 65 and Casals (1958) plays at the slowest average speed of 52.\textsuperscript{165}

**Tempo Flexibility and Rhythmic Alteration**

Many of the key characteristics of late nineteenth-century rubato are absent in these recordings. Rhythmic alteration is generally uncommon, although Casals infrequently plays quavers unequally, for example in the second subject of the Dvořák at bar 143, shown in Figure 4. In later recordings, Fournier (1954), Rostropovich (1952) and Starker (1956) lengthen the semiquavers of the first subject.\textsuperscript{166} By contrast, Piatigorsky (1946) plays the semiquavers unequally in the first phrase and lengthens them in the second.\textsuperscript{167} There is also a general absence of dislocation with a few exceptions. For

\textsuperscript{165} Metronome speeds in the Beethoven refer to minim beat (e.g.: minim=65).
\textsuperscript{166} See Fournier (1954) Track 1, 3:50, Rostropovich (1952), Track 2, 3:25, Starker (1956), Track 3, 3:30.
\textsuperscript{167} See Track 4, 3:30.
example, Piatigorsky (1946) uses the device in the second subject of the Dvořák, most notably in bars 150 to 156 shown in Figure 4 on page 34.\textsuperscript{168}

Dislocation occurs most extensively in Casals’ recording of the Beethoven with Alfred Cortot (1958). While it should be noted that both Cortot and Casals were both in their eighties at the time of the recording and this may partially account for the lack of ensemble precision, many instances of dislocation between the two performers appear to be deliberate, such as in the second subject, shown below, in which the melody is played out of time; Casals and Cortot synchronise the end of the phrase.\textsuperscript{169}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure9.png}
\caption{Beethoven, bars 38-50}
\end{figure}

In contrast, the same passage is played with far more ensemble precision in Casals’ earlier recordings with Otto Schulhof (1930)\textsuperscript{170} and Rudolph Serkin (1953).\textsuperscript{171} The differences in interpretation between Casals’ three recordings highlights the likelihood that factors other than aesthetic change may have impacted on cellists’ performance practices, such as the mutual influence of co-performers in chamber music situations.

Nonetheless, such exceptions are at odds with the use of rubato in the majority of recordings analysed here, which is characterised by its considered rather than apparently spontaneous application. For example, the analysis of the Beethoven, shown in Table 4b, illustrates, in all performances, an accelerando towards bar 40 and a ritardando in

\begin{footnotesize}\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{168} See Track 4, 6:00.
\item \textsuperscript{169} See Track 7, 1:35.
\item \textsuperscript{170} See Track 5, 1:30.
\item \textsuperscript{171} See Track 6, 1:25.
\end{enumerate}\end{footnotesize}
bar 45 which is also the longest bar in the excerpt. The most restrained use of rubato is reserved for the Bach, followed by the Beethoven and the least restrained is in the Dvořák. This is consistent with trends in portamento already observed and reflects the goal of more „objective” performance of music of the Baroque and Classical eras. The presence of tempo flexibility in all examples shown in Tables 4a to 4b also indicates a degree of reading „beyond the score” as is recommended by most cellists and noted in Chapter Three, since there are few printed directions for rubato; for example, the decelerations played by all performers in bar 143 of the Dvořák and bar 41 of the Beethoven are not indicated in the scores.

However, whilst there is a uniform use of the modern style of rubato, chronological trends regarding the extent to which it is employed are, again, less obvious. For example, the most restrained uses of rubato in performances of the Dvořák are by Feuermann (1929), Fournier (1949, 1954, 1961) and Casals (1937); but these are spread throughout the period. Furthermore, whilst some performers demonstrate predictable tendencies within their own recorded output, others vary widely in their use of rubato in each work. For example, across all three works, Cassadó (Bach 1957, Dvořák 1935, 1950s) consistently demonstrates the most extensive deceleration whilst Fournier (Bach 1962, Beethoven 1947, Dvořák 1946, 1954) is generally the most restrained. However, Casals demonstrates the most extensive rubato in the Beethoven (1930, 1953 and 1958) and Bach (1938, 1955) but is the most restrained in the Dvořák (1937).

Anomalies such as this sometimes contradict views about rubato expressed by the performers themselves. For example, Piatigorsky’s performance (1946) is more restrained in the Bach than that of Feuermann (1939) despite a far more restrictive view held by Feuermann than Piatigorsky regarding personal expression, as discussed in the previous chapter. This may explain Feuermann’s dissatisfaction with his own interpretation of the Bach Suites and, as George Neikrug recalls, his reluctance to include them in recitals:

In general, he kind of felt he had to do Bach, but he didn’t have that great affinity for it and he wasn’t secure in the fact that he knew exactly what to do with it…

Greenhouse and Nelsova similarly caution against judging Casals by his recordings since he often exaggerated his interpretation in ways which were uncharacteristic of his

---

172 See Janigro (1953), Track 8, 1:50
173 See Track 9, 0:00
174 Morreau, Emanuel Feuermann, 334.
live performances. The discrepancy between Feuermann’s views on the ideal interpretation of Bach and his recorded performance has implications for how recorded evidence should be evaluated. As with Casals and Cortot’s recording, it highlights that recorded performances were influenced by a variety of factors that may have conflicted with the individually expressed views of these performers and their ideal interpretation of these works, and indeed may not actually represent how they played in live performance.

**Conclusions**

Recordings reveal some trends which support the views of the performers themselves as discussed in Chapter 3, as well as broader observations regarding general instrumental performance practices discussed in Chapter Two. The Modernist perception of early music as deserving of the most „objective“ treatment is evident in the observation that the most restrained use of portamento and rubato occurs in performances of the Bach, whilst the most individual use of these devices is reserved for the recordings of the Dvořák. The increased significance of the bow as a means of expression is also evident especially in the latest recordings, which compensate expressively for the lack of portamento with varied articulation and a more extensive dynamic range. However, inconsistencies of style between multiple recordings by the same performer suggest that factors other than the changing aesthetic values discussed in previous chapters may have been influential. Furthermore, traits of the new and old styles co-exist in recordings by the same performer: for example, Fournier is consistently restrained in his use of rubato but comparatively liberal with his use of portamento across his recordings from 1947 to 1962. Reviews of these performances allow for the contextualisation of cello performance practices within the broader trends of general instrumental practices, and also offer further information about the aesthetic changes which occurred during the period. This will be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 5:  

Cello Performance Practices in Context

An examination of the critical reception of cello playing during the period is important in placing cello performance practices in the context of general instrumental practices of the time. This chapter will survey reviews of the recordings analysed above, as well as reviews of recitals given by the performers who are represented in this group of recordings and other prominent performers who are not. While an attempt has been made to collate reviews from a variety of sources, the majority of these are necessarily taken from English language publications. The main publications which have been consulted are *The Gramophone*, *The New York Times* and *The Musical Times*. Other reviews are translations extracted from biographies of the performers.

Not surprisingly in this era, most critics emphasise the importance of the balance between technique and emotional expression. Casals’ playing was the standard by which cellists were often measured and he is often praised for achieving this. For example, in 1925, the conservative yet influential music critic Olin Downes describes Casals in recital as:

…a consummate master of his instrument, as well as a consummate musician in his profound intelligence and knowledge, his musical feeling, his exquisite taste, his purity of style, his repose and authority.\(^{177}\)

Bernard Shore disapproves of the trend in violin playing “to worship sheer technical brilliance at the expense of emotional power, imagination and the art of colouring and tone” but similarly distinguishes Casals from all string players for his “peerless interpretive genius.”\(^{178}\) Furthermore, critics are less forgiving of the lack of expression in performances than of technical inaccuracies. For example, Feuermann is often singled out in reviews for his virtuosity; however despite this, his live recording of the Bach in 1939 is heavily criticised by Downes for being monotonous and unimaginative:

The phrases were performed accurately and well, but they had little distinction, either of curve or tone quality. The power of this music must lie in the interest of its line and the grandness of its


phrases. As played last night, it was a workmanlike job, but not a great one or one that added anything to the evening.\textsuperscript{179}

In a letter to Carl Flesch, Hugo Becker similarly criticises Feuermann’s interpretation of the Schumann Concerto for being “technically excellent but unromantic as can be” and wholly lacking in “feeling and spirit…If he were a pianist or violinist, the public would never forgive him.”\textsuperscript{180} By contrast, Becker applauds another of his former students, Piatigorsky, for possessing both technique and “romantic feeling.”\textsuperscript{181} Similarly, Mainardi’s recording of Dvořák’s concerto, which is most distinctive for its minimal portamento, is attacked for being merely a reproduction of the score: “correct and dull.”\textsuperscript{182}

Consistent with the preference for the balance of technique and expression, critics recognise the co-existence of both Modernist and Romantic performing styles. For example, in 1925 Paul Bechert identifies two emerging cellists of equal merit but opposing approaches to interpretation. He classifies Marits Frank as “…the modern and intellectual type – the artist who steps modestly behind the composer’s work.” Bechert casts Cassadó as Frank’s “antipode”, implying Cassadó’s interpretations were more personal and thus more Romantic.\textsuperscript{183}

However, the previous chapter also shows that the style of performers deemed “romantic” by critics was vastly different to that of cellists represented in recordings before 1920; hence the definition of the term “romantic” had, by the time of these reviews, assumed a different meaning. Cassadó’s romanticism is praised again in his 1935 recording of the Dvořák. The reviewer describes the first movement as a “romantic heart on-sleeve emotional spell, in which anything may happen.”\textsuperscript{184} Cassadó’s undeniably expressive performance relies on the imaginative use of the bow and vibrato rather than portamento. His rubato features the most extreme acceleration and decelerations of the recordings analysed. This may be what both reviews referred to.


\textsuperscript{180}King, \textit{Gregor Piatigorsky}, 28.

\textsuperscript{181}Ibid.


when classifying his style as „romantic“. However, the considered shaping of his phrasing indicates an analytical approach at work, in contrast to the spontaneous and impulsive rubato advocated by the late-Romantic aesthetic and exemplified in the playing of Herbert and Gruppe, discussed above. Later reviews show an even more limited definition of the term „romantic“. Janigro, whose rubato is more restrained than that of Cassadó’s, is criticised for „romanticising” Haydn’s Concerto No.1, but praised for applying the same approach more appropriately to Dvořák’s concerto:

...here he more than makes amends by exercising these poetical qualities in a work that richly responds to them. He brings feeling and shape to every phrase of the solo part, as well as a technique that can apparently take the considerable strain without audibly wilting.\(^\text{185}\)

The reception of Janigro’s Dvořák also indicates a preference for greater objectivity in the interpretation of early music. Whilst critics generally refrain from comment on vibrato and portamento, they particularly recommend the restraint of rubato for performances of Classical and Baroque works. Janigro’s 1953 recording of Haydn’s Concerto No. 2 is criticised for its rhythmic flexibility which the reviewer deemed to be ill-suited to the „appropriate eighteenth century style“: “Haydn didn’t intend every passage of triplets to be the green light for a change of tempo.”\(^\text{186}\) The objective interpretation of early music is further supported by Downes’ review of a recital by Felix Salmond which commends Salmond’s fidelity to the composer’s intentions, especially in his performance of the earliest work on the programme, Beethoven’s Sonata No. 2. Downes writes that Salmond’s interpretation of the Sonata, „sufficed for any music lover to realize the scruple and fidelity of the performer to the letter of the score.”\(^\text{187}\) Overall, Downes compliments the „personal quality of the tone and interpretation of this musician” but follows with the disclaimer that

\[ \text{[i]t is not to be inferred from the foregoing that he imposes his personal interpretation upon his audience at the expense of the conception of the composer, which is much too often the case in this period of much vaunted self-expression.} \]


This reflects the dominant aesthetic of the time, discussed in Chapter One, which prioritised objectivity and the expression of the composer’s intentions over the performer’s own emotions.

Restraint of rubato is especially recommended for performances of Bach’s music. Fournier is deemed “the ideal Bach player” by Howard Klein for his smooth tone and slow tempos, which “allow expressive nuances” but are “strict and unrelenting.”\textsuperscript{188} Similarly, a live performance by Casals of the Bach Suites in 1930 is praised above interpretations of Bach’s music by violinists Ysaïe and Kreisler for Casals’ “strict and continuous control of rhythm” which the reviewer considers to be more stylistically appropriate:

As an interpreter of Bach, Casals stands supreme. No other great violinist or cellist exploits quite the same marvellous range of tone without affecting the noble character of Bach’s music. Ysaïe’s readings were wonderful but just a shade too ardent for so cool a composer. Kreisler makes him too elegant and so detracts something from its solidity...\textsuperscript{189}

Indeed, Casals’ restrained interpretation of the Bach represents the benchmark by which most performers are measured. Mainardi’s recording which is freer in rubato is classified “romantic” by the reviewer and suffers in comparison:

We meet here romantic rather than classical playing of the Bach unaccompanied Suites….So much of the great and endearing qualities that have made Casals a unique figure are lacking here; but one does not seek to belittle Mainardi’s stature by setting him alongside a giant and blaming him for the other’s size.\textsuperscript{190}

Reviews of cellists’ recordings during this time, as well as the recordings themselves, also reflect a blend of Romantic and Modernist styles of performance. In fact, rather than being definitively allied to either style, the most favourable reviews are reserved for those performances which balance emotional expression and technical facility. Emotional expression is also seen as vital, with inexpressive, “objective” performances being the most negatively received. Recordings also illustrate the myriad of individual performance styles which existed during the period; however, once again, critics recognise their co-existence and give equal merit to opposing styles which balance technical prowess and emotional expression. The term “romantic” comes to be

synonymous with a free use of rubato, rather than with sentimentality or exaggeration, and is associated with this more than any other expressive device. Furthermore, whilst it is criticised as a quality in the performance of early music, it is welcomed in the interpretation of music of the nineteenth century.
CONCLUSIONS

Written sources from 1920 to 1960 reveal a turbulent period of aesthetic change during which scholars, audiences and performers engaged in polemical discussions about the current and future state of artistic expression. Performers and critics who declared Romanticism obsolete reflected this change through a prioritisation of technical accuracy and abandonment of personal expression, thus aiming to achieve ultimate fidelity to the printed score. However, the general public was largely unreceptive to these changing aesthetic values and thus the performer was required to strike a compromise between the duty to realise the composer’s intentions and the practical need to attract audiences and appeal to them.

For cellists, this balance was perhaps the most successfully achieved in the playing and philosophy of Pablo Casals, whose technique and musicianship earned unanimous acclaim from audiences, performers and critics alike. Rather than subscribing definitively to the Romantic or Modernist aesthetic, Casals aimed to combine the two schools of thought, and this compromise perhaps accounts in part for his immense popularity. He also arguably had the greatest influence on cellists of the period and thus his ideas pervade literature on cello performance published throughout his lifetime. In fact, despite differing views regarding the role of the performer, the most common threads in sources by cellists consulted in this study echo his condemnation of militant objectivity, instead emphasising performance with restrained emotional expression.

Thus, for the most celebrated cellists, the departure from late nineteenth-century Romanticism was manifested in the transformation of the performer from the heroic virtuoso into being the interpreter of the composer’s vision. Ideally, however, this never occurred without emotional expression. In fact, the term “romantic” was never excluded from the vocabulary of critics; instead, it assumed new meaning as idioms of expression changed to suit the tastes and emotional climate of the time. Critics seemingly use the term to indicate when a performance is generally expressive rather than to denote any specific nineteenth-century performing practices. Wanda Landowska’s belief in the persistence of Romanticism in 1909 thus rings true: “Let us not say adieu, but au revoir to romanticism because soon it will come back adorned with new attractions and under a changed name.”

However, whilst literature discussed in Chapters One and Two emphasise the profundity of the impact of aesthetic change on performance practices, cello recordings of the period show that the practical realisation of music in performance was most likely influenced by a number of different factors. For example, inconsistencies in style of multiple recordings by the same cellist often contradict the views expressed verbally by the performers themselves. These may be accounted for by the impact of changes in recording technology, individual performer’s response to the recorded performance situation and the influence of the relationship between performers subscribing to differing aesthetic viewpoints in collaborative chamber music situations.

Such considerations represent directions for further research. Case studies might include, for example, the collaborative synthesis of the definitively Modernist violinist Jascha Heifetz with the Romantic-inclined style of Piatigorsky in several recordings made in the 1970s, such as the Brahms Double Concerto. The influence of violin pedagogy on cellists in the early twentieth century could also be investigated, for example, Feuermann’s contact with his brother’s violin teacher, Otakar Ševčík. Further study might also focus on the development of bowing technique and expression, which gained importance throughout the twentieth century, as well as the influence of advances in recording technology on performance practices.

The findings of the present study contribute to an understanding of the tensions between Romantic and Modernist aesthetics which continue to resound in performance practices beyond 1960 to the present day. Albert Jarosy’s concern in 1936 that the performer compromises personal expression in order to interpret music of a range of eras and styles is more relevant than ever, since present-day twenty-first-century performers are additionally required to realise the music of the past hundred years. As Haynes observes, the Modern style is still taught in conservatories worldwide,192 and whilst studies in historical performance attempt to counter the practice of applying this style indiscriminately to all eras of music, such studies ironically also promote the Modernist predisposition for intellectualism and interpretation through “objective” analysis. Additions made by performers to the score, notational and otherwise, are viewed with scepticism, as fidelity to the composer’s notated intentions is prioritised. An Australian review of the Borodin Quartet from October 2014 attests to this. The reviewer, Jennifer Gall, admires the Quartet’s rendering of a programme in which, “every finger placement

192 Ibid, 49.
and every bow stroke is dedicated to interpreting the composer’s intention faithfully.” In commending the restraint of their interpretation in which “there is no place for gestural flamboyance, assertive liberties with the tempo or improvisational departures from the score,” Gall’s criticism strongly recalls Downes’ review of Felix Salmond in 1925, cited in Chapter Five.

Some aspects of the Romantic aesthetic also persisted beyond 1960 into present-day ideas about music. The emotionally charged and intensely personal playing of Jacqueline Du Pré represents yet another incarnation of the Romantic aesthetic. Furthermore, the public reception of Du Pré’s playing and her elevation to celebrity status is reminiscent of the similar treatment afforded to Casals, reflecting in both cases the Romantic conception of the heroic virtuoso. Haynes also observes a number of Romantic ideas in music performance today, such as the formation of an untouchable “canon” of repertoire impenetrable by lesser known composers of the past or present, and the ritualization of performance.

The lasting presence of these influences has several implications for the ways in which performers reflect on the practices of today as well as of the past century. For cellists, the lineages from present-day performers to early twentieth-century figures remain unbroken, thus the present study offers insight into the philosophies which have since been inherited. In addition, performers of the period between 1920 and 1960 reimagined early music to suit the kind of objectivity valued in their own era, and in doing so, robbed that music of much of its inherent emotionalism. This also highlights philosophical issues for present-day performers regarding historically informed performance practice. To avoid repeating the mistakes of our predecessors, it is therefore important to address the influences, inherited consciously or not, of our own emotional climate, and performers should be wary of projecting a modern bias onto music of the past. The changing definition of the term “Romantic” discussed above highlights this importance of recognising that whilst some ideas regarding interpretation

---


194 Du Pré’s obituary in The New York Times (20 October 1987) notes the common comparison of her professional and personal relationship with Daniel Barenboim with Robert and Clara Schumann, the “poster couple” of the late nineteenth century. The article also quotes a review by Harold C. Schonberg stating that her playing was of a “modern vein”, but crucially contained “a good measure of romanticism without the romantic string mannerisms of portamento….”

195 Haynes, The End of Early Music, 68.
and emotional expression may recur throughout history, each reappearance occurs on a different world stage as the result of multiple influences and replete with a new expressive language. Robert Wolf summarises this idea astutely:

> It is important to appreciate the continuity of time, the continuous interpenetration of conceptions across the ages. Certain ideas and attitudes appear as actors upon a constantly shifting scene; unless we are attentive we fail to note that the play has changed and the actor’s play a new role, subtly but surely different as he now acts with new actors in a new setting.\(^{196}\)

For performers, these ideas should be therefore interpreted in light of both the „new roles” which they play and the „new settings” in which they occur. From this perspective, the present study is also important in informing the performance of Modernist music by contributing to an understanding of the spirit and context in which such music was conceived.

However, just as advances in technique in the early twentieth century formed the foundation of modern cello performance practices, present-day studies in historical performance practice have facilitated the rediscovery and revival of outlawed practices, which in turn influence the unprecedented plethora of styles which exist today. Performers today should aim not only to reimagine past styles, but also consider the constantly evolving nature of performance practices and the broader question of what they may take away from or contribute to existing traditions.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: List of Analysed Recordings

Pre-1920 Recordings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cellist/Pianist or Orchestra</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.V Wierzbilowicz/?</td>
<td>Romance sans Paroles</td>
<td>Karl Davidoff</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Whitehouse/?/Edward Lloyd, tenor</td>
<td>Sing me to Sleep</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Newberry/?</td>
<td>Spinnelied</td>
<td>David Popper</td>
<td>c. 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo Becker/?</td>
<td>Minuet</td>
<td>Hugo Becker</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August van Biene/?</td>
<td>The Broken Melody</td>
<td>August van Biene</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludwig Lebell/John Bull</td>
<td>Ständchen</td>
<td>Franz Schubert</td>
<td>c. 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barbirolli/ Rosa Barbirolli</td>
<td>The Broken Melody</td>
<td>August van Biene</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Herbert/Rosario Bourdon</td>
<td>Petite Valse</td>
<td>Victor Herbert</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Abbas/?</td>
<td>Elfentanz</td>
<td>David Popper</td>
<td>c. 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paolo Gruppe/Hans van der Burg</td>
<td>Rondo in G minor, Op. 94</td>
<td>Antonin Dvořák</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablo Casals/?</td>
<td>Träumerei from Kinderszenen Op. 15 No. 7</td>
<td>Franz Schubert (arr. for cello and orchestra)</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals/Albert Baker</td>
<td>Serenade (Spanish Dance No. 2)</td>
<td>David Popper</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich Kruse</td>
<td>Fantasie über Sehnsucht</td>
<td>Robert Schumann</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Hollman/?</td>
<td>Ave Maria, Op. 52 No. 6</td>
<td>Franz Schubert</td>
<td>c. 1916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-1920 Recordings

**Johann Sebastian Bach, Bourrées I and II from Suite No. 3 in C major**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Record Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casals</td>
<td>1938197</td>
<td>His Master’s Voice (H.M.V.)198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuel Feuermann</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Live Recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregor Piatigorsky</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Excerpt from the film Carnegie Hall (1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Rose199</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrico Mainardi</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Decca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Janigro</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

197 Casals recorded the Bach Suites over a period of four years however a specific date is not given for each Suite. However, The Gramophone reviews a release of the D minor and C major suites in 1938 and this is how the date shown above was concluded.

198 The label „His Master’s Voice“ will hereafter be referred to by the initials „H.M.V."

199 The recording analysed was extracted from a compilation CD titled Leonard Rose: Soloist. Whilst there is no mentioned of the recording other than in relation to this CD, analysis shows consistencies in style with recordings of the Dvořák and Beethoven which have been clearly attributed to Rose.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Record Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zara Nelsova</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Decca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Live Recording, (Casals Festival, Prades)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaspar Cassadó</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>H.M.V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Fournier</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>DGG Archive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ludwig van Beethoven 1\(^{st}\) movement of Sonata in A major, Op. 69, No. 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Pianist</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Record Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casals</td>
<td>Otto Schulhof</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>H.M.V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feuermann</td>
<td>Myra Hess</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>Artur Schnabel</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>H.M.V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janigro</td>
<td>Carlo Zecchi</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals</td>
<td>Rudolph Serkin</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Live Recording (Casals Festival, Prades)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsova</td>
<td>Artur Balsam</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Decca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals</td>
<td>Alfred Cortot</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Live Recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Glen Gould</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Live Recording</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Antonín Dvořák 1\(^{st}\) movement of Cello Concerto in B minor, Op. 104, B.191**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Orchestra/Conductor</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Record Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feuermann</td>
<td>Berlin State Opera Orchestra/ Michael Taube</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Parlophone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassadó</td>
<td>Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra/ Hans Schmidt- Isserstedt</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Telefunken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals</td>
<td>Czech Philharmonic Orchestra/ George Szell</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>H.M.V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Kurtz</td>
<td>NBC Symphony Orchestra/ Arturo Toscanini</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Live Broadcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Philadelphia Orchestra/ Eugene Ormandy</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Live Broadcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piatigorsky</td>
<td>Philadelphia Orchestra/ Eugene Ormandy</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/ Rafael Kubelik</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>H.M.V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Orchestra/Musician</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassadó</td>
<td>Pro Musica Vienna/ Jonel Perlea</td>
<td>195?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsova</td>
<td>London Symphony Orchestra/ Josef Krips</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Decca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mstislav Rostropovich</td>
<td>Czech Philharmonic Orchestra/ Vaclav Talich</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>H.M.V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janigro</td>
<td>Cologne Radio Symphony Orchestra/ Erich Kleiber</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Live Recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>NHK Symphony Orchestra/ Nikolaus Aeschbacher</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Live Recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>André Navarra</td>
<td>New Symphony Orchestra of London/ Rudolph Schwartz</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Capitol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainardi</td>
<td>Berlin Symphony Orchestra/ Fritz Lehmann</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Deutsche Gramophone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Tortelier</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/ Sir Malcolm Sargent</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>H.M.V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janos Starker</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/ Walter Susskind</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piatigorsky</td>
<td>Boston Symphony Orchestra/ Charles Münch</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>R.C. A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

200 A recording by Perlea and Cassadó is cited in the Gramophone for comparison with Rostropovich’s 1952 recording of the Dvořák; however either the same record or a later one with the same conductor and orchestra is advertised for release in 1964. Cassadó’s second recording of the Dvořák after 1935 is not reviewed. Neither is any mention made by The Gramophone of a third recording by Cassadó in 1951 with the Austrian Symphony Orchestra under Kurt Woss. This was later released on the Forgotten Records. The recording which was used for analysis was accessed via YouTube where it was labelled as being produced in the 1950s, but no specific date was given.

201 Janigro also made an earlier recording in 1953 which is reviewed in The Gramophone with the Vienna State Opera under Dean Dixon. The 1955 recording which was analysed was accessed via YouTube but can also be found on a recent release by Archipel.
APPENDIX B: List of Recorded Examples

YouTube Playlists containing recorded examples referred to in the main thesis can be accessed from the following links:

‘Thesis Recorded Examples: Vibrato and Tone’

https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL0wzHDol9fTJrYETaXvlxuv_6xBQlChR8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track No.</th>
<th>Video Title</th>
<th>Work, Performer (Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>„Gaspar Cassadó plays Dvorak Cello Concerto in B minor op.104 1mov.wmv”</td>
<td>Dvořák, Cassadó (1950s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>„Emanuel Feuermann &quot;Cello Concerto&quot; Dvorak (1. Mov.)”</td>
<td>Dvořák, Feuermann (1929)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>„Leonard Rose - Dvorak Cello Concerto op. 104 mov. 1”</td>
<td>Dvořák, Rose (1945)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>„Pablo Casals: Dvorak Cello Concerto - 1st mvt. (1/2)”</td>
<td>Dvořák, Casals (1937)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>„Enrico Mainardi &quot;Cello Concerto&quot; Dvorak (1. Mov.), Video clip (2012)”</td>
<td>Dvořák, Mainardi (1955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>„Casals plays Bach's Suite n.3 in C major BWV 1009 - V. Bourrées I and II”</td>
<td>Bach, Casals (1938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>„J.S. Bach - Suites for cello solo - Antonio Janigro (1954)”</td>
<td>Bach, Janigro (1954),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Thesis Recorded Examples: Portamento’

https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL0wzHDol9fTJzZN5pk_yFsHzzkWduE6Ds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track No.</th>
<th>Video Title</th>
<th>Work, Performer (Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>„Antonio Janigro &quot;Cello Concerto&quot; Dvorak (1.Mov.)”</td>
<td>Dvořák, Janigro (1955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>„André Navarra &quot;Cello Concerto&quot; Dvorak (1. Mov.)”</td>
<td>Dvořák, Navarra (1954)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>„Gaspar Cassadó plays Dvorak Cello Concerto in B minor op.104 1mov.wmv”</td>
<td>Dvořák, Cassadó (1950s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Enrico Mainardi "Cello Concerto" Dvorak (1. Mov.), Video clip (2012)."

Dvořák, Mainardi (1955)

‘Thesis Recorded Examples: Rubato’

https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL0wzHDol9fTKO6LP_nfUGMwbKUbcsw034

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track No.</th>
<th>Video Title</th>
<th>Work, Performer (Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>„Pierre Fournier plays Dvořák 1stMovement part1”</td>
<td>Dvořák, Fournier (1954)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>„Mstislav Rostropovich &quot;Cello Concerto&quot; Dvorak (1. Mov.)”</td>
<td>Dvořák, Rostropovich (1952)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>„Janos Starker &quot;Cello Concerto&quot; Dvorak (1. Mov.)”</td>
<td>Dvořák, Starker, (1956)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>„Gregor Piatigorsky &quot;Cello Concerto &quot; Dvorak (1. Mov.)”</td>
<td>Dvořák, Piatigorsky (1946)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>„Ludwig van Beethoven - Cello Sonata No. 3 in A major Op. 69 - I. Allegro ma non tanto (HR)”</td>
<td>Beethoven, Casals (1930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>„Casals Serkin Beethoven Cello Sonata No.3 in A Op.69”</td>
<td>Beethoven, Casals (1951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>„Cortot Last Concert: Cortot &amp; Casals Beethoven Sonata op.69”</td>
<td>Beethoven, Casals (1958)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>„Beethoven Cello Sonata No 3, Janigro, Cello”</td>
<td>Beethoven, Janigro (1953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>„Gregor Piatigorsky plays Bach Bourees”</td>
<td>Bach, Piatigorsky (1946)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: Recording Analysis Tables

Portamento

Table 1a: Number of each type of portamento, Beethoven, Sonata in A major, Op. 69, No. 3, 1st movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Up (Same note)</th>
<th>Down</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1930)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feuermann (1937)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier (1947)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1953)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janigro (1953)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsova (1956)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1958)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (1960)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1b: Number and type of portamento: Dvořák, Cello Concerto in B minor, Op. 104, B.191, 1st movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Up (Same note)</th>
<th>Down</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feuermann (1928)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassadó (1935)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1937)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (1945)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtz (1945)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piatigorsky (1946)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier (1949)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassadó (1950s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsova (1951)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rostropovich (1952)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use and Placement of Portamento

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Single Finger Slide</th>
<th>B Portamento</th>
<th>L Portamento</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janigro (1953)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier (1954)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarra (1954)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainardi (1955)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starker (1956)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortelier (1956)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piatigorsky (1960)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier (1962)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (1964)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2a: Use and Placement of Portamento: Beethoven, Sonata in A major, Op. 69, No. 3, 1st movement, bars 140-164**

202 „[Flesch] examines the methods of achieving a portamento, and distinguishes between three basic types:

1. An uninterrupted slide on one finger [single finger slide]
2. A slide in which one finger slides from the starting note to an intermediate note, and a second finger stops the destination note [B portamento]
3. A slide in which one finger plays the starting note, and a second finger stops an intermediate note and slides to the destination note [L portamento].

Flesch calls the second method the „B portamento” and the third method the „L portamento”, after the „beginning and „last finger”…” See: Philip, p. 144.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casals  (1953)</th>
<th><img src="image1" alt="Sheet Music" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janigro (1953)</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Sheet Music" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsova (1956)</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Sheet Music" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1958)</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Sheet Music" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (1960)</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Sheet Music" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2b: Use and Placement of Portamento: Dvořák, Cello Concerto in B minor, Op. 104, B.191, 1st movement, bars 136-157**

<p>| Feuermann (1929) | <img src="image6" alt="Sheet Music" /> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piatigorsky</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassadó</td>
<td>1950s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsova</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sheet music for each performance is shown in the table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rostropovich (1952)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janigro (1953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarra (1954)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier (1954)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainardi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortelier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piatigorsky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Tempo Rubato**

**Tempo Modification**

**Table 3a: Tempo Modification: Bach, Bourrées I and II from Suite No. 3 in C major**

(MM=Minim beat)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Bourrée I MM</th>
<th>Bourrée II MM</th>
<th>Average MM Bourrée I&lt;sup&gt;203&lt;/sup&gt; (Bourrée II)</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1938)</td>
<td>80 (84) 80</td>
<td>80 (86) 84</td>
<td>75 (75)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feuer-mann (1939)</td>
<td>71 (75) 75</td>
<td>75 82</td>
<td>67 (63)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piatigor-sky (1947)</td>
<td>69 (69) 71</td>
<td>69 68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (1947)</td>
<td>86 (85) 80</td>
<td>83 (82) 81</td>
<td>68 (74)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainardi (1952)</td>
<td>60 (63) 60</td>
<td>63 (63) 63</td>
<td>63 (57)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janigro (1954)</td>
<td>71 (71) 71</td>
<td>71 (67) 71</td>
<td>67 (65)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsova (1955)</td>
<td>75 (74) 74</td>
<td>75 72</td>
<td>63 (64)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1955)</td>
<td>73 (75) 70</td>
<td>78 (72) 79</td>
<td>63 (64)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassadó (1957)</td>
<td>86 (86) 89</td>
<td>86 (86) 86</td>
<td>77 (79)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>203</sup> The average tempi of Bourrée I were calculated using the duration value of the first playing, rather than the Da Capo repeat.
Table 3b: Tempo Modification: Beethoven, Sonata in A major, Op. 69, No. 3, 1st movement (MM=minim)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Expos.</th>
<th>Repeat</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
<th>Coda</th>
<th>Average MM</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Subject Bar 1</td>
<td>Second Subject Bar 38</td>
<td>Development Bar 94</td>
<td>First Subject Bar 152</td>
<td>Second Subject Bar 175</td>
<td>Bar 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1930)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feuermann (1937)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier (1947)</td>
<td>64 63</td>
<td>75 74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1953)</td>
<td>55 59</td>
<td>65 62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janigro (1953)</td>
<td>47 51</td>
<td>59 58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsova (1956)</td>
<td>64 63</td>
<td>63 65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1958)</td>
<td>52 53</td>
<td>57 61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (1960)</td>
<td>61 64</td>
<td>67 64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3c: Tempo Modification: Dvořák, Cello Concerto in B minor, Op. 104, B.191, 1st movement (MM=Crochet)\(^{204}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>First Subject Bar</th>
<th>Second Subject Bar</th>
<th>Development Bar</th>
<th>Second Subject Bar</th>
<th>Coda Bar</th>
<th>Average MM</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feuermann</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1929)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassadó</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1935)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1937)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1945)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piatigorsky</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1946)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtz</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1945)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1949)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassadó</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1950s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsova</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1951)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rostropovich</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1952)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janigro</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1953)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1954)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarra</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1954)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainardi</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1955)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starker</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{204}\) "S" value refers to the metronome markings present in both the Simrock (1896) and SNKLHU (1955) editions of the score.
### Tempo Flexibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Bar 1</th>
<th>Bar 2</th>
<th>Bar 3</th>
<th>Bar 4</th>
<th>Bar 5</th>
<th>Bar 6</th>
<th>Bar 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1936-39)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feuermann (1939)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piatigorsky (1947)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (1947)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainardi (1952)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janigro (1954)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsova (1955)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1955)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassadó (1957)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier (1961)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4b: Tempo Flexibility, Beethoven, Sonata in A major, Op. 69, No. 3, 1\textsuperscript{st} movement, bars 38-45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Bar 38</th>
<th>Bar 39</th>
<th>Bar 40</th>
<th>Bar 41</th>
<th>Bar 42</th>
<th>Bar 43</th>
<th>Bar 44</th>
<th>Bar 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feuermann (1937)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1930)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier (1947)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1953)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janigro (1953)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsova (1956)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1958)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (1960)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4c: Tempo Flexibility: Dvořák, Cello Concerto in B minor, Op. 104, B.191, 1st movement, bars 140-146

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Bar 140</th>
<th>Bar 141</th>
<th>Bar 142</th>
<th>Bar 143</th>
<th>Bar 144</th>
<th>Bar 145-146&lt;sup&gt;205&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feuermann (1929)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassadó (1935)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casals (1937)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtz (1945)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (1945)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piatigorsky (1946)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier (1949)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassadó (1950s)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsova (1951)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rostropovich (1952)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janigro (1953)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier (1954)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarra (1954)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainardi (1955)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starker (1956)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortelier (1956)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piatigorsky (1960)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>205</sup> The last beat of bar 145 is tied to the first crochet beat of 146, making it difficult to ascertain the point at which bar 145 ends and 146 begins. Thus the two bars have been timed as one and a shade of grey has been allocated based on the halved value of the duration shown.
APPENDIX D: Diagram of Pedagogical Lineages