

The Inter-nationality of Late Nineteenth-Century Budapest Quartets and Their not Entirely Prejudice-free Reception in the Press

Zsolt Vizinger

In this paper, I shall present – through the reception of the Krančević and Hubay-Popper string quartets, active in Pest – how the Hungarian press developed a not entirely prejudice-free language, which distinguished between the “German” and the “other” (that is: “French” or “Hungarian”) manners of performance. I will also deal with the following questions: What was the role played by the performers’ national origin, the influence of their teachers and of the schools they attended and how did the press reviews treat these aspects?

Pest-Buda already had two permanent ensembles during the 1830s, although as a matter of fact the Tábornszky and the Szervacinszky quartets still performed at “mixed” concerts. Then, after a break of a decade, the city had again string quartets. Dávid Ridley-Kohne and Károly Huber, two important violinists in the musical life of the city, founded a string quartet each. Their concerts were advertised in the press as “quartet concerts.” They played Beethoven, Haydn, Mozart, Onslow, Spohr, and Schumann. However, their audiences soon decreased, so these were not long-lived ventures.

The Krančević Quartet

It was only in 1876, that the first Budapest-based quartet was founded that disposed of an excellent playing technique and remained stable for the years to come. Although this ensemble led by Dragomir Krančević was soon referred to in the press as the “Budapest quartet,” in fact only the second violinist was of Hungarian origin and native of Pest. Serbian musician Krančević was born in Pancsova (today: Pančevo, Serbia), a locality which then belonged, within the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, to Hungary. His musical talent manifested early, and at the age of ten he got to the conservatory in Vienna, where he was taught by Joseph Hellmesberger Sr. The young Krančević was introduced to the

audience in Pest as the second violinist of the Hellmesberger Quartet, and was offered a contract by János Richter, conductor of the National Theater, in 1873.

In a substantial article dedicated to the Krančević String Quartet in 1878, József Harrach wrote: “their aim is to ensure that all instruments are properly placed and reflect the spirit of the work as faithfully as possible.”¹ Harrach also addressed the delicate question of the origins of performers: “The first among them, Dragomir Krančević [...] was born in Pancsova in 1847; he is Serbian, but a Hungarian Serbian, that is, by no means an Omladinist; he couldn’t care less about politics and his whole being belongs to the music.” Here, Harrach referred to the anti-Habsburg and anti-Hungarian political movement of the United Serb Youth, also known as Omladina (which is Serbian for “youth”), banned in 1871.² Krančević must have been an introverted personality, in any case Kornél Ábrányi described him as “the most modest violinist in the Hungarian musical life.”³ When, in the summer of 1901, Krančević retired after thirty years of service from his position as concertmaster, he wanted no farewell events organized in his honor. The board of Opera House eventually addressed an open letter to him. From it, we learn that the violinist has done an invaluable artistic service to the city with “his unprecedented precision, great diligence, conscientiousness and, above all, tremendous musical knowledge.” The commentaries on the letter published in reviews like *Budapesti Hírlap*,⁴ *Magyar Nemzet*,⁵ and *Pesti Napló*⁶ also highlighted the activity of the Krančević String Quartet, which was “a real educator of the Budapest audience.”

Krančević moved back to Vienna, where he lived from violin classes and the price of the Guarneri violin he sold to Jan Kubelik.⁷ He became impoverished during the difficult years following the First World War. As the orchestra of the Opera in Budapest went on strike in the mid-1920s because of their unworthy wages, the columnist of the review *Magyarság* noticed that “no one is willing to retire because the pension is too low even for starvation” and at the end of the

¹ József Harrach, “A quartett-zenéről [About the quartet music],” *Fővárosi Lapok* 15, 244 (October 23, 1878): 1184–1185.

² Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans* (Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2001), 121.

³ Kornél Ábrányi, *Képek a múlt és jelenből* [Images from the past and the present] (Budapest: Pallas Részvénytársaság Nyomdája, 1899), 227.

⁴ *Budapesti Hírlap* 21, 166 (June 19, 1901), 7.

⁵ *Magyar Nemzet* 20, 156 (June 6, 1901), 10.

⁶ *Pesti Napló* 52, 167 (June 20, 1901), 10.

⁷ Tatjana Marković, “Networks of Cultural Zones between Imperial Theatre Houses. Migrations of Two Serbian Musicians,” in *Cultural and Artistic Transfers in Theatre and Music: Past, Present, and Perspectives*, ed. Michaela Mojžišová (Bratislava: Art Research Centre of the Slovak Academy of Sciences Institute of Theatre and Film Research, VEDA Publishing House of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 2021), 81–99.

article he mentioned Krančević, the former concertmaster of the orchestra, who was starving at the time in Vienna.⁸ The Serbian violinist died in misery in 1929.

Harrach, in his previously quoted article, wrote about the second violinist, Henrik Pinkusz: “Without him, the ensemble would not be the Budapest-quartet, because if we listened to Istóczy, we would have to send him as well to Jerusalem to establish quartet there, for he would certainly prove suitable as a first violinist.” Győző Istóczy was a Hungarian anti-Semitic politician, who suggest in a proposal he handed in to the House of Representatives in 1878, that Hungarian Jewry be deported to Palestine – the proposal was not taken seriously.⁹ There is not much to know about Pinkusz. His name appeared in the press only in 1894, in connection with his unsuccessful suicide attempt. He seemed to have recovered and he moved to Berlin with his sisters, where he died with tragic suddenness, only two weeks after his arrival. According to the press, Pinkusz justified his move with the “suffocating air” of Pest, however, he also mentioned to several people that: “although he is not Hungarian, in the event of his death, he would like to be buried in the Hungarian capital.”¹⁰

It was the biography of the cellist Hermann Ruhoff that presented the most of interest to Harrach. Ruhoff studied with August Lindtner in Hanover, his hometown, and later played in the orchestra of the court chapel there. Harrach pointed out that Ruhoff also played in Friedrich Hegar’s string quartet in Zurich (along with Hans Richter) to none other than Richard Wagner. This event is also mentioned by Liszt’s daughter, Cosima Wagner, in her diary. Cosima’s entries reveal that Wagner taught Beethoven’s late string quartets to the young quartet.¹¹ Harrach, on the other hand, saw in the cellist a descendant of Arminius due to his blonde hair. Arminius, whom the Germans call Hermann, led the Germanic tribes to victory against the Romans in the Battle of Teutoburg in 9 AD, so it is hardly surprising that he became a mythical figure for nineteenth century German nationalists. However, Harrach was quick to withdraw his militaristic analogy, stating that Ruhoff’s “small figure shows that he was not born to carry weapons.” Hermann Ruhoff, the first cellist at the National Theater, resigned due to illness in 1884, after eleven years of service. He moved to Zurich, where he taught at his brother’s music school.¹²

The National Theater replaced Ruhoff by contracting Eduard Rosé from Vienna. Eduard and his brother Arnold founded the Rosé Quartet in 1882, which

⁸ *Magyarság* 6, 36 (February 14, 1925), 5.

⁹ Péter Ujvári, ed., *Magyar zsidó lexikon* [Hungarian Jewish Lexicon] (Budapest, 1929), 47.

¹⁰ *Pesti Napló* 45, 225 (August 15, 1894), 6.

¹¹ Cosima Wagner, *Napló* [Diary] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1983), 79–88.

¹² Wilhelm Joseph von Wasielewski, *The Violoncello and Its History* (London: Novello and Company, 1894), 138.

later premiered several works by Brahms and Schönberg. However, Eduard left the ensemble after a single season, and he moved to Budapest in 1884 to become the first cellist of the National Theater and then the Opera House. He also became a member of the Krančević String Quartet.¹³ He stayed in Hungary for three years only. As the already world-famous Rosé Quartet (without Eduard) gave a concert in Budapest, a press review made clear that Eduard Rosé in fact left Budapest, because he had an argument with Krančević.¹⁴ He was succeeded at orchestra of the Opera House by Zsigmond/Sigismund Bürger, a pupil of David Popper, who was also born in Vienna.¹⁵ In 1893, two years after the Krančević Quartet ceased to exist, Bürger joined Vilmos Grünfeld's Quartet, which in many respects became the descendant of the Krančević Quartet: they performed more or less the same repertoire in the framework of similar "popular concerts." According to an article dedicated to the Grünfeld Quartet by the review *Ország-Világ*, Bürger played the cello at the Komische Oper in Vienna, the Gewandhaus in Leipzig, then – following a successful European tour – he was to become the first cellist of the Munich Court Opera for a longer period.¹⁶

The Hubay-Popper Quartet

In 1886, another quartet was formed in Budapest, the Hubay-Popper Quartet. Their story is more complex, as the performers of the inner part changed quite frequently. Jenő Hubay was taught in Pest by his father, Károly Huber, and then by Joseph Joachim in Berlin. He began the obligatory concert tours in France and Belgium, where he befriended Henri Vieuxtemps. Following the demise of the latter, Hubay took over his place at the Academy of Music in Brussels. That is to say, at the age of twenty-three, in 1882, he entered the Violin Department of one of the world's leading music academies. He got "the position of Europe's first violin teacher," as the review *Pesti Napló* put it.¹⁷ The board trusted Hubay so much that they wanted to tie him permanently to the institution, however, Hubay insisted to retain his Hungarian citizenship. He also wished to be responsible of the chamber music education. In addition to his normal salary, the King of Belgium provided him with special financial to form a quartet specifically dedicated to the performance of Beethoven's late string quartets.¹⁸

¹³ First concert with the Krančević Quartet on 10th October 1884; see *Pesti Napló* 35, 281 (October 11, 1884), 2.

¹⁴ *Pesti Hírlap* 32, 310 (December 29, 1910), 7.

¹⁵ *Budapesti Hírlap* 7, 303 (November 3, 1887), 2.

¹⁶ *Ország-Világ* 19, 44 (October 30, 1898), 701.

¹⁷ *Pesti Napló* 33, 43 (February 12, 1882), 2.

¹⁸ *Pesti Hírlap* 14, 70 (March 10, 1892), 7.

Hubay recalled to Budapest in 1886 with the intention of expanding the Academy of Music, which was in a bad position, and where, in fact only piano and composition was taught at the time. He proposed Dávid Popper to be the Head of the Cello Department. Popper was born and educated in Prague, and the Budapest audience first met him, together with Dragomir Krančević, in the Hellmesberger Quartet.¹⁹ In 1889, Sándor Feleki published a short biographical article on Popper, which stated that he gave a concert at the Gewandhaus at the age of sixteen.²⁰ Feleki regretted that many artists born and raised in Hungary were looking for success abroad. However, for Popper, the opposite was true. “The most famous cellist in Europe,” as Feleki formulated, was conquered by Budapest. Popper had been the first cellist of the Löwenberg court orchestra after his studies in Prague.²¹ He moved to Vienna in 1868 where he played at the Hofoper, the Vienna Philharmonic, and the Hellmesberger Quartet. He married Liszt’s famous disciple, Sophie Menter and for years they toured Europe together, including such provincial Hungarian towns as Miskolc.²² The marriage ended in 1886, not long before Popper’s arrival to Hungary. He taught at the Budapest Academy of Music until his death in 1913. He never gave up his career as a solo cellist. One of his disciples wrote: “As a performer, he was considered the cello’s Franz Liszt, as a composer he was the cello’s Chopin.”²³ This was an actual difference between the Krančević and Hubay-Popper quartets: members of the former taught at the conservatory and were leaders of their respective parts in theater orchestras; the members of the latter taught at the Music Academy, most of them had their own careers as soloists and were active as composers as well.

In 1934, Jenő Hubay wrote a long article on the past and future of the Academy of Music, at the beginning of which he described the difficulties of founding a string quartet. In Budapest, there were no suitable performers to be found for second violin and the viola parts.²⁴ That was the reason why Viktor Herzfeld, a Bratislava-born Vienna resident, and Bram Eldering, Hubay’s best student from Brussels, were both invited to Budapest.

Viktor Herzfeld, although born in Bratislava, did not speak Hungarian – which was hardly a singular case. In Vienna he was a pupil of Hellmesberger, then a conductor and violinist in Linz and Leipzig.²⁵ He also studied in Berlin

¹⁹ *A Hon* 8, 60 (March 15, 1870, Esti kiadás [Evening edition]), 1.

²⁰ *Egyenlőség* 8, 13 (March 31, 1889), 2–4.

²¹ Marc Moskovitz, “Popper, David,” in *Grove Music Online*.

²² *Borsod – Miskolci Értesítő* 7, 10 (March 6, 1873), 5.

²³ István Deák, “Popper Dávid. †,” *A Zene* 5, 7 (September 1913), 149–153.

²⁴ *Pesti Napló* 85, 145 (June 29, 1934), 11–12.

²⁵ Bence Szabolcsi and Aladár Tóth, eds., *Zenei lexikon II.* [Music Lexicon II.] (Budapest: Zeneműkiadó Vállalat, 1965), 194.

and then worked in Vienna – as I have mentioned it was in Vienna that he received Hubay's invitation to come to Budapest. Press articles published following the first success of the Hubay-Popper String Quartet in 1886 attempted to clarify Herzfeld's origins. "Born in Bratislava, thus Hungarian, but having lived abroad since his childhood, he barely speaks Hungarian" – wrote the review *Magyar Salon*.²⁶ In 1919, Antal Molnár remembered his late teacher in the columns of the prestigious cultural journal *Nyugat* [the meaning of the title in English is "West"].²⁷ In this text, Molnár saw Herzfeld as one the educated and serene – *gemüthlich* – Viennese gentlemen who perceived life as a comedy. To quote Molnár's own word "a solitary piece of gem that broke off from the church of the West." In 1886, the music life in Budapest was "merely a province of Vienna," continues Molnár, where Herzfeld's circle of friend was limited to a few "families of purely Western culture." Here, Molnár probably thought of, among others, Hans von Koessler, the Music Academy's teacher of composition who was himself of German origin. "You could learn from Herzfeld, the humble pioneer, that you can only create with faith and knowledge," Molnár concluded. The issues around Herzfeld's national identity are best shown by the fact that his first name was spelled with Hungarian orthography, with a "K," in the journal's table of contents, whereas Molnár used the German orthography, with a "C," to refer to his master in his article. Molnár's passionate text eulogized Herzfeld, as we might expect it from an obituary, however, to interpret it correctly we must take into consideration the resentment of the younger generation at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries against German culture. Bartók, Kodály, Molnár, and others tried to distance themselves from the Romantic concept of their masters. Herzfeld was not an outstanding performer, but rather a kind of musical polyhistor: composer, teacher of violin and chamber music, critic and musicologist. In Hubay's string quartet, he played the second violin for four years, but he returned later as well, whenever this was needed.

Rezső Kemény, a disciple of Hubay, who played the second violin in the quartet from 1899, was born in Nyíregyháza, northeastern Hungary. He was a pupil of Hubay at the National Conservatory, not at the Music Academy. In 1890 he traveled to Berlin to study with Joachim.²⁸ After his concert at Budapest's Vigadó/Redoute, the critics were really impressed by his performance technique. The *Budapesti Hírlap* wrote:

The training of this young virtuoso equally testifies to both of his masters; however, the sobriety bordering on the aridity which prevails his entire being is un-

²⁶ *Magyar Salon* 4, 6 (January 1887), 413.

²⁷ *Nyugat* 12, 6 (March 16, 1919), 442–443.

²⁸ *Pesti Hírlap* 12, 321 (November 22, 1890), 6.

doubtedly Joachim's reaction at the Hubay School; and by "reaction" we mean that the young violinist has suddenly shifted from the sentimental and passionate direction towards the tranquility and coldness of Mount Olympus, and now he is looking for aridity and indifference with the exuberance of an imitator.²⁹

Even after Rezső Kemény got a job at the Königsberg Conservatory in 1892, he regularly came back home to give concerts.³⁰ And the critics continued to mention both of his two famous masters. The *Budapesti Hírlap* wrote, that Kemény was "one of the cold-tempered violinists with an academic formation, having all the advantages and disadvantages of the Joachim School."³¹ The review *Pesti Hírlap*, on the other hand, attributed Kemény's results to Hubay: "he could learn a lot from his master in Berlin, [...] we still consider him a pupil of Hubay, because he owes to the talent of this ingenious Hungarian master everything he knows [...]."³² And finally, in 1896, the critic of *Budapesti Hírlap* heard in Kemény's performance the synthesis of the two schools: "[...] he studied the technical part of the violin playing with Master Joachim, and brought his emotional, warm cantilena from the Hubay School."³³

Conclusion

It seems that there were two performance manners: technical knowledge and intellectual, calm play as opposed to a more emotional, singing performance. Where does this sharp distinction come from? In the 1870s – that is, before Krančević and Hubay founded their quartets in Pest – both the Hellmesberger Quartet from Vienna and Jean Becker's quartet from Florence gave concerts in Pest almost every year. It was then that a clear distinction between the performance manners emerged in the Hungarian press. Hellmesberger represented the erudite and sober-minded "German" manner, devoid of emotions, while Becker (who was, by the way, also of German descent) together with his Italian peers stood for something that was more interesting, more colorful, and more emotional.³⁴ This distinction lived on to appear in the comparisons between the Krančević and the Hubay quartets. Here, Krančević, the disciple of Hellmesberger, fol-

²⁹ "Az ifjú virtuóz dologbeli készsége egyaránt vall a két mesterre; az a szárazsággal hatásos józan-ság azonban, mely egész valóján uralkodik, kétségtelenül Joachim reakciója a Hubay-iskola után, értvén a reakciót úgy, hogy a fiatal hegedűs a szentimentális és szenvedélyes irányból egyszerre az olimpiai nyugalom és hidegség felé tért át és most az utánpótlás szertelenségével szinte keresi a szárazságot, egykedvűséget." *Budapesti Hírlap* 11, 299 (October 31, 1891), 4.

³⁰ *Pesti Hírlap* 14, 256 (September 16, 1892), 5.

³¹ *Budapesti Hírlap* 13, 305 (November 4, 1893), 9.

³² *Pesti Hírlap* 15, 305 (November 4, 1893), 5–6.

³³ *Budapesti Hírlap* 16, 333 (December 3, 1896), 11.

³⁴ *A Hon* 9, 60 (March 14, 1871, Esti kiadás [Evening edition]), 2.

lowed the German school, while many found Hubay's French-styled, virtuoso play more interesting.³⁵ A few years later, the Bohemian String Quartet and the Joachim Quartet will be presented in a similar fashion by the Hungarian press. Interestingly enough, the same distinction can also appear between the members of a single ensemble. Hubay's "fervent and emotional" playing style had often been contrasted with Dávid Popper's "finite and settled" performance.³⁶

As Joseph Joachim, the world-famous violinist of Hungarian origin, visited Pest again after ten years, in February 1889, he played together with Hubay at two concerts. The press even reported about their rehearsal held at Hubay's apartment.³⁷ Joachim first performed with the Hubay-Popper Quartet, where he played the first violin and Hubay played the viola. A few days later, Joachim played Spohr's double concerto with Hubay. Both concerts were extensively reviewed by the *Budapesti Hírlap*. The critic, who was disappointed by the chamber music concert, stated that in the performance of chamber music works, only experts could notice the difference between the two schools.³⁸ On the other hand, the same reviewer really enjoyed the double concerto:

It is in Joachim's great individuality that German Classicism stood out in stark contrast with Hubay's French Romanticism. How differently the two artists said the same thing! Philosophical depth, pure strength, and puritanical simplicity emanated from the old artist's instrument, almost as a cold light; while the violin of the young artist was full of fervor and emotions often dominating the thought, we might even say: coquetry.³⁹

Old vs. young, German Classicism vs. French Romanticism, and puritanical simplicity vs. emotion. In general, this distinction worked well. It certainly could be used for some layers of the repertoire. For the Kravčević String Quartet, the classical performance of Mozart has always brought great success. However, the same did not automatically apply to Schumann. "They lack passion," wrote the reviewer of *A Hon* on the rendition of Schumann.⁴⁰ The same concept was also noticeable in their selection of the repertoire. In their early days, the ensemble

³⁵ *Pesti Hírlap* 10, 307 (November 6, 1888), 5.

³⁶ *Nemzet* 5, 1509 (November 11, 1886, Reggeli kiadás [Morning edition]), 5.

³⁷ *Pesti Hírlap* 11, 37 (February 6, 1889), 8.

³⁸ *Budapesti Hírlap* 9, 40 (February 9, 1889), 3.

³⁹ "Joachim nagy individualitása: a német klasszicizmus itt domborodott ki erősen ellentétben Hubay francia romantikusságával. Mily különbözőképpen mondta el a két művész ugyanazt! Az öreg művész hangszeréből filozófiai mélység szólt, csupa erő, csupa puritán egyszerűség, szinte hideg világosság; az ifjú művész hegedűje pedig tele a gondolaton gyakran uralkodó érzelemmel, hévességgel, majd azt mondjuk: kacérkodással." *Budapesti Hírlap* 9, 44 (February 13, 1889), 4.

⁴⁰ *A Hon* 15, 279 (October 25, 1877, Reggeli kiadás [Morning edition]), 3.

was still praised for playing works of “recognized value.”⁴¹ But during their seventeen years of activity, the prudent programming of classical pieces remained unaltered, and by 1884 Kornél Ábrányi already criticized the “conservative tendencies of these gentlemen.”⁴² In contrast, the strength of Hubay String Quartet lay in the diversity of the repertoire and in presence of guest performers such as Johannes Brahms, but sometimes they got carried away with their romantic, virtuoso performance style.

In 1888, Beethoven’s string quartet in C-sharp Minor was performed three times in a row in Budapest. The first performance, that of the Hubay Quartet, took place at the end of October. The same piece was played by the Krančević Quartet in November. Finally, the Hubay Quartet played the Op. 131 again, at the end of the year. The quartet of the Serbian violinist achieved a unanimous success. However, reviews of the Hubay Quartet were rather heterogeneous. When the work was performed for the third time, some critics got fed up with the elusive “musical apocalypse.”⁴³ The critic of *Pesti Napló* did not hesitate to qualify the performance of the ensemble led by Hubay as inappropriate for Beethoven’s composition:

The pieces with a simpler texture and a clearer thematic elaboration have made a much greater impact during the earlier concerts than today’s performance of the C-sharp Minor quartet, during which part of the audience followed the music by using their binoculars and addressing polite greetings. Hubay’s violin playing lacked two essential qualities, strength and simplicity, and without these it is difficult to ascend to Beethoven. The artist’s performance was tender, sugary and – from time to time – ostentatious, which is out of place in this quartet.⁴⁴

Bibliography

Ábrányi, Kornél. *Képek a mult és jelenből* [Images from the past and the present]. Budapest: Pallas Részvénytársaság Nyomdája, 1899.

Marković, Tatjana. “Networks of Cultural Zones between Imperial Theatre Houses. Migrations of Two Serbian Musicians.” In *Cultural and Artistic Transfers in Theatre and Music: Past, Present, and Perspectives*, edited by Michaela Mojžišová. Bratislava: Art Research Centre of the Slovak

⁴¹ *Fővárosi Lapok* 14, 229 (October 7, 1877), 1100.

⁴² *Pesti Hírlap* 6, 327 (November 27, 1884), 4.

⁴³ *Budapesti Hírlap* 8, 339 (December 8, 1888), 4.

⁴⁴ “Az egyszerűbb szövéssé, tematikailag világosabban kidolgozott négyesek az eddigi hangversenyeken sokkal nagyobb hatást tettek, semmint a Cis-moll quartett mai előadása, mely alatt a közönség egy része látcsövezésekkel és udvarias köszönetekkel kísérte a zenét. Hubay hegedűjátékában két lényeges tulajdonságot nélkülöztünk, az erőt és egyszerűséget, mely nélkül Beethovenhez nehéz fölemelkedni. A művész játéka édeskésen gyöngéd és közbe-közbe czifrállkodó, mi e quartettben nincsen helyén.” *Pesti Napló* 39, no. 339 (December 8, 1888), 3.

Academy of Sciences Institute of Theatre and Film Research, VEDA Publishing House of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 2021.

Moskovitz, Marc. "Popper, David." In *Grove Music Online*.

Roudometof, Victor. *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2001.

Szabolcsi, Bence and Tóth, Aladár, eds. *Zenei lexikon II*. [Music Lexicon II.]. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó Vállalat, 1965.

Ujvári, Péter, ed. *Magyar zsidó lexikon* [Hungarian Jewish Lexicon]. Budapest, 1929.

Wagner, Cosima. *Napló* [Diary]. Budapest: Gondolat, 1983.

von Wasielewski, Wilhelm Joseph. *The Violoncello and Its History*. London: Novello and Company, 1894.

The Inter-nationality of Late Nineteenth-Century Budapest Quartets and Their not Entirely Prejudice-free Reception in the Press

Abstract

Pest-Buda already had two permanent ensembles during the 1830s – the Tá-borszky and the Szervacinszky quartets; in the 1850s, ambitious programs, explicitly labeled as “quartet concerts,” were performed by the short-lived Ridley-Kohne quartet. However, it was only in 1876, that the first Budapest-based quartet was founded that remained stable for the years to come. Although this ensemble, which was led by Dragomir Krančević and disposed of an excellent playing technique, was referred to in the press as the “Budapest quartet,” only the second violinist was of Hungarian origin and native of Pest. The case of the Hubay-Popper quartet – established ten years later, in 1886 – was quite similar: of its members, Jenő Hubay was only the one to be born and having studied in this city.

In this paper, I will present the press reception of the two latter quartets, focusing on the following issues: How did a biased discourse emerge in the Hungarian press that made a clear distinction between the “German” and the “other” (e.g., French or Hungarian) manners of playing? What was the role played by the performers’ national origin, the influence of their teachers and of the schools they attended? How did the press reviews treat these aspects? How did the repertoire of these quartets evolve during this period, and was there any connection with the prejudices suggested by the press?

Mezinárodní charakter budapeštských kvartetů konce 19. století a jejich ne zcela bez předsudků přijímaná recepcí v tisku

Abstrakt

Již ve 30. letech 19. století měla Pešť-Buda dva stálé soubory – Tábornszkyho a Szervacinszkyho kvarteto; v 50. letech 19. století pak ambiciózní programy, výslovně označené jako „kvartetní koncerty“, uvádělo krátce existující Ridley-Kohneovo kvarteto. Teprve v roce 1876 však vzniklo první budapeštské kvarteto, které zůstalo stabilní po celá následující léta. Ačkoli byl tento soubor, který vedl Dragomir Krančević a který disponoval vynikající technikou hry, v tisku označován jako „budapeštské kvarteto“, pouze druhý houslista byl maďarského původu a pocházel z Pešti. V případě Hubay-Popperova kvarteta – založeného o deset let později, v roce 1886 – to bylo dost podobné: z jeho členů se Jenő Hubay jako jediný narodil a studoval v tomto městě.

V tomto příspěvku představím recepci obou posledně jmenovaných kvartetů v tisku, přičemž se zaměřím na následující otázky: Jak vznikl v maďarském tisku zaujatý diskurz, který jasně rozlišoval mezi „německým“ a „jiným“ (např. francouzským nebo maďarským) způsobem hry? Jakou roli hrál národnostní původ interpretů, vliv jejich učitelů a škol, které navštěvovali? Jak se k těmto aspektům stavěly recenze v tisku? Jak se v tomto období vyvíjel repertoár těchto kvartet a existovala nějaká souvislost s předsudky naznačovanými tiskem?

Keywords

Budapest; string quartet; reception; reviews; Dragomir Krančević; Jenő Hubay

Klíčová slova

Budapešť; smyčcové kvarteto; recepcie; recenze; Dragomir Krančević; Jenő Hubay

Zsolt Vizinger

Institute for Musicology, RCH, Department for Hungarian Music History

vizinger.zsolt@abtk.hu