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INTRODUCTION

In 1817, at the height of his career, Paganini was invited to play in Vienna. This invitation was considered, by him, an important honor. Not only was it issued by the celebrated Count Metternich, but also, to play in Vienna, the centre of German musical culture, was the aspiration of every performing artist of the time.

Spohr was the accepted master of the German violin world and Paganini had many misgivings concerning the reception which might be accorded an Italian violinist with a strange, and hitherto unheard of, style. Spohr and Paganini had met in Venice and had not found themselves en rapport, musically. Spohr "... regarded the Italian School as superficial. He had an antipathy to harmonics and anything that had the slightest suggestion of trickery or studied effect. Paganini, on the contrary, regarded everything as legitimate that stirred the emotions." (1) Paganini was well aware of Spohr's great qualities as an artist, but he also was aware of his own unique power to stir an audience and felt some confidence in his ability to succeed in Vienna as he had throughout Italy. So, after a slight delay of eleven years, caused by ill health, marital difficulties, and business matters, he accepted Count...
Metternich's invitation and journeyed to Vienna. Then, instead of giving the one concert for which he was engaged, he was obliged to give twenty. In the vernacular of our day, he "wowed" the Viennese public. This public, by the way, included Franz Schubert, who according to contemporary accounts was much affected by Paganini's music and said to his friend Bauermannfeld that he had heard an angel sing. Castelli, one of the influential critics of the time, wrote in the "Theaterzeitung" - "... never has an artist caused such a great sensation within our walls as this God of the Violin."

Just one hundred years later a young Russian boy appeared on the American concert stage and created a sensation comparable to that which Paganini had aroused in Vienna a century earlier. This was, of course, Jascha Heifetz. The hundred years from Paganini to Heifetz encompass the entire history of virtuoso violin playing. Whether, during this time, violin technique developed, or whether it has merely changed to accommodate itself to changing conditions, is open to question. The purpose of this discussion is not to resolve this question, but to trace the course of the changing technique of playing and give credit to those forces which have been instrumental in bringing it about.
GROWTH OR CHANGE OF TECHNIQUE

In case there is doubt that some change in our technical approach to violin playing has occurred, consider Paganini appearing on our concert stage in a sudden and surprising reincarnation. One of his typical recitals would undoubtedly amuse, but bore, our musical public. Heifetz could undoubtedly duplicate a Paganini program but would not think of doing so. On the other hand, what would Paganini make of a program containing the Bach Chaconne, the Ravel Tsigane and a Bartok Rhapsodie?

It is doubtful if the human nervous system and its reflexes can have altered during this hundred years. Paganini had all the speed, dexterity, accuracy and endurance of which human anatomy is capable. Heifetz has these same qualities in a comparable degree. Yet the playing of the two has little in common. It is probable that Paganini would have been delighted with the playing of Heifetz. On the other hand, Heifetz could not entirely have approved of Paganini's.

This does not imply that violin technique has developed. It means however, that public taste demands from the violin virtuoso something more or something different.
Nor is it the intention to make invidious comparisons between these two great masters of their instrument. Nothing can detract from the tremendous debt which violin playing owes to Paganini. There will, in all probability, never again be the opportunity for any violinist to alter so greatly the course of violin playing as he did. As in the case of Liszt and the pianoforte, he at one bound realized the physical limitations of his instrument. In that direction, no further development seems possible.
PAGANINI

As has been said many thousand times, it is too bad that Mr. Edison was not a bit more fore-handed with his phonograph invention. No one now living can have a true idea of how Paganini actually played. Our conceptions are based on an aggregate of the accounts, many of them emotionally biased, of those who came under the spell of his unique genius. The opinions of his contemporaries were colored by the aura of mystery, of intrigue, of diabolical showmanship which went to make up the "Paganini Myth." Paganini’s appearance was sinister. He was a sick man his entire life and was thin, sallow and gaunt. He never walked on the stage, but ‘glided’ on. His power of projecting his personality across the footlights, first horrifying, then entrancing an audience, was a source of wonder and of jealousy to his fellow violinists. If it is possible to sift from the chaff of contemporary accounts some gleanings of actual facts concerning Paganini’s technical methods and accomplishments, it will serve as a point of departure for the discussion of the channels and changes affecting the matter under consideration.

Paganini was born in Genoa in 1782. He made his
first public appearance at an age which was advertised as nine years but which was actually eleven. At this time Baillot was the premier violinist of the great Parisian School and was perhaps the most important violinist living. The Parisian School stressed a broad, large tone, long sustained bows and a polished style. The musical fare for the French and Italian violinists consisted of the music of Corelli, Tartini, Vivaldi, Veracini and Locatelli. The latter had incorporated in his music passages in the very high positions, with intricate, "labyrinthine" string crossings, which even present day violinists find difficult. Paganini studied this music with the best available teachers, but so rapidly outgrew them that at an early age gave up his dependence on others and taught himself in his own individual manner. He likewise studied composition with some very famous Italian composers. It is said that they dreaded his coming, for he advanced so rapidly and asked so many embarrassing questions that they soon let it be known that they could teach him no more. He practiced cruelly hard. His father, the "hatefulest father in musical history," locked him in his room and refused him food until he had done so many hour's practice. When the concertos and sonatas of Vivaldi and Tartini grew to be child's play for him, he devised his own exercises. This arduous work ruined his health but gave him a technical foundation which
served him so well in his later years that he seldom, if ever, did consistent practicing again. His only pupil, Sivori, insisted that he had never heard Paganini practice a note. From this fact grew the story that there were some secret, silent exercises, which would work magic for others if Paganini would only divulge them.

Paganini's first successes were won in the cities and towns of his native land. His successes were not only artistic but also financial. Soon he bought himself a travelling coach and began the restless wandering up and down the length and breadth of Europe which lasted until his death. In 1828 he made his phenomenal success in Vienna. From there he travelled throughout Germany. In Prague, the correspondent for the Hamburger Boersenhalle wrote as follows: "The flageolet tones often turn into screeching sounds. His cadenzas are bad taste in the highest degree and partly old fashioned. A true art is the playing on the G string. As he uses only one finger for this, there results a horrible sound of mewing and bawling due to the fact that the finger slides back and forth, which seems to give Herr Paganini particular pleasure. His greatest weakness: poor presentation of the adagio as the adagios of Kreutzer and Rode were replaced by works of his own, after he had put aside those which were uncomfortable for him to play."
From Germany, he travelled to England. There a leading London critic wrote that, "Nothing can be more intense in feeling than his conception and delivery of an Adagio passage." Everywhere he aroused intense interest and excitement. From London, he went to Paris, where his brilliant style was extraordinarily sympathetic to the French public. His Paris visit was memorable for many remarkable happenings. He was heard by Liszt and Berlioz, amongst others. To Berlioz he made the extremely generous gift of twenty thousand francs in admiration for that composer's genius.

During this first quarter of the nineteenth century, the years when Paganini, in his travelling coach, was demonstrating his art up and down the land, there were three distinct schools of violin playing in existence. They were very different in ideals and ways of playing. There was the Italian School, somewhat decadent, still devoted to the old Italian masters. There was the German School, steeped in the musicianship and traditions of Mozart, Haydn, and lately, of Beethoven. And finally, there was the Parisian School, with interest centered somewhat more in the manner of playing than in the matter. Paganini, with his individual style, which belonged to no school but was winning unequalled public acclaim everywhere, was the first catalytic agent to commence the process of combining all schools into the eclectic violin playing of our own day.
It is not on record that Paganini ever played the music of Bach or Mozart in public. He played almost exclusively his own music. When he attempted the music of other composers, he was not entirely successful. The notes were of no difficulty to him. Almost any music written for the violin he could play at sight. But the music of Rode, Kreutzer and the Italian classics were not sympathetic to him. He admired and loved to play, in private, the string quartets of Beethoven. While in Vienna, he heard Beethoven's seventh symphony and wept because the composer of so much that was beautiful had recently died.

The tools which Paganini used were much the same as the ones we have today. He used throughout his successful years a Guarnerius violin which is, or was, preserved in the museum in Genoa. He had excellent strings. They were somewhat lighter and thinner than the ones in use now, for Paganini's playing demanded instant response rather than largeness of tone. For his flageolets the thicker strings of today would have been impractical. The wire G string had been in use for some time and made possible his phenomenal feats on that string alone. His bow was the Tourte type of bow. Tourte, with the assistance of Viotti, had made his improvements in violin bows shortly before this time and while Paganini attached little importance to the quality of his bows, he nevertheless had available the light-
ness, balance and spring which Tourte's innovations had made requisite in bows of that time.

Apropos of Paganini's point of view, an enlightening incident is related by the Scotch violin dealer, David Laurie who had it from Vuillaume, the great French bow and violin maker. During Paganini's visit to Paris he brought his bow to Vuillaume for repairs. It was a very inferior bow and was held together with strings. Vuillaume was somewhat aghast at the shoddy equipment which such an eminent artist considered adequate. He insisted that Paganini take as a gift one of his own best bows, but only after much pressure did Paganini consent. When he did, it was with this rather ungracious speech, "A thousand thanks my dear Vuillaume, but I have several fine bows which I never use and I might never use yours. . . . so far as my experience goes, the difference in the merits of bows is infinitesimal, the only difference lies with the player." This speech might well apply to the strings, the curve of the bridge and any other mechanical equipment. The violinistic intelligentsia of the day discussed in detail all of these matters. They were sure that the spectacular effects with which Paganini dazzled them were due to some necromantic equipment or secret. They were extremely loathe to give full credit to the tremendous natural genius of the man.

Paganini may not have been the greatest violinist of
all time, or even of his own time. He was not the master of all schools and of many styles as is the broadly trained violinist of the present day. Some of his contemporaries excelled him in the art of long, sustained, tone production. Some understood and phrased the classics in a manner which was foreign to his nature. But violin playing, today, could not conceivably be what it is, lacking the innovations and influence of Paganini's music and technical genius, his use of stopped harmonics in swift scale patterns, the left hand pizzicato, the flying staccato, both up and down bow, the tremolando spiccato, the rapid tenths, and octave trills. These devices were introduced into the violin technique with such dazzling effectiveness that subsequent players of the instrument have not dared, or cared, to disregard them.

One of Paganini's outstanding characteristics as a violinist was his power and skill in improvising. As a boy, he extemporized his own technical studies. Throughout his career he practiced and improved this gift. It must have been, for him, a necessary outlet for the talents which found the written music of his day too square, too much of a pattern, with routine passage work, and limited technical demands. In one of his letters, Paganini tells of a concert given in Paris with La Font, a favorite French violinist. Evidently La Font had complained rather bitterly that he found it impossible to play with a man who would not, or
could not, play the notes as they were written. Paganini remarks in his letter that when he and La Font were playing together, he, Paganini, played exactly the notes in his part but when he had a solo part he proceeded to embellish and improve the music with a few ideas of his own. He was in no way inhibited by what we call artistic integrity. He invented many "sound effects." When he was in the mood he reproduced bird calls, the moaning of a cow, the yowling of a cat or the clacking of chickens. In his last Vienna concert, he played a solo by a certain Herr Pannay, called The Tempest. Accounts of the performance tell of hearing the approach of the storm, the raging sea, the calm after the storm, joy, peace, and so on. It would not be acceptable music today in the most provincial concert hall in the musical world. The very fact that to Paganini the violin was not a "sacred cow", but as much a part of himself as his hand, or his larynx, accounts for many of the new sounds which were discovered and exploited by him.

To enumerate, specifically, the innovations which violin playing owes to this weird personality is perhaps advisable at this point. It should be borne in mind, however, that the intangible things which resulted from his impact on the violin playing and the violinists of his day, may have been of more importance. He jarred the too pedantic German violinists out of their self-satisfaction and com-
pletely altered the attitude of the classical Parisian School.

Paganini's printed works are comparatively few in number. The most important are, no doubt, the Twenty Four Caprices. These were written in the early portion of his career but not published until 1820. They exploit all the virtuoso devices to their fullest extent. The first Caprice requires light spiccato bowing across the strings, together with flights into the highest register of the instrument, rapid scales in thirds and extremely awkward chord combinations. The fifth Caprice is based on the very difficult "balzate" bowing. The sixth is a series of rapid trills and tremolos with a typical Paganini melody superimposed. The famous twenty fourth Caprice, which Schumann, Brahms, Liszt and Rachmaninoff have used, is a set of variations with left hand pizzicato, harmonics, scales in tenths and fingered octaves used with reckless abandon.

Besides the Caprices, the printed works of Paganini consist of two concertos, the Witches Dance, the Moto Perpetuo and some fragments which he has labeled Sonatas. One of his most difficult works for the modern violinist is the set of I Palpiti variations. On our modern, thicker and less responsive strings, the double harmonics are not playable with entire success. Paganini's skill in playing on one string resulted in the "Moses" fantasy for the G string alone. German critics of his day, complained that
Paganini played this composition entirely with one finger, slid about over the violin in a very unpleasant manner and sounded like cats mewing. Modern violinists still play this music as a virtuoso stunt. They, however, play it cleanly, with the notes well articulated and an effect which is not unpleasant even if hardly thrilling from a musical standpoint.

The manner of playing, speaking in a strictly technical sense, by which Paganini accomplished his feats of virtuosity, is not known. He left no written violin Method as some great violinists have done. He had only one pupil, as stated previously, and that one was inarticulate on the subject. Sivori, that lone pupil, was a small man with a very small hand. He could not possibly use the same technical methods used by his teacher. From the slender accounts he has left of his study with Paganini, little is to be learned. Paganini must have been the world's worst teacher. He was exceedingly impatient with any failure or fault.

When poor Sivori found the going difficult, Paganini, in a rage, would seize the violin, toss off the passage with the greatest surety and ease and stalk out of the room. So we do not know how he held his bow, how his hand was placed on the violin, how he managed the dexterous feats necessary to play as he did or any of the small technical details of so much interest to violinists. We do not know how he managed
shifts from one position to the other, whether his spiccato was dry or liquid, whether he played scales in double stops honestly, or whether they were a mixture of slidings and approximations. It really is of little importance. Paganini was not the founder of a violinistic dynasty. His claim to fame is based on other achievements. He altered the future of all violin playing, which surely is fame enough for any one man.

Today, all of the so-called tricks, effects and innovations which Paganini used in his music, are incorporated in our taken-for-granted violin technique. They are, however, superimposed upon a very solid base of technical equipment, some of which came from other schools of playing. The long, sustained bow stroke is not to be found in Paganini's music. The ability to mould long phrases with finesse and the restrained control necessary to play Bach or the classic chamber music resulted from other ideals of violin playing. Some of the best qualities in our present day technical style are due to the musicianship of the German school and particularly to the genius of its great violinist, Louis Spohr.
The first German violinist who can lay claim to artistic rank was Franz Heinrich Biber, who died in 1698. In technical skill he is said to have been in advance of his Italian contemporaries. He wrote for his instrument some worth while music, which is still extant, and is of the same character as the violin music of Veracini and Geminiani. His playing, however, is said to have been of a much warmer style than that of the Italians of his time. This warm characteristic, admired by the German people and expanded by Biber's followers, no doubt accounts for the great differentiation between the German and Italian violin playing of the eighteenth century.

Following Biber came a long list of not too important names, including Graun, Benda, Stamitz, Cramer, and strangely enough, W. A. Mozart. Mozart must be given credit in this connection for having done more for German violin playing than any other individual up to the time of Spohr. In his youth he was a violinist of great skill. Through his music for stringed instruments in ensemble, and through his concertos for the violin, he influenced the technical development of the instrument in the direction taken by his followers of the German School.
LOUIS SPOHR

The culmination of the German School was Louis Spohr. He, in his own manner, was an individualist and a genius, just as was Paganini. The two were contemporaries, yet their lives were worlds apart, both physically and spiritually. Neither could appreciate the full stature of the other, being so diametrically opposed in ideals. They sensed, however, each in the other, those qualities which each lacked. Both contributed much to the development and change in violin technique.

Spohr was born in 1784, into a family with strong musical interests. His youth was spent in a respectable, comfortable, and conservative German environment. His grandfather was a clergyman and his father a physician. He had good training in violin and composition, and was intensely interested in both fields of music. His violin teacher, during his early years, was Franz, brother of the very noted violinist Ferdinand Eck. Spohr travelled to Russia with Franz Eck, and there met Clementi and John Field. At this time he was a well grown youth, of huge frame, and a strong constitution. It is said that he practiced interminably, sometimes ten hours a day. After his return, from Russia to his home in Brunswick, he heard Pierre Rode and
was so greatly impressed that he determined to perfect his own playing in the style of Rode. From our standpoint this is interesting in that Rode was a member of the Parisian School and had qualities of finish and style which the German violinists might well imitate. It was of great value to Spohr to absorb some foreign schooling without which he might not have become the type of artist capable of appealing not only to the German public, but to the English, Italian and French, as well.

Early in his life Spohr became acquainted with the chamber music of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven. His mother was a pianist of some ability and his father played flute. He acquired the musicianly attitude toward music through his knowledge of the German classics. This serious musicianship was one of his outstanding characteristics. It was the foundation of his violin playing, as well as his composing. Besides the music of the German classicists, he knew thoroughly the music of Tartini, Corelli and Vivaldi. He also knew the violin music of Baillot, Kreutzer and Rode.

Throughout his life Spohr was a tireless worker. During his trip to Russia, while still a youth of nineteen, he practiced incessantly, composed in every spare moment and wrote his first violin concerto. From this time on, his individuality as an artist began to assert itself. As was said previously, Rode made a great impression on him and he spent
several years mastering the style of Rode. But from that
time on, he developed his own style and felt the self con-

fidence and surety which all truly great artists must have.
Later, when he heard Paganini play, his own ideas and
ideals were so firmly established that they were not in the
slightest degree affected by the dazzling style, so differ-
ent from his own.

Unlike Paganini, Spohr wrote much music. He composed
Symphonies, Oratorios, Operas and a great mass of violin mu-

sic. We seldom hear it now, but in his time it was impor-
tant music and was greatly admired. It is solid, honest, and
of artistic merit. Only his violin music, however, has had
lasting influence. He wrote eleven concertos, many duos for
two violins and other string ensemble music. In 1831 he
published his great violin school. It was an authoritative
work at that time. Now it has only an historical signifi-
cance. It is nevertheless, a guide as to the manner in
which Spohr wished his music to be performed.

Spohr had very large, strong hands. They were ex-
tremely supple, however, and capable of both wide stretches
and dexterity in passage work. His concertos demand both
qualities. They were considered in their day inordinately
difficult. They were not difficult, however, for the great
technical capabilities of Spohr, himself. His left hand
technique was much more highly developed, according to our
present day standards, than his bowing technique.

In the manner of holding the bow and of managing it, the German School was at great variance with modern ideas. Spohr held the bow near the finger tips with the fingers very nearly at right angles to the stick. The arm was held close to the side and the wrist arched. This manner of playing gave rise to that anathema of the modern violinist, the "floppy wrist". Broad, detached bowing did not and could not have, the liquid, legato quality of today. The bow, of necessity, clung tightly to the strings at all times. This must have resulted in a certain amount of surface noise and heaviness. Long sustained phrases could be molded with great finesse and subtlety. However, as said before, a musical, springing type of stroke could not be produced successfully. Spohr himself, disliked and never used this style of bowing. It is not to be found in any of his works. He had such an antipathy for it that it is told that he would not allow the orchestra to use it when he conducted the Midsummer Night's Dream Overture of Mendelssohn. How this piece sounded without the lightness and grace incident to spiccato bowing is a subject for speculation.

This glued-to-the-string bowing affected certain elements of left hand technique, such as the shift from one position to another. It is doubtful that Spohr himself used the unmusical shift which we associate with the German
school of playing. His concertos would indicate that he did not. He phrased his melodies in such a way that he could not have shifted as his followers and pupils did. In his ninth concerto, for example, the long shifts, with an accent on the top note, could not have been successfully performed if the shift had been made with the lower finger. The good taste which must have been apparent in Spohr's own playing was perhaps attributable to the Parisian influence by way of Rode. It is difficult to reconcile what we know of Spohr's actual performance and his theoretical ideas as set forth in his Violin Method. (1) His followers evidently followed his method but lacked his good taste, for even down to the past generation of German violinists, the shifts have been made with a decided "hiccup", and without benefit of aid from the bow. This type of shift had one advantage only. It made for greater security in intonation. This advantage, which was not one based on musical considerations, endeared it to the German violinist and the German audiences evidently became so conditioned to the unmusical sound of it that they no longer noticed it. That these audiences were conditioned to sev-

eral faults in the German violinist's manner of playing is attested to by the eminent violinist Tivadar Nachez in his account of his study with Leonard. He says, "... when I came to him (Leonard) I had the so-called 'German tone' (son allemand), of a harsh, rasping quality, which I tried to abandon absolutely." (1)

In 1815 Spohr undertook a long tour through southern Germany, Alsace and Italy. Knowing the Italian love for showmanship and the spectacular aspect of the virtuoso's art, he composed a new concerto especially for his Italian audiences. This was the eighth, the "Gesangseina" concerto. It is very revealing of Spohr's personality, for it is his utmost effort in the way of a flamboyant piece of music. (2)

There is not a harmonic, a pizzicato note or a spiccato passage in the entire piece. His attempt at rivalling Paganini's fireworks consisted of some fairly dramatic recitative passages and a cadenza with a few double trills and some mild double stopping. However, Spohr was a very handsome man, a thorough musician and above all, a sincere and earnest artist. These qualities will reach a responsive


spot in almost any audience. They were recognized by the sympathetic and musical Italian public. As a result Spohr had a very successful tour. While he failed to arouse the fanatical enthusiasm to which Paganini was accustomed, he, nevertheless, made many friends amongst the musical intelligentsia.

In addition to becoming well known throughout continental Europe, Spohr spent much time in England. He became a favorite with Londoners not only for his violin playing, but for his conducting of his operatic and symphonic works. His oratorios were especially well received by the English public.

This all tends to show Spohr’s widespread musical influence. While we are chiefly interested in his influence on violin playing, this is so closely entwined and somewhat dependent on his influence in other musical fields that it can hardly be considered alone. From a purely technical standpoint perhaps, Spohr’s influence on today’s violinists is not great. It is impossible to exactly evaluate such an imponderable thing. His influence was, and still is, along musical lines. He used the violin as a means for expressing musical ideas, not for display of technical virtuosity. He was perhaps the first great musician-violinist. As such, he heads a long list of the greatest names in violin playing. Joachim, Ysaye, Szigeti and Heifetz
were and are the same type of virtuoso. Whether or not he, Spohr, may lay claim to being the legitimate musical parent of this distinguished progeny, is beside the point. He holds a great and distinguished position in the history of violin playing and through him flowed one of the great streams of development which we think has culminated in our present day, composite type of musician-virtuoso.

Spohr died in 1859. He was active in composing and conducting to the very end. At the time of his death he had to his credit as a composer over two hundred works for every conceivable kind and combination of instruments and voices. The Breitkopf and Hartel catalogue of 1881 lists one hundred and fifty four printed compositions. (1)

PARISSIAN SCHOOL

It has been mentioned that Spohr was influenced by the playing of Pierre Rode. Rode was of the Classical Parisian School and a direct descendant, musically, of Habe- neck and Baillot. He had a large and probably rather saccharine tone; finesses of style and left hand routine. Like the other French violinists, he liked his passage work cut to a familiar pattern. This entire group of violinists lacked the serious musical attitude of Spohr. They were chiefly interested in violin playing and of course were astounded and fascinated by the pyrotechnics of Paganini. Him, they admired, envied, and would have imitated in so far as they were able. This school of violin playing is not in itself so very important for our present consideration. However, it produced a very important violinist whom we must discuss because of his historical significance. It might be considered the bridge between the eighteenth century violinists and this important individual, who was the first, or at least, the forerunner of a new school of playing. This person had the impressive name, Charles Auguste de Beriot, and must be credited with inaugurating the great Franco-Belgian School.
CHARLES DE BERIOT

De Beriot (1802-1870) was, by birth a Belgian. At the age of nineteen he went to Paris where he studied with Viotti and Baillot. He was a child prodigy and performed in public constantly from the time he was nine years old until he became blind at the age of fifty. During his public career he played throughout Europe, but was an especial favorite with the London public. He toured for five years with the famous singer, Malibran, whom he eventually married. He held several important teaching positions including that of 'Professor of Violin Playing' at the Conservatory in Brussels. He was offered a similar post in the Paris Conservatoire, as successor to Baillot, but refused it, preferring to remain in Brussels.

De Beriot's violin playing was distinguished by an aristocratic style, pure intonation, finesse and piquancy. Nearly every account of his playing speaks of a certain suave quality, which distinguished it from that of contemporaries. De Beriot was, in performances of his own works, exceptionally successful. They were the first violin compositions to exploit some of the effects which Paganini had used. In a considerably simplified version, De Beriot used in these works pizzicato effects, harmonics, spring
bowings and rapid arpeggios. The Donizetti and Bellini type of melodies which abound in his works, when adorned with these violinistic effects, formed a sort of musical fare which became extremely popular with a large part of the musical world of his time.

De Beriot wrote eleven concertos, of which the seventh and ninth are still very much alive and constantly used as teaching material. They have a salon type of elegance and are effective but not difficult. Perhaps his best known work is the 'Scene de Ballet', which has graced, or otherwise, untold numbers of conservatory programs. He also wrote a *Violin Method*, many sets of variations for violin and piano and duos for two violins. His writings have little musical value. However, by reason of them, and of his playing and teaching, he became the founder of one of the most important Schools of violin playing in history. His great pupil, Henri Viextemps, firmly established the style of playing and the violinistic ideals which produced and nurtured the great Franco-Belgian School of violin playing.
We have, so far, reviewed two of the most important source-springs of our present day model of violin playing. Paganini was, of course, a school unto himself and the source of much of our technical equipment. Then there was the German School headed by Spohr who's interest was centered chiefly in musical ideals. We now are to consider the third, the Franco-Belgian School, which is the direct precursor of our present generation. This school of violinists concerned itself very seriously with the closest and most detailed scrutiny of the mechanical techniques of playing. It tried to evaluate the work of all previous generations and to absorb all that seemed good, discarding the things which seemed bad or outmoded. So it examined the teachings of Paganini, of Spohr, of De Beriot and also of some great but unclassifiable violinists whom we have not heretofore mentioned. Some of these violinists, whom we have by-passed, had great qualities and were important in their day. They were not significant, however, in the historical development of violin playing. They now take on a measure of significance because the young students of the Franco-Belgian School studied them and their work with the same care which they devoted to the greatest of...
the previous generations.

Amongst these neglected violinists, whom we have failed to mention, there was Charles Lipinski, the Polish violinist, whom Paganini called the greatest violinist in the world next to Paganini. Lipinski had great technical facility and a self-taught style. He has left, as an example of the sort of technical material he exploited, one piece of music. This is his Military Concerto, which is no longer played because of its outmoded technical interest and trifling musical value.

Bernhard Molique was a pupil of Spohr in both violin and composition. He was a good and successful musician in both fields. He wrote six concertos, an oratorio, ensemble music for strings, songs, and studies for his own instrument. Of all his work, only his A minor violin concerto is still in print. More important than his music were the daily meetings at the "Birnbeck Kneipe" in Munich, with a group of earnest young musicians amongst whom were Winter, Moscheles, Romberg, Krebs and others. The record of their musical discussions and arguments is still preserved. (1)

---

1 Leonard Stuart, Biographical Note to Molique Concerto in A minor. (New York: G. Schirmer, Inc.)
One of the most phenomenal violinists of all time was Henri Ernst. He had a pure, limpid, and somewhat sensuous tone, together with a huge and extraordinary technical equipment. He was a thoroughly trained musician with some notable talent as a composer. For his instrument, he left the famous F sharp minor concerto, a set of transcendental studies, the 'Othello' Variations, Hungarian Fantasy, and an impossibly difficult transcription for violin alone, of Schubert's Erl König.

Ferdinand David was a fine violinist, a friend of Mendelssohn, and was responsible for much of the gratefulness of the violin part of the Mendelssohn violin concerto.

Ferdinand Laub was another very fine but almost forgotten violinist. He wrote several works for the violin which are never heard now, and which had very little musical value.

The accomplishments, the music, the ideas and theories of all these great and near-great violinists were being examined and absorbed by the young generation of the Franco-Belgian School. Through this group of violinists, which includes the names of Vieuztemps, Wieniawski, Thomson, Musin, Sauret, Auer, Ysaye and Thibaud, we inherit some measure of their greatness.
Henri Vieuxtemps (1820-1881), lived in great times, musically speaking, and knew most of the great men connected with the Romantic period of musical history. When he was six years old, he played for De Beriot, who at once accepted him as a pupil. Two years later, he played in Paris. For three years he studied with De Beriot and acquired some of the great stylistic qualities of his teacher. At the age of thirteen he made a tour of Germany, during which he met Spohr, Molique, and Czerny. He heard Fidelio performed and himself played, with great success, the Beethoven concerto. The next year he was in London, where he met and heard Paganini. Meanwhile, he was studying composition, writing for the violin, and practicing diligently. In 1838 he made a trip to Russia with the pianist, Henselt. It was a very successful trip, so the next year he made a second one, this time travelling with the great Belgian cellist, Servais. On the road, in Riga, to be specific, he met Richard Wagner. In 1844 he visited America. This is the first instance of a world renowned violinist crossing the ocean. After returning to Europe, Vieuxtemps accepted the post of Professor of Violin in the St. Petersburg Conservatory, a post later held by both Wieniawski and Leopold Auer. In 1857, having resign-
ed his Russian post, he journeyed to America again, with
the pianist, Thalberg. In 1870, he made his third, and last,
trip to the United States. Shortly after his return to
Europe, he suffered a paralytic stroke, which ended his
playing career. He continued travelling, composing, and teach-
ing, however. In 1881, soon after completing his sixth con-
certo, (1) he died in Algiers. Ysaye, his famous pupil,
mentions a seventh concerto, (2) of which there is no record
elsewhere.

Vieuxtemps was the first of the great virtuosi to
begin the task of gathering and absorbing the good qualities
of all schools of playing. He was the father of our present
school of eclectic violinists, if any one may lay claim to
that title. His playing was marked by a very large, sensu-
ous tone. A large tone was becoming a necessity for violi-
ists because of the large halls and the ever expanding or-
chestras of the time. Vieuxtemps' concertos were written
and orchestrated for a large symphony orchestra. They were
meant to sound rich and full textured. They were a depart-
ure from the concertos of Rode, Viotti and De Beriot, which

1 Paul David, Esq., "Henri Vieuxtemps," Groves Dic-
tionary of Music and Musicians, 3d edition, Volume V,
506-507.

2 Eugene Ysaye, "The Tools of Violin Mastery",
Violin Mastery, edited by Frederick H. Martens, New York:
Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1919, 292 pp.
had a thin and unimportant background accompaniment.

Being a pupil of De Beriot, Vieuxtemps inevitably acquired purity and elegance of style. He also had tremendous vigor and dramatic strength. He believed that the violin was made to charm and to move the hearer, emotionally. Neither his playing or his music stresses the mechanics of the virtuoso. Yet his playing was, technically, the most brilliant since Paganini. His natural aptitude had equipped him with an abnormally swift up and down bow staccato, which outdid the flying staccato of Paganini in speed and tonal quality. His performances may have been overdramatic, with exaggerated effects, yet it is due to him that violin playing was directed in the path of that admirable Romanticism of Victor Hugo, Balzac, Schumann, and Brahms; a milieu natural to, and suited to, the instrument.

Vieuxtemps's music for the violin includes six concertos; the Ballade and Polonaise; the Fantaisie Caprice; a set of Études; and cadenzas for Beethoven's concerto. These compositions have musical value as well as immense technical value and are very much alive today, after almost one hundred years. They are bombastic, it is true, but they have melodic value, vitality, and effectiveness. In them may be found every type of technical device; rapid double trills; pizzicato; harmonics; all types of springing bowings; surging four-note chord passages and an unequalled
effectiveness in the use of sweeping scales and arpeggio patterns.

To return to the specific qualities of Vieuxtemps's playing, one outstanding characteristic, which his contemporary critics remarked, was the purity of his intonation. It is a bit difficult to understand this. The great violinists preceding Vieuxtemps had very keen and exact ears. Yet they did not, evidently, give the impression of playing with exact intonation. The explanation, probably, is tied up with the manner in which vibrato was used. No series of tones, produced on the violin, is scientifically exact in pitch. By the use of the vibrato, however, each tone, even in rapid passages, can be instantaneously adjusted, so that the co-operation of each tone, with others sounding at the same time, can give the effect of true pitch. It is the process which players in a fine string quartet find themselves obliged to adopt. Pitches must be leaned, and adjusted to others. Without the vibrato, there is not sufficient freedom of movement in the finger tips to accomplish this process. And it is well known that, previous to Vieuxtemps's time, the vibrato was frowned upon by German violinists, and used very sparingly by all. At any rate, Vieuxtemps' pure intonation became one of his most remarked qualities.
FRANCO-BELGIAN BOWING TECHNIQUE

Before proceeding with a review of some of the other historically important violinists of the Franco-Belgian School, it should be noted that a rather revolutionary change in bowing techniques had its beginnings at this time. In order to acquire greater strength in the right arm, and yet retain ease and relaxation, Vieuxtemps, amongst others, shifted the position of the bow hand on the bow. The index finger was shifted to extend further across the bow stick. The bow rested on the soft flesh of the second joint, rather than in the finger tips and the fingers were inclined across the stick at an angle, instead of at right angles. This resulted in a shorter radius of leverage when pressure was applied to the bow, and, consequently, made possible the greatly enlarged and more flexible tone, which was becoming both necessary and desirable. For the average violinist, this manner of holding the bow made the study of bowing a much shorter process and a less arduous task. It was a long step in the development of our modern method of bowing. The Franco-Belgian School discarded, also, the old German method of holding the elbow of the right arm low and passive. This automatically eliminated the problem of the 'floppy' wrist.
The right arm became freer and more graceful, and the facility of bowing, which, heretofore, was peculiar to the greatest violinists, was becoming more possible for the great mass of mediocre talents.
VIEUXTEMPS' SUCCESSORS

Henri Wieniawski (1835-1880) was fifteen years younger than Vieuxtemps. His career paralleled that of his elder colleague in many ways. At the age of eight years he was taken to Paris, where he played with great success, and began study with Massart, the leading violin teacher in the Conservatoire. Later, he succeeded Vieuxtemps as Professor of Violin in Brussels. Still later, he succeeded to the post in St. Petersburg, which Vieuxtemps had held. Very early in life he acquired a phenomenally perfect technique of both bow and fingers. It was a natural aptitude. No difficulties seemed to exist for him. Musically, he was gifted with an easy understanding of most types of music and in consequence, played the great classics of violin literature with as much authority as he did the virtuoso music of Vieuxtemps. He wrote two concertos for the violin. The first, in f sharp minor, is so extremely difficult that violinists seldom perform it in public. The second, in d minor, is one of the most ingratiating and grateful in the entire literature. Most of his other compositions are still alive and an important part of the violin repertory. They all show a stylistic grace and a profound grasp of the technical intricacies.
of the instrument. To enumerate them; there are two sets of six melodic etudes, the brilliant Zohrzo-Tarantelle, the Capriccio Valse in F, the famous Fantaisie on melodies from Faust, the Airs Russe and also several small salon pieces.

Wieniawski's playing was distinguished, aside from its technical perfection, by a unique blend of grace, elasticity, and impetuosity. Regardless of their nationality or their musical awareness, his audiences invariably responded to the intensity of his Polish temperament. He travelled extensively throughout Europe and likewise made a very successful tour of the United States in company with Anton Rubinstein.

Extensive and constant travel was becoming more possible and much more comfortable for the virtuoso. Transportation was becoming more and more expeditious and reliable. Wieniawski met, and played for, many more and varied audiences than Paganini or Spohr could have done. Another matter, very mundane but important, was making the life of the virtuoso more useful to the world and more rewarding to himself. This was the much more satisfactory business arrangements transpiring between artist and concert manager. The manager was taking on his shoulders all the business details of planning, financing, and overseeing the concert tour. The artist bore the responsibility for the
quality of the performance, and since he was free to concentrate his energies upon this one thing, the quality of concert programs consequently improved.
Hubert Leonard (1819-1890) must be mentioned at this time because of his great influence on the younger generation of Franco-Belgian violinists. He was not an outstandingly great player, but was probably the finest teacher of his time. His pupils included many of the best violinists of the generation succeeding that of Wieniawski. He wrote some concert fantasies, never played now, of very little musical value. However, he also wrote many études and numberless short solos, of varying degree of difficulty, which are invaluable teaching material. Like most great teachers, he had a keenly analytical mind which was devoted to sifting and unraveling all the intricacies of violin technique, he was the teacher of Cesar Thomson and of Ovide Musin, indirectly, he must be given some of the credit for the teaching of Kreisler, Thibaud, and many other fine, but lesser known artists.
Of all the younger generation of virtuosos, which followed Wieniawski, Eugène Ysaye, through his playing, had more influence on violin playing, in general, than any other. He changed the ideals and moulded the aims of an entire generation of violinists by the greatness of his playing and the sincerity, and thoroughness, of his musicianship.

Born in Liège in 1848, his overpowering musical personality dominated the violin world throughout the rest of the century, and until long after the first World War. He studied with both Vieuxtemps and Wieniawski. His playing was distinguished by a bigness and a musical 'rightness', which could, and did, disregard all conventional technical considerations. His tone was huge and of a unique quality. Vieuxtemps never tired of hearing him. During his, Vieuxtemps', last illness, in Algiers, he asked to have Ysaye come and play for him. According to the account in Radoux's Life of Vieuxtemps, he was "... haunted by the 'chanterelle' of Ysaye".

Ysaye travelled extensively. In 1918 he came to America as conductor of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra. He was the first outstanding violin virtuoso to combine, so com-
pletely, the activities of composer, conductor, performer, teacher, and chamber music player. His very great musical interpretations led many composers to dedicate their music to him. In consequence, some of the greatest works in modern violin literature were written for him and first played by him. To name only a few of the best known of these works, there is the Sonata by Franck, the Lekeu and Lazzeri Sonatas, and the Poème by Chausson.

As was previously mentioned, Ysaye's playing was distinguished by a very large and luscious tone. He used the vibrato constantly, in passage work and also in cantabile melodies. Yet for a musical effect he could, and did, use what he called a 'white' tone, without any vibrato. He despised a set or routine fingerings. Every performance of a work had a spontaneity which might be attributed somewhat to the fact that the performance was not only new for the audience, but to some extent, for Ysaye, himself. His bow was held in a most unconventional manner. In his huge hand, the bow stick, at times grasped with but two fingers, was, at all times, under complete technical control.

His interpretations of the great works of the literature were as unique as his technical approach. The very free manner in which he played Bach was filled with so much beauty that even the 'Purists' praised it. His playing of the Beethoven and the Brahms concertos was the most
noble of his generation. Beauty of tone and romantic expressiveness were the keynotes of his playing. His very extensive use of the rubato was the despair of many conductors and accompanists, yet it never exceeded the bounds of good taste. For it was a true expression of his musical personality, which was one of the greatest and most noble the musical world has known.
LEOPOLD AUER

Leopold Auer was born in Hungary in 1845. He studied violin with Jacques Dont in Vienna and with Joachim in Hanover. Following in the footsteps of the other concert violinists, he played throughout Europe. In Russia he became an especial favorite. Tchaikowsky dedicated his controversial concerto to him. The ensuing embroglio incident to Auer's refusal to play the concerto in its original form, served to bring his name sharply before the notice of the entire world of music. However, Auer's claim to our attention at the present time and his significance as an historically important figure are due, not to his playing, but to his teaching career. He succeeded Wieniawski as head of the violin classes in the St. Petersburg Conservatory. Here he attracted the talented young violinists from all of Russia. It was a mass of talent from an environment new to the musical world. Being of Jewish extraction himself, his personality was extremely congenial to the talented youth of that race. They came to him from southern Russia, from Poland, from Hungary, and later, from all parts of the world. His genius as a teacher, combined with the extraordinary violinistic talents which found their way to, and through, his
classes, combined to make him the most successful producer of first rank virtuoso violinists the world has known. A list of his pupils is a very convincing statement of our contention that Auer ideals and style have thoroughly impregnated and colored all violin playing of today.

Auer had the happy faculty of allowing the natural aptitudes of his talented pupils to find their own most natural means for overcoming the mechanical aspects of violin technique. In consequence, a new school, with a free, unstudied, and natural technique, came into existence. Auer always refused to admit that he had a 'method'. Yet from the melting pot of his classes, where great talents were closely associated, exchanging ideas, and learning from each other, being constantly, but firmly, guided away from the pitfalls of bad taste, there emerged a group of players with so many similarities of style and technique that they were unmistakably known as Auer pupils. They form a School as distinctive as the German or the Franco-Belgian School. This School carried to its final step the process of adjusting the bow to the right hand, which the Franco-Belgian School had begun. Beginning with Mischa Elman, Auer’s first great talent, the bow slipped back to the soft flesh of the first joint of the index finger. The right arm swung freely from the shoulder and, in consequence, all varieties of bowing technique became natural, easily learned, and tonally de-
lightful. Every Auer pupil has displayed this perfection and ease of bowing. Elman, Seidel, Parlow, Zimbalist, Heifetz and many others have demonstrated so conclusively that this type of bowing is the only one entirely satisfactory to our modern demands, that it is fully and generally accepted as the ideal one. So we arrive at what might be termed the regimentation of violin playing, an outstanding mark of the new violinists, as opposed to the older generations of more, or less, individualists in the technical field.
OTHER FRANCO-BELGIAN VIOLINISTS

The other great Franco-Belgian violinists played their part in contributing to this changing violin technique which we are considering. They were of lesser importance, however, than the ones we have discussed and may be dismissed with a mere mention.

Cesar Thomson was an eccentric personality, entirely engrossed with the mechanical problems of left hand technique. He practiced for years to play fingered octaves with lightning speed. He forced his pupils to unnatural tasks such as playing in a rhythm of two against three with the index and third fingers of the left hand. This obsession with mechanical matters left little time for a consideration of musical ones.

Emil Sauret and Ovide Musin were extraordinary violinists who concerned themselves, largely, with a salon type of playing and were completely overshadowed by the musicianship of Ysaye.
Three great virtuosi, who belonged to no established school, yet who impressed their personalities upon the violin playing world, must be considered before we conclude this list.

Pablo Sarasate (1844-1908) possessed some unique qualities which have left their mark on violin playing. His playing had a peculiar, 'bright' quality. He had lightning facility, great purity of tone, and an aristocratic style. With his distinguished appearance, which Whistler has made famous by reason of his "Portrait of Sarasate", his individual and beautiful performances of the finest works in violin literature, he so impressed the musical world that many of the finest violin works composed during his lifetime are dedicated to him. Amongst these are the Lalo first concerto, the Lalo Symphonie Espagnole, the Bruch concerto in D minor and Scottish Fantasia, the B minor concerto by Saint-Saens, and many others. He, himself, wrote a large number of Spanish Dances and solo pieces for the violin, which every violinist must include in his repertoire. Undoubtedly, his music and his manner of playing have left their mark on the ideals of tone and style which our modern violinists possess.
Joseph Joachim was a name to conjure with during the latter part of the nineteenth century. He stood for the utmost in sincerity and profundity of musicianship. His interpretations of the Beethoven and Brahms concertos were accepted as a criterion. His many years of exploiting the finest music of the Romantic Era in the field of chamber music were, and still are, of inestimable value to our musical conceptions of today. He was not a very successful teacher in the conventional sense. Most of the violinists of the past generation heard, and learned from his playing; however, He was the friend and advisor of Brahms and Schumann. He played the great German violin literature with a discernment and sense of devotion that has never been equalled. We cannot exactly evaluate his influence on today's generation, yet we know it must be very great.

Fritz Kreisler, still living, and still the most loved violinist of a generation of concert-goers, has some unique gifts which have affected the trend of modern violin playing. Like Joachim, his gifts were not centered in a transcendental technique, but in a musical personality and the ability to project it across the footlights. His playing of a musical trifle had such tonal beauty and nostalgic pathos that it made an artistic masterpiece of that which had little intrinsic value. Kreisler's own
original compositions, together with his arrangements and editings, have greatly enlarged the catalogue of violin music.

We may not owe to Kreisler, Joachim, or Sarasate, any great revolutions or innovations in mechanical technique. But if technique is the skill to reproduce the great musical conceptions with as few mechanical hindrances as possible, and with the utmost beauty, devotion, and sincerity, then we owe them much.
Having traced the course of violin playing from Paganini to the present day, and having attempted to show how each of the violin's great exponents has added his contribution, either in guiding the direction of its development, or in adding to its accumulated body of technical knowledge, it seems appropriate to see how the greatest contemporary violinist sums up, in his playing, the qualities of the past. Also to determine if violin playing has developed and grown in stature, or if it has merely changed to suit our times and ideals.

Heifetz uses the same kind of violin and bow that Paganini used. His violin strings are not so thin, for he needs a larger, broader tone than did Paganini. He plays with large orchestras in large halls and the very fine gut strings of Paganini's time would not be serviceable now. He plays the music, which Paganini wrote and played, with finish and aplomb. He does not play this music in the style which we fancy Paganini to have done. However, this is because the modern concert-goer would not tolerate the element of charlatanism which was an essential part of Paganini's showmanship. He has complete mastery of all the Paganini technical devices. He has, to the nth degree, the
skill with up and down bow staccato, spiccato, pizzicato, and harmonics. In addition, he plays the music of Spohr with a consideration for the particular style of Spohr's playing. To do both of these things would have been beyond the capabilities of either Spohr or Paganini. Heifetz also plays the concertos of Vieuxtemps with the dash and verve which distinguished their composer's playing. He plays the music of Wieniawski with elasticity and beauty of tone which Wieniawski could not have surpassed. He plays the great classics, from Bach to Beethoven and Brahms, with immaculate technique and musicianship. This is not to say that Heifetz embodies in himself the personalities of all the great players of the past. But, when playing the Beethoven concerto, he shows himself to have inherited the sense of devotion which was such a striking mark of Joachim's playing. In addition, he plays, with the style fitted to it, the music of Chausson, Franck, Ravel and Debussy, with a perhaps broader and more eclectic viewpoint than Ysaye or Thibaud might have done. He plays the music of Sarasate with the elegance, brilliance, and restraint, that must have made Sarasate distinguished. In addition to all this, he plays the new works for the violin; the concertos of Prokofieff, Walton, Gruenberg, and Stravinsky, with their extraordinary, new patterns and demands on the technique of violin playing. From Gershwin to Bartok, any good music is accepted, studied, and performed with the greatest artistry.
This is quite different from a Spohr who would not play Paganini's music because he hated it; a Sarasate who could not play it, because of his small hand; a Paganini who would not play Spohr's music, because he could not understand it, and a Joachim, who had no sympathy for the French music of his time.
THE NEW VIOLINIST

Heifetz is the summation of all that is best in violin playing. He is the archetype of the new violinist. He does not play Paganini better than Paganini did, but as well. He does not play the Bach Chaconne better than Joachim did, but he plays it as well and, perhaps, more to the taste of our present day audiences. He plays the entire list of standard violin concertos as well as they have ever been played. All in the same day he may play some small pieces by Kreisler, the Bartok concerto, a Mozart concerto, and some Gershwin transcriptions. They have their own true style, they are played with fine musical taste, and without extraneous exhibitionism.

Strangely enough, our whole generation of violinists does exactly this same thing in varying degrees of excellence, depending on their capabilities. This is the mark of the newest development, or change, in violin playing. It is the eclecticism of our present generation which is new and remarkable. It is not the superiority of talent. It is the broadening of understanding, the enlarging of musical sympathy, increased insight, and consequent greater musicianship.
This new approach to violin playing is due in part, at least, to the mechanical inventions of our time. The radio, the phonograph, and rapid transportation have done away with provincialism in music, as it has in other fields. If Heifetz plays a new concerto today, in New York, the whole world hears it by way of air waves or phonograph transcription. If some have missed hearing it, they will hear it the day after tomorrow in San Francisco or London.

The training of modern violinists takes for granted that each one must have the well rounded ability to play the entire violin literature. They are drilled in the traditions of the classics, they hear, and attempt to play, the modern works, and are expected to understand every style and kind of music.

In one respect the modern violinist fails to measure up to the great individualists of the past. They do not, and perhaps cannot, improvise. There is no place on our modern concert platform for this accomplishment and it has been allowed to atrophy. This may be partially compensated for by the development of musical memory. Paganini played only his own music from memory. Spohr often used notes even for his own music. None of the great virtuosi of the past was required to retain in his memory the entire violin literature as does Heifetz. Several of the great contemporary violinists could, no doubt, reproduce, at a moment's notice
any major work in the violin literature. Today's conditions require it.
SUMMARY

To summarize and try to reach some conclusion as to whether violin technique has developed, or merely changed, seems somewhat immaterial. It has changed, and on a purely physical plane it seems obvious that it has only changed. It is doubtful if, in that respect, it can ever develop.

If one considers the musical aspects of technique, then a real development has taken place. The innovations of Paganini were strictly physical skills. The added ingredients which have gone into the making of the kind of violin playing exemplified by Heifetz are due to the bit by bit accumulation of our musical knowledge and tastes. For them, we owe some portion to every great violinist who has lived and practiced his art since the first violin was glued together.
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