

https://dspace.org/

Controlling the canon: institutional piano performance repertoires and their practical and theoretical implications

Cartwright, Peter Mark

2015-02-27
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/17059

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

CONTROLLING THE CANON:

INSTITUTIONAL PIANO PERFORMANCE REPERTOIRES AND THEIR PRACTICAL AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

Peter Mark Cartwright

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of Master of Music

in the Wits School of Arts, Faculty of Humanities,

University of the Witwatersrand.

Johannesburg, October 2014

Declaration

I declare that this research report is my own unaided work. It is submitted for the degree of Master of Music in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any other degree or examination in any other university.

_____

23 October 2014

Abstract

This dissertation examines the concept of the canon in Western Classical piano music in practical and theoretical terms, located in South Africa with international reference. Performance-level music qualifications and international piano competitions are identified as institutions with the power and authority to influence the canon as they are two of the most important stepping stones to concert success for pianists. The repertoire prescribed by these institutions is analysed in terms of various categories drawn from research into performed music in both musicology and music history. This research investigates the extent to which the canon, and the historical approach to piano performance, is still prevalent in institutional performance syllabi. It then relates these findings to actual concert experience in South Africa and to the theory that has allowed this canonic music to become entrenched in performance repertoires.

The research design draws on both qualitative and quantitative methods, using interviews with leading South African pianists and reflection on my practice as a classical pianist. The research finds that the canon is still influential within the repertoire of these two institutions and that repertoire from the pre-1900 and twentieth-century eras is favoured over contemporary music, demonstrating that piano performance, as defined by these institutions, is still strongly located in a historical performance approach. Furthermore, these institutions are found, at times, to be out of touch with repertoire choice in actual concert experience in South Africa: they promote repertoire that has pedagogical value, but that is constructed in such a way that does not necessarily prepare pianists for concert performance.

Contents

Declaration ii
Abstract iii
Contents iv
List of Tables v
Acknowledgements vi
Chapter One: Introduction 1
1.1 Rationale: Canon and Repertoire in Contemporary Piano Performance 3
1.2 Aims: An Inquiry into Composer and Repertoire Privilege 7
1.3 Methodology and Research Design 8
1.4 Chapter Outline 14
Chapter Two: Literature Review and Theoretical Framework 15
2.1 The Development of the Canon and Repertoire 16
2.2 The Creation and Implications of Performance Repertories 24
Chapter Three: The Repertoire of Performance-Level Music Qualifications 29
3.1 The Dominance of a Few Composers in the Examination Repertoire 29
3.2 The Establishment of National Cultural Canons - Past and Present 34
3.3 Representing Contemporary Composers: Change versus Conformity 39
3.4 Types of Available Repertoire: Major and Minor Works 41
Chapter Four: The Repertoire of International Piano Competitions 46
4.1 Establishing and Promoting National Cultural Canons 46
4.2 Compositional Traditions Represented 48
Chapter Five: Practical Implications of Institutional Canons 52
5.1 The Use and Value of Historically Constructed Repertoire 52
5.2 The Shortcomings of the Institutional Approach to Repertoire 60
5.3 Audience Consideration when selecting Performance Music 61
5.4 Alternative Approaches to Programme Construction for Performance 62
Chapter Six: Theoretical Implications of Institutional Canons 66
6.1 The Concept of the Musical Work 66
6.2 The Implications of the Historical Recital Format 69
6.3 The Implications of National Canons for Contemporary Music 71
6.4 Change and Conformity 73
6.5 Conclusions 74
Appendix One: Sample Interview Schedule 77
Bibliography 79

List of Tables

Table 1: ABRSM Repertoire Allocation 31
Table 2: Trinity Repertoire Allocation 32
Table 3: UNISA Repertoire Allocation 33
Table 4: Concerto Appearances across seven Competitions 50

Acknowledgements

My sincere thanks to my supervisor, Dr Susan Harrop-Allin: your insightful criticism, constant support and encouragement, and generous sharing of your time and expertise have made this research most informative and enjoyable.

A further word of thanks to my piano teachers, Professor Malcolm Nay and Mrs Pauline Nossel: your expert teaching and guidance have made an immeasurable contribution to my development as a musician.

I would also like to thank the participants who answered my interview questions. Your responses have made a valuable contribution to this dissertation.

Finally, thank you to my family: your support while completing this degree, especially through two challenging events, has undoubtedly allowed me to complete this qualification.

Chapter One: Introduction

The names of five historical Western Classical music composers are inscribed above the entrance to the Chicago Symphony's Orchestra Hall. Bach, Mozart, Schubert and Wagner, with Beethoven's name centred, welcome patrons to the concert hall. These composers and their works are made permanent, not only through their physical representation on the façade of the concert hall, but through the repeated performances of their works on the stage inside.

Closer to home, the 2012 season of the Johannesburg Philharmonic Orchestra saw the orchestra perform 18 concert programmes totalling 45 performances in Johannesburg and Pretoria. Of the works performed, only one was written by a living composer, South African Peter Klatzow, and a significant portion of works were composed in the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries by Austrian, German, Russian and North American composers.

In my own performances as a pianist, the majority of my repertoire could be considered 'traditional' works within the Western canon. For my two Master's recitals, the composers performed are Beethoven, Brahms, Prokofiev, Rachmaninoff, Scarlatti and Schubert, strongly representing central-European and Russian compositional traditions.

The continued performance and valuing of historical works prompted me to take a closer look at canonisation in contemporary Western Classical music performance, with specific focus on the piano. The discussion that follows serves to highlight the current state of composer and repertoire canonisation and provide a rationale for the research by identifying a gap in current literature, from which certain pertinent questions emerge for investigation.

While works of visual art can literally be placed in a museum for public appreciation, and literature is preserved in text, music in the Western Classical tradition was historically consumed through public performance and existed only in the moment of its performance (until the development of recording and playback devices towards the end of the nineteenth-century). In the time of Bach, Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert, music that was included in these performances was mostly written by living composers and tended to fall out of use a generation or so after the death of the composer (Kerman 1983: 111). Nicholas Cook observes that "even Bach's music dropped out of performance for the best part of a century and had to be revived" (1998: 30). However, this situation gradually changed between the early to the mid-1800s when musicians "began to see musical masterpieces as

transcending temporal and spatial barriers" (Goehr 1992: 246) and entering into what Richard Taruskin and Lydia Goehr call the "museum of musical works" (Goehr 1992, Taruskin 2005: 639). As a result, certain composers and their works were privileged above others and formed what is known as the Western Classical music canon, a construct that still influences contemporary performances of classical music. In response, the hegemony of the canon has been contested by 'new musicology', focussing on "'marginalized' types of music and counter-canonical strategies" (Beard and Gloag 2005: 33-34) and attempting to bring the subject "into contact with social science, political history, gay studies, and feminism, to achieve a genuine intellectual prestige" (Rosen 2000: 256).[1]

Two related concepts essential to understanding how specific composers and their works are privileged above others are 'canon' and 'repertoire'. These notions have, for several years, occupied a large part of re-examining what is valued in Western Classical music (Kerman 1983, 1985, Goehr 1992, Weber 1994, 1999, 2003, Taruskin 2005) and moreover, what is considered to constitute this music. A fundamental understanding of the canon can be borrowed from literature, where critic Harold Bloom describes it as "what has been preserved out of what has been written" (1994: 17).

With specific relevance to music, 'canon' can be broadly understood as a "term used to describe a list of composers or works assigned value and greatness by consensus" (Samson 2001: 7). Furthermore,

> …there has been a tendency to privilege particular repertories as canonic. Embedded in this privilege is a sense of the ahistorical, and essentially disinterested, qualities of these repertories, as against their more temporal, functional and contingent qualities (Ibid.).

Joseph Kerman makes a useful distinction between the terms 'canon' and 'repertory': "a canon is an idea; a repertory is a program of action" (1983: 107).[2] In other words, 'canon' refers to the overall theory and concept of composer and repertoire privilege, while 'repertory' refers specifically to a collection of works that are privileged within the canon. Closely linked to canon is the idea of 'classical' music, borrowed from "the 'classical' art of Greece and Rome, which was seen as the expression of universal standards of beauty" (Cook 1998: 30-31).

[1] For more on 'new musicology' see McClary 1991, Bergeron and Bohlman 1992 and Cook and Everist 1999.
[2] Kerman and other scholars use the term 'repertory'; I use 'repertoire' with the same meaning.

1.1 Rationale: Canon and Repertoire in Contemporary Piano Performance

New Musicology's interrogation of the canon led to several studies that examine specific instances of canonisation, or more accurately, specific instances of how repertoire creation operates in various aspects of musical performance and education.

Several scholars have theorised factors influencing the development of the canon-concept, while others have explored how the canon has manifested as specific repertories. Reinhard Kopiez *et al*, (2009) investigated the historical concert repertoire, specifically Clara Schumann's concert programmes. They analysed her performance repertoire to identify which composers were favoured at various times throughout Schumann's performing career, and proposed possible reasons for this. Ton Bevers (2005) analysed high school exam papers for music and art in England, France, Germany, and the Netherlands to show which composers were favoured, based on the composer's country of origin, the period of composition and other relevant factors. In the orchestral performance domain Samuel Gilmore (1993) analysed programmes in the United States over a single concert season to ascertain the dominance of repertoire composers over contemporary composers. In piano performance John Gould (2005) surveyed a selection from recital repertoires compiled in George Kehler's *The piano in concert* (1982) to establish which composers dominated performances amongst leading pianists within five chronological time periods. The research mentioned here suggests that there are various ways for music to be canonised and for repertories of performance music to be formed.

It stands to reason then, that within the canon, there must be various entities that decide what is canonised and what is included in performance repertories. Philip Bohlman identifies these as both people and institutions called "canonizers" (1992: 205), including music historians, musicologists, universities, conservatories, record companies and music publishers.[3] In order for them to function as canonizers they must "wield some kind of power and maintain some basis of authority" (Ibid.: 206). I suggest that there are two institutions that Bohlman has not included in his list that "canonize by deciding what will enter canons and by undertaking the representation of canons as texts" (Ibid.: 205). Both performance-level piano examinations and international piano competitions have not been fully investigated in terms of how they reinforce the status of 'great works' and composers already deemed to be part of the canon, influence the canon, and create repertories for performers or influence pianists' performance careers.

[3] Of course, one cannot ignore the role of the teacher as a potential canoniser, albeit in a smaller context.

This research aims to demonstrate how both these institutions function as canonizers in Bohlman's sense, by both wielding power and authority, and representing canons as texts (Ibid. 205, 206). This textual representation is visible in the existing repertoire lists prescribed for both exams and competitions. Institutions offering performance-level music examinations enable pianists to obtain a professional qualification through the performance of prescribed repertoire, and piano competitions require competitors to play works included in pre-set repertoire lists. The discussion that follows demonstrates how both institutions have become firmly entrenched in Western musical culture over many years and are widely respected in contemporary piano performance, both in South Africa and internationally. It is necessary to demonstrate how these institutions act as canonizers, as specific research aims are founded upon this assumption.

1.1.1 Performance-Level Music Examinations as Canonisers

Performance-level music exams are offered by three large examining bodies in South Africa, two of which are based in the United Kingdom, and used internationally, and one of which is local.[4] The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music (ABRSM), Trinity College London (Trinity), and the University of South Africa (UNISA) all offer exams to thousands of candidates around the world each year.

The ABRSM facilitates over 650 000 exams and assessments in 93 countries annually (ABRSM 2013: 'About Us'), Trinity assessments are taken by nearly 600 000 candidates in over 60 countries annually (Trinity 2013: 'About Trinity'), and by 1995 over 20 000 music examinations were conducted by UNISA (UNISA 2013: 'A Brief History'). These statistics demonstrate that all three of these examining bodies conduct vast numbers of exams each year; those offered by the ABRSM and Trinity are conducted worldwide. The ABRSM claims that its diploma exams are "…recognised throughout the world as the gold standard at this level" (Taylor 2011: 52) and that it is "the leading authority on musical assessment" (ABRSM 2013: 'More about ABRSM'). It considers its exams to be "a measure of personal progress and attainment against internationally recognised benchmarks" (Taylor 2011: 9). David Wright substantiates these claims, saying that the ABRSM "has influenced the musical lives and tastes of millions of people since it conducted its first exams in 1890" (2012: ix) and that "in the course of its 120 years few institutions can be said to have had a greater effect on people's musical lives across the world" (Ibid.: 1).

[4] It is worth noting here that UNISA has itself developed in a post-colonial South African society, and as such, would form a complex relationship with the ideals of its former colonizer, the country that hosts the other two examining institutions.

Trinity also declares worldwide influence: "Performing is at the heart of Trinity Grade examinations, which is key to their continued success around the world" (Trinity Syllabus 2012: 3), while UNISA exams are conducted "in over 150 centres throughout South Africa and Namibia" (UNISA 2013: 'a brief history').

The evidence provided above attests to the widespread influence of these three examining bodies both internationally and in South Africa, and demonstrates the authority they wield to act as Bohlman's canonizers. All three institutions create repertories by representing musical works as texts, or more specifically, representing performance repertories as texts through their prescribed repertoire lists. These performance-level music exam institutions have each existed for over a hundred years (ABRSM 2014: 'ABRSM history', UNISA 2013: 'A Brief History', Trinity 2013: 'About Trinity'), while international piano competitions have become so central to performance that winners are often offered performance management and concert opportunities, as well as significant financial reward. For example, the winner of the Fourteenth Van Cliburn International Piano Competition, Vadym Kholodenko, received:

> Cash award of $50,000; career management, and international and U.S. concert tours for the three concert seasons following the Competition; studio and live recordings produced by harmonia mundi usa; and performance attire provided by Neiman Marcus (The Cliburn 2014: '2013 Competition Awards & Competitors').

I therefore suggest that these international piano competitions wield the power and authority to canonize.

1.1.2 The Influence of International Piano Competitions

The ubiquity of these competitions is confirmed on the Alink-Argerich Foundation (AAF) website, which tracks over 300 piano competitions taking place globally each year (Alink-Argerich Foundation. 2013. 'Alink-Argerich Foundation').[5]

Substantial research confirms the power and authority of these musical institutions. In 'Competitions: Pinnacles and Pitfalls, an interview with Daniel Pollack, by Nancy Bachus' (2010), Pollack highlights the importance of these competitions: [6]

> Top-tier competitions offer sizable cash prizes. Some offer a grand piano, while a few offer concerts and management… Yet the avenue of a competition is still the most accessible

[5] The AAF foundation keeps track of details for hundreds of piano competitions worldwide, providing a range of information about each one. It is the comprehensive index of the world's piano competitions.
[6] Daniel Pollack was placed second to Van Cliburn the year he famously won the first Tchaikovsky International Piano Competition in Russia during the Cold War in 1958.

> route to a career. How else can a young talent get heard? If you don't win in competitions, the road ahead becomes more difficult. You must creatively search out contacts and create relationships that will set up auditions for managers, introduce you to conductors and corporate sponsors, and help you find recording opportunities (Ibid.: 14).

Essentially, Pollack demonstrates that competitions are the most direct route to gain concert opportunities and recording contracts for young pianists. In 'Higher, Faster, Louder: Representations of the International Music Competition' (2009), Lisa McCormick reinforces the prominent position that music competitions have come to hold in contemporary music performance:

> Competitions have become standard pedagogical practice. Public schools, conservatories, music festivals, arts philanthropies, and volunteer organizations regularly sponsor and organize competitions for every ability level, every instrument, and every combination of instruments. In both popular and high art musical genres, competition prizes are staples of promotional media, resumes, and biographies of aspiring and professional musicians alike… Historically, they have provided an arena for nations to demonstrate cultural superiority through the artistic excellence of their musicians (2009: 6).

In Peter Takacs' review of Alink's *International Piano Competitions* (1994), he elaborates why these competitions have become so popular, demonstrating how they allow the winners to separate themselves from their peers:

> A number of reasons, in addition to the dramatic aspect, can be found for both the popularity and proliferation of music competition. In a world beset by highly skilled performers, a victory… can provide the participant with instant visibility; thus great numbers of young aspirants flock to competitions in the hope of standing out from the crowds (1994: 617).

However, scholars have questioned the usefulness of piano competitions for pianists trying to develop a career. In 'The State of International Piano Competitions: A "Frenzy for Attention"' (2010), Michael Johnson questions the popularity of competitions and their effect on young pianists. He paraphrases Charles Rosen who talks about "the limiting effect it [the competition] has on repertoire. The young competitor must concentrate on "competition warhorses" such as Brahms, Rachmaninoff, Chopin and Beethoven concertos" (Rosen 2002: 102, quoted in Johnson 2010). This suggests that the repertoire required by these competitions is not necessarily the most helpful when trying to develop a professional performance career.

Nevertheless, it is clear that international piano competitions are often perceived to be significant for pianists' professional careers. As demonstrated above, they possess both power and authority; therefore they can function as canonizers in Bohlman's sense.

In conclusion, it is evident that both performance-level music qualifications and international piano competitions have been firmly ingrained into the local and international piano performance worlds,

and have the power and authority to influence the repertoire choices of pianists following their guidelines.

1.2 Aims: An Inquiry into Composer and Repertoire Privilege

The authority and power of performance-level music examinations and international piano competitions as canonisers prompted an investigation of how the canon manifests in contemporary piano performance practice. This research asks to what extent traditional canonic works and composers are valued and promoted in the repertoire guidelines offered by two major musical institutions and explores the theoretical concepts that allow canonisation to take place.

This research further interrogates the practicality of these institutional repertoire choices in terms of developing a performing career as a classical pianist, in relation to specific strategies employed by successful pianists. Having determined this, the research also examines the broader implications of repertoire privilege and concepts of worth and value in relation to theories of repertoire and canonisation.

While the research uses both international and South African institutional repertories as evidence, the findings are largely applied to a South African context in terms of piano pedagogy and performance careers, with comparison to international performance examples providing a broader comparative context.

In her article, 'In the Shadow of the Canon' (2002), Lydia Goehr states that concepts of the canon need to be informed by research of their constituent works and composers (2002: 320). This research is, therefore, located within this type of argument, while relating the significance of repertories back to the broader canon-concept that underpins them.

This research analyses and interprets the repertoire choices of a number of canonising institutions in terms of the prominence of composers and their works from the Western canon and the inclusion of non-canonical and contemporary composers. These include repertoire choices offered in the performance-level qualifications of the Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music (ABRSM), Trinity College London (Trinity) and the University of South Africa (UNISA). Seven international piano competitions are also included: the Fourteenth Van Cliburn International Piano Competition (2013), the Ferruccio Busoni International Piano Competition (2013), the Leeds International Piano

Competition (2013), the XIV International Tchaikovsky Competition (2011), the 14th Arthur Rubinstein International Piano Master Competition (2014), The 8th Hamamatsu Piano Competition (2012) and the 12th UNISA International Piano Competition (2012). These competitions were chosen on the basis of their establishment within the international competition circuit and because they represent a wide geographical spread, with the UNISA competition doubling as a comparative local sample.

The performance-level music exams include the qualifications that are offered to prepare candidates for professional performing careers, and not the graded exams that are more focussed on the learning stages of piano development. The ABRSM qualifications are the Diploma (DipABRSM), Licentiate (LRSM) and Fellowship (FRSM). Trinity qualifications also range over three levels, namely the Associate (ATCL), the Licentiate (LTCL) and the Fellow of Trinity College London (FTCL), while UNISA has recently combined the repertoire from three qualifications into one. The Advanced Certificate in Performance, the Teacher's Licentiate and the Performance Licentiate have been collapsed into what is now just called the Performer's Assessment.

The research further identifies the works that are part of these repertories, and questions why specific historical repertories continue to be elevated as exemplars of 'classical music' in contemporary piano performance practice. This research then explores the different types of repertoire approach that have contributed to performance careers amongst pianists in South Africa, and following this, describes possible alternative routes to repertoire choice for pianists seeking to develop a successful career.

1.3 Methodology and Research Design

In order to address these questions, this research uses multiple methodologies, drawn from a variety of research fields. Although primarily qualitative in design, the use of quantitative methods is necessary, specifically when dealing with large repertoire lists from performance-level music exams and international piano competitions. Such a mixed method approach "assumes both qualitative and quantitative approaches for different parts of the project" (Badenhorst 2008: 93); and acknowledges that qualitative research can draw on statistics to argue a point (Ibid.). Furthermore, mixed method studies can show "the result (quantitative) and explain why it was obtained (qualitative)" (McMillan and Schumacher: 2010: 25). This mixed method approach was adopted for this study as certain data is best understood in statistical terms, such as the huge volumes collected from repertoire lists; while other data, such as that collected from interviews (Merriam 2009: 267), is best understood

through qualitative means, where texts are interpreted for meaning. This methodology has been organised according to the specific research question that the method seeks to answer, as different methods were employed to address each question.

1.3.1 Analysis of Performance-Level Music Examination Repertoire

The first inquiry is that of composer and repertoire privilege within the performance-level qualifications of the examination syllabi offered by the ABRSM, Trinity and UNISA. The two British examining bodies are by far the largest institutions of their type, taken in several countries around the world, while UNISA is highly prominent in South Africa, providing a local equivalent.[7] The most useful example of an appropriate methodological approach is adopted by Ton Bevers (2005) who conducted similar research on high-school exams in four European countries. Bevers aimed to determine instances of cultural canonisation based on the promotion of the ideals of the country where each exam was held. Through his method of "content analysis" (Bevers 2005: 388) he concluded that the content of the exams is "a conscious choice made by experts" and that it indicates "what every student should know and be able to do" (Ibid.: 394). This statement is applicable to my research, as repertoire guidelines offered by performance-level music qualifications and international piano competitions set out exactly what a candidate must play to gain a professional music qualification. Further, the repertoire guidelines themselves are more reliable than the various accompanying text and booklets; the text provides opinions and interpretation of the requirements, while the repertoire lists demonstrate specifically which works and composers are to be performed.

1.3.2 Data Sources

Repertoire requirements from the three performance-level examining institutions were analysed for all the applicable qualifications for piano. For the ABRSM and Trinity, there is just one repertoire list for each exam, while UNISA divides the repertoire into four different lists A, B, C and D where the candidate must choose a work from each. The institutions all make allowance for candidates to submit an own-choice work, but strict control is maintained by the examining bodies. Candidates have to submit the repertoire for approval to the institution and the length of the works is also controlled by the examining body. All three bodies make statements of the type confirming the

[7] While there are other international examination boards in existence, such as the Australian Music Examinations Board and the Royal Conservatory Examinations in Canada, they do not appear to have the international reach of their British counterparts.

sufficient difficulty of the works to replace their own listings: “Permission to perform this work must be obtained from the Directorate Music” (UNISA 2012: 9), “approval is simply in terms of technical and musical difficulty” (Trinity College London 2013: 10), while replacement works must be “comparable in standard” (The ABRSM 2010: 11) to the listed repertoire.

For each institution the most recent available listings (February 2014) were used, all of which were available online from the individual websites.[8] This provides a cross-section of the current performance qualification situation, as opposed to a measure of the change in preference over a period of time.

1.3.3 Variables and Data Presentation

The information from these repertoire lists was entered into a database. Each individual work was listed as one entry, and classified according to various criteria: the type of exam (for example: DipABRSM or ATCL), name of composer, composer date of birth, composer nationality, period of composition (pre-1900, twentieth-century or contemporary), title of work, and genre where applicable (for example: sonata, etude, rhapsody or ballade).[9] When two or more works were required from a set of pieces, the set was listed as one repertoire item (the implication being that a single piece from the set would not count as a work on its own); also, where pairs of works were stipulated they were listed as a single repertoire item (for the same reason). Furthermore, complete sets were listed as one item (for example, Chopin *Etudes* Opus 25). In cases where the syllabus required candidates to choose one work from a collection of pieces (for example: any etude from *12 Etudes* by Debussy) the individual etudes were each listed as one entry. When the syllabus listed a choice such as ‘any one, two or three’ from a set, the set was separated so that each piece was listed

[8] For performance-level exam syllabi requirements see: The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music 2010: *Performance Diploma Full, Syllabus Updates 2010 reprint*, Trinity College London 2013: *Diplomas in Music: Performance and Teaching from 2009 (Fifth Impression)* and University of South Africa 2012: *Unisa Piano syllabus 2012 until further notice: Piano; Piano Duet, Two Pianos (four hands)*. For international piano competitions repertoire requirements see: 12th Unisa International Piano Competition 2012, Ferruccio Busoni: International Piano Competition Foundation 2013, The 14th Arthur Rubinstein International Piano Master Competition 2014, The 8th Hamamatsu International Piano Competition 2013, The Cliburn 2011, The Leeds International Piano Competition 2012 and XIV International Tchaikovsky Competition 2011.

[9] The derivation of the period of composition categories is discussed at length in Chapter Two, but is worth explaining here. Gilmore uses a measure of 30 years to determine contemporaneity, which in 1970 extended back to 1940. In 2014 this extends back to 1984; as such, works up until 1984 are classified here as ‘twentieth-century’ while those in the last 30 years are labelled as contemporary. While this can at times simplify a complex situation it is necessary as a quantitative exercise. There was a great variety in the piano music written in the twentieth century, ranging from works that could be considered Romantic, such as Rachmaninoff’s Second Piano Concerto, to the music of fellow Russian Edison Denisov. These anomalies are dealt with individually.

as one entry, as this implied that each piece could potentially stand on its own, and did not necessarily have to be performed with the whole set.

Composer information for transcriptions was taken from the transcriber and not the original composer as the transcriber is responsible for the performed version of the work. The database created for the performance-level qualifications resulted in just over 1 400 individual entries, which allowed various data to be collected, such as how many works by a particular composer across the three institutions are listed, or determining from which historical time-frame a significant amount of works were listed. This information is numerically represented in the form of tables and the implications of this are explored in terms of the research questions.

1.3.4 Analysis of International Music Competition Repertoire

The second major inquiry of this research is an examination of composer and repertoire privilege within seven major international piano competitions in order to ascertain which composers and repertoire were preferred over others, and to examine phenomena such as the attempts to create a "national culture" canon for the country hosting the competition (Bevers 2005: 395).

1.3.5 Data Sources

The repertoire requirements for each of the seven competitions listed are not as easily analysed as those of the performance-level music qualifications. Unlike the qualifications they do not provide lists that are entirely fixed, and the repertoire choice is sometimes completely free for certain rounds. As such it was necessary to use different approaches from the analysis of the qualifications to gather different kinds of information. The seven competitions listed do not constitute a complete range of the kinds of competitions available to young pianists, but rather they serve as case studies to provide answers to research questions. As a research method, case study is appropriate as "a case can be… used to illustrate an issue" (McMillan and Schumacher 2010: 24), the issue here being how a composer and type of works are privileged in repertoire choice for international piano competitions.

1.3.6 Data Presentation and Analysis

In areas where the repertoire requirements are readily comparable and quantifiable, these have been tabled by specific work. The most prominent example of this is the concerto round for each

competition. Here it was possible to create a database where a concerto can be ranked according to how many of the selected competitions require competitors to play it, creating a "rank-order distribution" (McMillan and Schumacher 2010: 152) to show which concerti are the most popular as listed by the various competitions. Other questions were answered by looking at specific instances of composer preference in various competitions to determine the implications thereof in creating a "national cultural canon" (Bevers 2005: 392) for the host country. For example, the Tchaikovsky Competition in Russia requesting competitors to play specific concerti and solo works by Tchaikovsky (XIV International Tchaikovsky Competition 2011).

1.3.7 Supplementary Approaches: The Semi-Structured Interview and Personal Reflection

In order to determine the kind of repertoire approaches that contributed to the development of successful performance careers in South Africa, I conducted interviews with four South African pianists who have successful careers as concert pianists and piano teachers. Albie van Schalkwyk, Nina Schumann and one anonymous candidate were interviewed in 2012, while Jill Richards was interviewed in 2013. Albie van Schalkwyk is one of South Africa's "leading chamber musicians and vocal accompanists" (South African College of Music 2014) and has extensive concert experience both locally and internationally. Nina Schumann is well known both for her performances and extensive repertoire of both solo and concerto works. She has also won prizes in several major competitions including the UNISA International Piano Competition (1993), the Shreveport Concerto Competition (1996) and the Casablanca International Piano Competition (1997) (Nina Schumann 2014). Jill Richards has made a name for herself through specialising in new music and has had numerous works written for her by significant contemporary South African composers. These three candidates, and one who chose to remain anonymous, have all made successful careers as performing pianists, and were able to provide useful insights into repertoire choice for performance and pedagogy with specific focus on a South African context tempered by international experience. While choosing other candidates may have resulted in different views, the information gained from these interviews provided a helpful sample and topics for further exploration.

I then reflected on the approaches I have used to secure various performance opportunities in the context of building a performance career. These two methodological approaches help to determine how composer and repertoire choice function in actual performance situations and to evaluate how programme construction can be helpful to a pianist's career.

1.3.8 The Semi-Structured Interview

In order to gain insight into the opinions of successful pianists regarding their performance careers in South Africa, the "semi-structured interview" within a qualitative design is the most appropriate approach as it provides direct access to the experience of the respondents (Merriam 2009: 267). The semi-structured interview contains a mix of "more and less structured interview questions" (Ibid.: 89), that are flexible with little pre-determined wording or order, and questions are "phrased to allow for individual responses" (McMillan and Schumacher 2010: 206) while they remain "fairly specific"(Ibid.) in their intent. This format allows the interviewer to obtain specific data from the interviewees, while allowing room for their interpretation of phenomena, with the interviews guided by "lines of inquiry" (Weiss 1994: 46) along various subjects and areas of interest.

I am aware of the many challenges inherent in the interview method, including its potential for "subjectivity and bias" (McMillan and Schumacher 2010: 205), as well as the problem of perceptions of the interviewer and their personal interpretation of the information provided (Ibid.). I was familiar with three of the interviewees, having had master-classes with them, which reduced any feeling of discomfort. I was also sure to "explain the purpose of the interview" (Ibid.: 207) and address any concerns the respondent may have. All respondents were provided with a consent form giving permission to record and transcribe the interview, offering them the choice to view the transcript before the report was published and the option to remain anonymous in the report. The interviews were recorded and transcribed for content (I did not transcribe the nuances of the speech itself but rather the information provided), as well as my personal observations of the data collected. The interview schedule is attached (Appendix One).

1.3.9 Reflection on my Practice as a Classical Pianist

I have been active as a professional pianist both in South Africa and internationally (Zimbabwe, Botswana and the United States) for the past five years. I analysed the repertoire used in the construction of my concert programmes for both of my Master's recitals and used evidence from other concerts in order to determine the ways in which my repertoire is selected, both in terms of standard repertoire works prepared for my Master's recitals and the ways in which I have come to perform works by contemporary composers. The reasons for my repertoire choice are then analysed to determine the extent to which this repertoire is congruent with institutional repertoire trends and to determine if these trends had an influence on my repertoire selection.

1.4 Chapter Outline

The results of this study are organised according to the research questions, preceded in Chapter Two by a survey and analysis of the various bodies of literature that are relevant to this research. These include the development of the canon and the theoretical concepts that allowed it to become prominent in performance, the creation of historical performance repertories, as well as literature dealing with surveys of performance repertoire from which various ideas and categories of classification can be drawn for analysing performance-level music qualifications and international piano competitions.

Chapters Three and Four present the findings from analysing the performance-level qualification syllabi and international piano competitions' repertoire respectively, while Chapter Five explores the implications of canonisation and stipulated repertoire for performance careers of successful pianists, as well as the alternative methods of programme construction available for pianists looking to develop performance careers. Chapter Six describes how this research contributes to existing theory on the concepts of canon and repertoire and draws important conclusions and insights that emerged from doing this research.

Chapter Two: Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

The previous chapter provides a rationale for this research in terms of existing literature on the canon and its impact on performance, precedent for research of this kind and the necessity to examine two canonising institutions. This chapter draws on aspects of music history, musicology, and studies of repertoire canonisation based in social and cultural fields, in order to understand how the canon developed and became entrenched in Western Classical music, how it has recently been questioned and interrogated, and on what grounds. The chapter begins by reviewing the work of scholars Joseph Kerman, Katherine Bergeron and Philip Bohlman, Nicholas Cook and Mark Everist, William Weber, Lydia Goehr and finally Richard Taruskin. Of course there is not space here to outline all the research that questions the canons of musicology and performance practice from a wide range of perspectives, rather I have selected research that both contextualises this study, and provides relevant theories for it.

The second section of this chapter reviews literature concerning the canon and repertoire choice in performance repertories, as several specific elements of these studies are applicable to this research. These include more scientifically-oriented research pertinent to the quantitative aspects of these studies by authors including Ton Bevers, Samuel Gilmore, Kopiez *et al* and John Gould, all of whom have undertaken studies of specific repertories from various spheres of musical performance practice. The two broad areas of literature mentioned here provide epistemological and theoretical foundations for this study.

Questions of the institutionalisation and privilege of repertoire and music are inextricably linked to the concepts of canonisation and repertoire creation, both of which have been extensively explored in musicology over the past three decades. A review of this literature not only provides valuable concepts to this research, but also contextualises it within a movement of questioning performance repertoire and the idea of canonisation in academic musicological literature; a movement that was started in the 1980s by scholars such as Joseph Kerman. While examining how the canon came about in various countries and spheres of musical practice, these scholars also distinguished between different types of canonisation, most significantly the theoretical canon, based in scholarship and academic discourse, and the repertoire, based largely in performance.

Scholars have proposed several reasons for the development of the performance canon that still exists today. These are based on theories of reception and conception of music, as well as political and intellectual reasons, but there are conflicting interpretations. Understanding these theories of canon is significant for contextualising its position in this discourse, in fact, the canon we employ in

South African performance (as demonstrated in the JPO reference in Chapter One) is surely a continuation and development of a canon formed much earlier in Europe and later the United States of America. A study of performance repertoire is necessarily linked to the canon-concept that created it; to study the repertoire in isolation would verge on the myopic and ignore the underlying aesthetic that allowed it to take hold. The concept of a canon developed and was enabled by various social and cultural conditions and philosophical ideas in different countries at different times.

2.1 The Development of the Canon and Repertoire

What follows serves to trace the history of the academic discussion and debate about the concept of canonisation and the critiques thereof. I follow the arguments of various scholars and their work chronologically, broadly located within musicology, philosophy, and music history. Of course not all scholars have divided their work entirely according to these categories, hence the choice to follow the discussion from its beginnings through to contemporary theory.

2.1.1 Kerman and the Start of the Debate

Historically, the canon developed within music performance practice without being explicitly articulated as such. One of the earliest scholars in musicology to start a discussion around the canon (albeit mainly of works examined in theoretical analysis) was British-born, Joseph Kerman (who was mostly active in the United States). In 'A Few Canonic Variations' (1983) and two years later in his seminal text *Musicology* (1985) he opened a wide-ranging debate on the subject of musical works and canonisation. Kerman highlights how the concept of a musical work being objectified in the score came to be essential to the creation of a canon (1983). In the nineteenth-century the performance tradition in Western Classical music changed from the secular repertoire consisting of works of the "present generation and one or two preceding generations" (1983: 111) to including works from a "historical dimension" (Ibid.). Kerman identifies early Romanticism as one of the founding ideas behind historical repertoire and canon formation. In addition to Kerman's distinction between repertoire and canon mentioned in Chapter One, he adds that repertories are determined by performers, while canons are determined by critics through literary discourse. As such, the musical score assumed a new importance; not only as a guideline for conductors and performers, but as a text subject to criticism (Ibid.: 112). It was through this criticism that the canon was able to take hold.

Kerman shows the composers who were traditionally included in the canon: Beethoven, Haydn, Mozart, Wagner, Brahms and Liszt are all indicated as having claims to the canon in varying degrees. He elaborates that the canonisation of certain works was validated by the studies of musical analysts, who thought canonic and aesthetic value was determined by "some form of analysis of the scores" (Ibid.: 114). At the end of this landmark article, Kerman calls for a questioning of canons and repertoire: "*How* are canons determined, *why*, and on *what* authority" (Ibid.: 124) [Italics original]. This sparked a significant debate in musicological circles.

However, it was Kerman's *Musicology* (1985) that truly outlined a rethinking of the theoretical foundations of music history as a discipline. Through examining the then current state of the field, he highlighted how the historical import of music was realised far more recently than it was in literature and art (1985: 33). He reiterates that during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth-centuries music underwent a change in its repertories and the "social conditions under which Western art music was composed and presented" (Ibid.). Through questioning the nature of musicology and the methods associated with it, Kerman encouraged a debate that led to a wide rethinking of the musicological discipline and its values as a whole. This debate outlines how the canon-concept originated and how specific repertories are formed in performance practice. An understanding of both these ideas is needed, as discussions of specific repertories have emerged from the broader discussion of canonisation as a whole.

Katherine Bergeron and Philip Bohlman's collection of essays *Disciplining Music: Musicology and Its Canons* (1992) uses Kerman's text as a point of departure for discussing the various ways individual scholars perceive and 'discipline' music. Many of these essays relate to fields that are not explicitly relevant to this research, but rather provide broader contexts for canonical hegemony, such as using ethnomusicological methodologies to examine Western music and cultures. However, it is in the summarizing epilogue where Bohlman elucidates important elements of how canonisation takes place, is theorised and is reinforced. He outlines the "plural" (1992: 197) nature of musicology, while drawing attention to a canon that excluded several "musics, peoples, and cultures" (1992: 198).

Bohlman reinforces Kerman's idea that canonisation developed mostly in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth-centuries in Europe when music performance took on a historical dimension (Ibid.: 199). He continues that these canons became dependent on textual representation to become entrenched: "To enter the canon of great works, a piece of music must "last" and how better to make it last than to transform it into a text?" (Ibid.: 202). Bohlman elaborates that through these texts canons are able to influence and control musical study and performance. This idea of the canon represented as text is a key concept in this research because it is through such texts that

performance-level music qualifications and international piano competitions represent the repertoire that they would see performed. Bohlman's idea of 'canonizers' with relation to exams and competitions discussed in Chapter One provides useful ideas of how an institution can both create a repertoire and influence a canon. Text, in this case, refers both to the score of a work of music, and to the discussion and representation of this music in academic discourse.

In his review of the above text, Alan Street highlights one of the fundamental tenets of canonisation:

> Before the nineteenth century therefore, music existed in a condition of perennial contemporaneity: what transformed the spirit of evanescence was a change in social, ideological, and philosophical circumstances mediated through the agencies of historicism, nationalism, organicism…" (1993: 171).

Highlighting the shift from a condition of contemporaneity to a condition of history is essential to understanding the process of canonisation and repertoire creation that took place in nineteenth-century Europe, and several scholars have looked at these conditions in detail.

2.1.2 Lydia Goehr and the Philosophy of Musical Museum Pieces

In her influential text *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music* (1992), Lydia Goehr examined the philosophical conceptions underpinning canon formation. The chapter 'Werktreue: Confirmation and Challenge in Contemporary Movements' relates canonisation specifically to the Romantic notion of a musical 'work', which came to pervade all aspects of Western Classical music. She examines how the out-dated concept of a canon has survived in contemporary society, and questions the tendency amongst musicians to package musical activity into works; this idea has been applied retrospectively to composers from the pre-Romantic era, like Bach and Vivaldi, and is still applied to contemporary experimental composers (Ibid.: 244). She addresses the construction of the canon by identifying historical and philosophical patterns that have shaped our thinking about it, observing that around 1800:

> …musicians began to reconstruct musical history to make it look as if musicians had always thought about their activities in modern terms. Even if it was not believed that early musicians had thought explicitly in these terms, the assumption was that they would have, had circumstances allowed them to do so (Goehr 1992: 245).

Goehr emphasises the idea of canonisation as both a Romantic ideal, and one motivated by an academic interest in musical history during the nineteenth-century:

> What is also clear is that the musician's interest in the revival of past music was taking a specifically romantic form. Reconstructing the past was partly motivated by a new sort of academic interest in music history… Musicians did not look back to the past, as they once

> had done, to find models for contemporaries to imitate. Instead, they began to see musical masterpieces as transcending temporal and spatial barriers (Ibid.: 246).

Goehr's linking of canonisation with academic interest in music, suggests that the Romantic ideal of timelessness influenced a conception of musical works as ahistorical masterpieces. Many scholars of 'new musicology' argued instead for a focus on music as performance and practice, and the necessity to consider music within its historical and social contexts.[10]

Understandably, Goehr's text was the subject of much review, and one such by Willem Erauw, 'Canon Formation: Some More Reflections on Lydia Goehr's Imaginary Museum of Musical Works' (1998) questions whether the concept of a musical 'work' was not actually in use much earlier than Goehr allows (Erauw 1998: 110). However, Erauw acknowledges that canon formation is linked inextricably to the work-concept, and the representation of music as text.

From this discussion there emerged research that started to focus more closely on the social and ideological structures that helped to embed the canon in performance practice in various European countries, and it appears that these are still the repertories we have inherited today.

2.1.3 The Development of the Canon in Europe

A notable scholar of the canon, William Weber, discusses the formation of a performance canon in England in the eighteenth-century. In 'The Intellectual Origins of Musical Canon in Eighteenth-Century England' (1994) he identifies a scholarly need to examine the "origins and development of the musical canon" (Weber 1994: 488). Weber relates the development of the canon to the intellectual movements of Empiricism and Romanticism (thus conferring with Goehr) in eighteenth-century England, connecting it to the concurrent canonisation occurring in the fields of art, and literature, where a series of 'classics' was being established. He attributes much of the rise of the canon to the theory of empiricism; musical writing changed to include "the discussion of actual pieces of music instead of rules about composition or theories about their scientific or philosophical origins" (Ibid.: 493) and he relates the formation of canon to a change in the "fundamental structure of ideas and discourse by which music was perceived" (Ibid.).

Canon formation is related to the textual representation of music in the discourses of music theory and history, conferring with Kerman and Bohlman; composers came to be acknowledged as the

[10] For discussions of music being understood as an activity, with its meaning located outside of the score see Christopher Small's *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening* (1998) and in Music Education, David Elliott's *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education* (1995).

source of musical authority above theorists. Weber briefly mentions the canonisation taking place in both France and Germany in the eighteenth-century. Lydia Goehr's discussion of German canonisation provides a framework for examining contemporary repertoire choices based on particular composers. It is indeed largely German and Austrian composers that have come to wield authority in contemporary practice: Bach, Mozart and Beethoven are amongst the most requested composers listed in both the qualification and piano competition syllabi.

In 'In the Shadow of the Canon' (2002) Goehr traces the formation of the canon in Germany in the nineteenth-century, strongly linked to what she refers to as the "Beethoven cult" (2002: 307). She outlines that canon formation started at a time when "public concert halls and commissioned works" (Ibid.) took on a new significance in music performance with "new roles defined for composers, performers, audiences, and critics" (Ibid.). Music that was originally conceived in secular terms took on a sacred role for its patrons, displaying "canonic aspirations and anxieties of earlier forms of religious authority" (Ibid.). In other words, music concerts took on a religious significance for the audience. Goehr relates German canon formation strongly to an attempt by the German public to distance themselves from political decisions in the nineteenth-century. The canon was to represent that which was true and good about humanity, and act as a touchstone for moral authority, outside of political concerns. Of course, in doing this, the German canon naturally promoted its own composers, to the exclusion of anything "French, Italian, or any other "foreign" lineage" (Ibid.: 314). Goehr demonstrates, ironically, how this process of "retreat from political failure into a spiritual or cultural consolation certainly contributed to giving German music and its canonic lineage of works a greater prominence in the country's political life" (Ibid.: 318). It would appear that this strong German canon still influences contemporary performance practice. The idea of a national cultural canon is explored when examining specific repertories of performance.

A collection of essays under the title *Rethinking Music* (1999), edited by Nicholas Cook and Mark Everist, uses a large part of Kerman's discussion outlined in *Musicology* as a point of departure for canonic critique, as did *Disciplining Music*. As noted in the preface by the editors, "Kerman created the vacuum that was filled by what came to be called the 'New Musicology'" (Cook and Everist 1999: viii).

Again, the work of William Weber is useful from this collection that includes challenges to and re-examinations of both the nature and methodologies of musicological analysis. Weber's chapter 'The History of Musical Canon' provides most useful theories as to how historical performance repertories relate back to, and influence, the broader concept of the canon. Similar to Goehr's call above, he suggests that questions of canonisation and repertoire creation be linked *first* back to the

individual collections and works in which they appear (in this case the repertoire requirements of performance-level qualifications and international piano competitions), and then "together, as a complete musical context in a particular period" (Weber 1999: 338).

This research aligns with Weber's approach, in studying two particular contemporary institutional repertories, while relating them to broader implications for the canon itself. Weber continues to provide tools for this undertaking of canonic examination through repertoire. He first outlines three branches of canon: the "scholarly" (Ibid.: 339), the "pedagogical" (Ibid.: 340), and the "performing canon" (Ibid.: 340). This research focuses on Weber's performing canon, which "involves the presentation of old works organized as repertories and defined as sources of authority with regard to musical taste" (Ibid.: 340). Weber takes Kerman's distinction between canon and repertory and expands it into four interrelated aspects, "*craft*, *repertory*, *criticism*, and *ideology*" (Ibid.: 341) [Italics original]. These distinctions are useful to this research in various ways.

Weber's idea of craft refers to "respect for the master composer" (Ibid.: 341) and he shows how this eventually contributed to the development of performing canons in England and France (again acknowledging the important idea of national canonisation). He argues that works entered different repertories based on "quite individual performing traditions" (Ibid.: 343). This research concerns itself with the performing traditions of different countries that are upheld by two canonising institutions. Furthermore, the idea of a master composer is also evident in institutional repertories, which often focus heavily on the repertoire of particular composers, including Bach, Beethoven and Liszt for example.

Writing in 1999 Weber suggests that 'repertory' had not yet been "the subject of much extensive study or analysis" (Ibid.: 343), however, since then there have been several studies of this kind as discussed later in this chapter. He shows how, in the middle of the nineteenth-century, repertoire creation was no longer constructed around a central composer; instead, the canon was so established that no composer was needed as a basis for this construction, implying that creators of repertories were free to 'pick and choose' from a list of accepted composers, as they still do today.

Weber's distinction of 'criticism' (or the canon in the discourses of music history and theory) has already been widely covered in the literature mentioned above, where textual sources validate the canon with intellectual authority. However, here he argues against Kerman's clean divide between the forces that influence repertoire and canon. He suggests that we "cannot write off musicians as shapers of the canon" (Ibid.: 349). In other words, performers influence both a repertoire *and* a canon. Canon is no longer simply defined by intellectual forces, but by practical performing concerns

as well. Repeated public performance of specific works can bolster their place in the canon in the same way that textual criticism can provide these works with intellectual import. The institutions discussed foster this culture of repeated performance of canonical works.

Weber's final category of 'ideology' relates the repertories examined back to the broader cultural and social perspectives from which they emerge. He suggests that the canon is defined on three broad planes, as a "*moral*, a *spiritual*, and a *civic* force" (Ibid.: 351) [Italics original]. As a moral force, canonic music reacted against commercialism that could have potentially threatened standards of musical taste, while Romantic musical thinking "interpreted the primarily secular repertory of the early nineteenth century in religious terms…" (Ibid.: 352). This spiritualisation of secular music allowed it to adopt increasing civic power in nineteenth-century Europe, and music embraced an important role as public music, where it had previously been the concern of the aristocratic classes. This spiritualisation provides clues to the canonisation of specific composers in the repertories analysed, specifically Beethoven, as discussed in Chapter Five.

Interestingly, and of relevance here, Weber identifies how leaders of classical music performance institutions in London "set themselves up on a lofty plane as guardians of the canonic tradition" (Ibid.: 354). Both institutions discussed here can be regarded as such 'guardians' as they determine which music is included and which is not. The questions to be answered here are why, and to what effect, as discussed in my final chapter.

A useful summary of canon formation and value attribution is provided by Richard Taruskin, who writes of the changing nature of concert life in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Europe. In "The Coming of Museum Culture", in *The Oxford History of Western Music* (2005) he states that the successors of Mozart and Haydn in the early nineteenth-century inherited a tradition of musical composition from

> …the growing sense of canon, of an accumulating body of permanent masterworks that never go out of style but form the bedrock of an everlasting and immutable repertory that alone can validate contemporary composers with its authority (Taruskin 2005: 638).

Taruskin also identifies the eighteenth-century public concert, particularly of Mozart and Haydn, as having a canonising effect on certain music, where public access and reception helped to elevate certain works and composers to a canonical status. Reception from the public, as opposed to the aristocracy, started to determine the perceived value of musical works:

> The prime venue of musical performance became the public subscription concert rather than the aristocratic salon. Not the needs of a patron but the communal judgement of a public (as arbitrated by a new class of public critics) now defined values (Ibid.: 639).

Furthermore, Taruskin identifies London as the first city to establish the musical equivalent of the museum in the nineteenth-century: the public concert series promoting the work of dead composers. He names Haydn, Mozart and Handel as the first "inhabitants" of this musical museum (Ibid.). Here Taruskin agrees with Weber who identifies England as one of the first countries in which the idea of the canon developed. Taruskin points out growing distinctions between composition and performance, and to the associated loss of "spontaneous public invention" starting in the nineteenth-century (Ibid.). Interestingly, two of the three performance-level examining bodies are located in the United Kingdom, and are still based largely in London, while UNISA developed with strong British colonial influences. It would appear that the English tradition of 'guarding the canon' continues to this day, perhaps as a continuation of it developing there several years ago.

Taruskin provides a history of canonisation. In the nineteenth-century music became a matter of public interest and criticism, and value was judged communally:

> And those values were defined in accordance with a new concept of the artistic masterwork – a consummate, inviolable, even sacred musical text that contained and transmitted the permanently valuable achievements of a master creator. Thanks to this new concept, the art of music now possessed artifacts of permanent value like the painter's coloured canvas or the architect's solid edifice (Ibid.).

It would appear that repertories today still consist, to a large extent, of these 'artifacts' that are made permanent in repertoire lists created for performance-level qualifications and international piano competitions.

While these discussions above have dealt in a large part with musical history, they explain relevant principles underlying the formation of canon and repertoire, as well as providing a context for research that examines repertories specifically in terms of Weber's individual and idiosyncratic entities (Weber 1999: 344). Understanding how, when and where the canon developed historically provides theoretical background to the examination of specific repertoire. For example, the idea of performance repertories created in certain countries (and often consisting of local composers), is relevant when examining qualifications (which attempt to create local repertories), and also when examining international piano competitions that require performances of commissioned works by local composers.

Having outlined how the canon developed (in eighteenth and nineteenth-century Europe), I now look at studies that have questioned more specifically the repertories contained therein, and those created more recently by performing institutions. This research is closely aligned with these studies.

2.2 The Creation and Implications of Performance Repertories

There is a body of literature that analyses specific cases of repertories being created and canonised, which offers theoretical and methodological approaches for analysing specific repertories in performance-level music exams and international piano competitions. Standards and measures for examining how the canon is manifested in practice are outlined here. Within these studies there are various approaches to classifying repertoire canonisation - from historical perspectives (Kopiez *et al* 2009) to both sociological and cultural perspectives (Gilmore 1993, Dowd *et al* 2002). All these articles provide tools for measuring canonisation in practice. It is worth reiterating that apparently there is no substantial research looking at the repertories created by performance-level music exams and international piano competitions, but sufficient studies exist of repertoire creation in other performance areas such as orchestral programmes and school exams, establishing a precedent for this research.

2.2.1 Repertoire of the Past and Present

An earlier study concerned specifically with repertoire canonisation is Samuel Gilmore's 'Tradition and Novelty in Concert Programming: Bringing the Artist Back into Cultural Analysis' (1993). Gilmore provides useful distinctions of repertoire against which I can measure the works prescribed by two canonising institutions. He examines instances of "rationality and innovation" (1993: 239) in concert programming of American orchestras in the 1969-1970 concert season, demonstrating how a focus on performing works from the standard repertoire shifts critical focus from the work itself to the performance abilities of the orchestra or soloist (1993: 222) and contributes to the programming of canonical works as a result. He further acknowledges the important role of the performer in canonising repertoire: "artistic decisions are still made primarily by artists" (Ibid.: 223). Gilmore argues that "repetition of programming serves a rationalized aesthetic that primarily reflects the interests of performers" (Ibid.: 224), allowing them to focus on "virtuosity and musical interpretation" (Ibid.).

By comparison the performance of new compositions shifts the focus towards the music and its composer, and away from the performer. Gilmore suggests that as a result, musicians tend to perform standard repertoire in order to demonstrate their own performance abilities, even though the performance of new works is of "vital interest to the concert world" (Ibid.). Playing works from the standard repertoire is what enables assessment and comparison of performers, as a result of the performance tradition that has developed around these works. Through closer analysis of the

orchestral repertoire from 1969-1970 of 27 major American orchestras Gilmore shows how 15 composers comprise an average of 59% of repertoire performed, while demonstrating that twentieth-century composers are marginalised. This is very similar to the situation of the institutional repertoire analysed, which tends to focus more on the standard repertoire than contemporary music, despite the apparent need for contemporary music to be included in concerts, as advocated by Gilmore.

Furthermore Gilmore delineates historical repertoire categories into two broad divisions: works composed pre-1900 or "repertory" (Ibid.: 227) and works composed post-1900 or "20th century" (Ibid.) These he breaks down into two sub-categories: works composed between 1900 and 1940 and works composed post-1940 or "contemporary" (Ibid.). This is not to say that there is no greater complexity to repertoire division. However, his categories are a starting point for examining which historical compositional periods are preferred in repertoire lists offered by both performance-level music exams and international piano competitions.

Attribution of performance evaluations can also be inferred from these divisions; the ability to perform works from the standard (pre-1900) repertoire shows an ability to play with a level of technical and virtuosic skill. This prompts a question as to whether or not the canonising institutions are wary of allowing too much contemporary repertoire as it could be significantly more difficult to assess without the accompanying performance standards and practices associated with music in the repertoire. In other words, do they select repertoire that allows them to judge the individual performer and compare different performers more easily? These questions are addressed in later chapters. In relating the repertoire back to the broader canon-concept, Gilmore shows that "concert repertory is, as such, an active canon generated by artists" (Ibid.: 237). I suggest that his use of the term 'canon' is more in line with what Kerman distinguishes as 'repertory'.

In a wider analysis of the same orchestral repertoire, 'Organizing the musical canon: the repertoires of major U.S. symphony orchestras, 1842 to 1969' (2002) Dowd *et al* also use methods of statistical analyses to determine how orchestral performances either reinforced the traditional repertoire or introduced works by new composers, a dichotomy they labelled "change and conformity" (2002: 37). They suggest that 'change' or the introduction of new composers into the American orchestral performance repertoire was influenced by three factors: "increased performance capabilities of symphony orchestras, the expanded resources for new music, and the proliferation of music programs among U.S. colleges and universities" (Ibid. 35). While the research may be of more interest to statisticians, it does legitimise Gilmore's standard of examining repertoire through the

elements of repertoire performance against innovation, or as Dowd *et al* prefer 'conformity' versus 'change'.

Furthermore, their study labels various people and institutions as "actors" who "worked hard to sacralise orchestral music by touting the most revered of the classics" (Ibid.: 39). These 'actors' can be seen as equivalent to Bohlman's concept of the 'canonizer' which is used in this research. Of particular interest are the institutions of non-profit symphony orchestras through which classical music was entrenched in performance practice and as a result of which "…discourse regarding exalted music was now rooted in practice…" (Ibid.: 41). This shows the possible influence of canonising institutions. Interestingly their study found that 'change' had no bearing on 'conformity'. In other words, despite the introduction of new composers coupled with the increased performance ability of orchestras, repertoire performance was not significantly diminished as a result (similar findings are discussed in Chapter Six).

2.2.2 The Historical Approach and Prominence of Performed Composers

Two studies taking a historical perspective of repertoire canonisation, as opposed to the statistical approach above, were conducted by John Gould (2005) and Kopiez *et al* (2009). Gould's 'What Did They Play?: The Changing Repertoire of the Piano Recital from the Beginnings to 1980' (2005) traces historical programmes from before 1860 until 1980 in periods of 30 year intervals. He analyses how the presentation of piano repertoire changed from concerts where solo piano works were mixed with chamber and vocal works to solo piano recitals, and pianists' subsequent fixation on a limited number of composers from 1951 to 1980. He describes how the "historical" (2005: 64) recital emerged with Ignaz Moscheles and Franz Liszt in the early 1800s. The important role played by Clara Schumann is acknowledged as she shifted public attention towards the more serious works of "Beethoven, Chopin, Schumann and Mendelssohn" (Ibid.: 65), despite unenthusiastic public response.

Gould demonstrates how a few composers, notably Beethoven, Chopin and Liszt tended to dominate performances across various time periods. While his list is by no means exhaustive, it does show trends and patterns of programming. One of these is the idea of "major and minor works" (Ibid.: 69) in piano recital repertories. These terms differentiate between "compositions of sufficient artistic weight to stand on their own in a programme and those better suited to be coupled with other similar works in a 'bracket'" (Ibid.), implying an inherent value judgement on this music. While these distinctions are obviously not applicable to all compositions, they allow further categorisation

and interpretation of repertoire offered by the two canonising institutions dealt with in this research in terms of a focus or balance of works from either category.

He demonstrates that Beethoven's prominence in the repertoire analysed comes entirely from his output of 'major works'. Furthermore, between 1951 and 1980 works from the "German-Austrian tradition" (Ibid.: 75) dominated to the exclusion of much else from the repertoire, and there was a distinct lack of contemporary music being performed. Gould's study is relevant for this dissertation because it deals specifically with piano music, and identifies trends such as national compositional traditions being canonised in repertoire, and the exclusion of contemporary music from performance. Gould's work enables a similar inquiry into the repertoires of the two institutions mentioned.

In another historical analysis, 'Clara Schumann's collection of playbills: A historiometric analysis of life-span development, mobility, and repertoire canonization' (2009) Kopiez *et al* analysed Clara Schumann's concert programmes and linked them to her biography. While their analysis concerns changes in repertoire over time, their categorisations of repertoire are still useful to this study. The first of these categorisations is the "popularity pyramid" (2009: 51: attributed to Mueller 1951), which refers to "the dominance of a few composers over the entire repertoire" (2009: 51). In Chapters Three and Four "similar tendencies of concentration" (Ibid.: 52) are applied to the two canonising institutions.

Kopiez *et al* also explore the concepts of "novelty and tradition" (Ibid.) in performance, which are discussed through examining whether historical repertoire is dominant over contemporary compositions in the two institutions, and whether the "decline of such contemporaneity" (Ibid.) is pertinent (also in accordance with Gilmore and Dowd *et al*). Kopiez *et al* discuss how audiences can influence repertoire, which is relevant when relating the repertoire of two canonising institutions to a professional performance context, as discussed in Chapter Five. To determine the degree of contemporaneity in repertoire selection they used the age of the composition performed; a similar principle is used when determining the inclusion of contemporary works in the syllabi examined.

One last useful distinction in their research is that of 'type of work' referring to solo piano works, concerti, chamber music or vocal works. This distinction of genre is adapted to the piano repertoire to include etude, sonata, rhapsody and scherzo, or chamber works and concerti.[11] Questions of aesthetic value also arise from this article, including factors that influence ones repertoire choice including public opinion and audience preference, allowing one to examine whether this is a possible

[11] Performance-level examining bodies also offer qualifications in chamber music and accompaniment, but these are beyond the scope of this research.

influence on repertoire lists provided; we could surmise that works regularly requested can be perceived as holding higher artistic merit than those mentioned only in a few instances.

2.2.3 National Cultural Canons

In terms of methodological precedents for this research, Bevers' 'Cultural education and the canon: A comparative analysis of the content of secondary school exams for music and art in England, France, Germany, and the Netherlands, 1990-2004' (2005) provides a precedent for repertoire analysis using categories outlined above. The most significant of these is the promotion of a "national cultural canon" (2005: 392) where the country hosting the exam (in this case) promotes its own national culture and composers. This concept is used to determine which national composers are promoted throughout the exams and competitions by listing the composer's country of birth. In this way I determine whether exams or competitions actively promote the works of native composers, and which foreign compositional traditions are embraced. Bevers' distinction between the cultures of the past and the present is useful for examining the inclusion of contemporary works in exam and competition repertoire lists.

From the literature dealing specifically with repertoire creation distinct concepts and categories have emerged which are explored in Chapters Three and Four, where the repertoire offered by performance-level music exams and international piano competitions is analysed and interpreted according to several factors. These include the dominance of a small number of composers over the repertoire, the creation and implementation of national cultural canons and the representation of standard repertoire over contemporary works.

Chapter Three: The Repertoire of Performance-Level Music Qualifications

Chapter Two outlines both the concept of canonisation in theory, and the ideas that shaped repertoire formation in canonising institutions. Having identified the ABRSM, Trinity, and UNISA as such institutions, this chapter analyses how this authority to canonise is manifested in the repertoire requirements of their performance-level music exams. This serves to provide evidence to address the first part of my main research question, which examines how the canon is manifested in practice in terms of the repertoire used by canonising institutions.

The findings of this analysis are framed and interpreted according to categories defined in the previous chapter by scholars including Gilmore, Gould, Dowd *et al* and Bevers which are adapted and expanded to suit the particular canonising institutions in question. These categories include the dominance of a small number of composers over a large percentage of the performing repertoire, the development of national cultural canons, and the inclusion of contemporary composers or repertoire composers, all of which are applicable to the repertoire of the performance-level qualifications.

In this chapter the evidence is only interpreted within the categories into which it is organised. The broader implications of canonisation through institutions for piano performance are discussed in Chapter Six.

The quantitative methodology used to organise this information comprised creating a database that lists exam syllabi for each repertoire item. For each item, details about the works consisting of the composer, the composer's dates and nationality and the exam in which the repertoire is listed are included. This allowed me to easily extract different kinds of information (for example how much of the ABRSM repertoire was composed by German composers during the twentieth-century). In this way repertoire trends emerged visually and numerically, such as seeing how many items of repertoire a certain composer had listed in the syllabus for a particular institution. Having completed this database, the information was extrapolated according to the various categories.

3.1 The Dominance of a Few Composers in the Examination Repertoire

The repertoire of the three institutions offering performance-level music exams is analysed in terms of Gould's concept of how a small number of composers can constitute a large amount of performed repertoire (2005: 67).

I used my database to determine which composers had more than five repertoire items listed in each institution's qualifications individually. Having done this, I was able to see what percentage of the total repertoire for one institution consisted of certain groups of composers. This is an effective qualitative method for determining whether certain composers are disproportionally represented as it can demonstrate whether or not a small number of composers are allocated a large amount of repertoire. The results of this process for the ABRSM across all three of their exams (DipABRSM, LRSM, FRSM) are tabulated below.

All the composers with more than five repertoire items are listed by name, while the rest of the composers have been collapsed into the group 'Other Composers'.[12] Percentages of the total repertoire have been listed for each group. Out of 65 different composers in the ABRSM syllabi, 22 of them had more than five repertoire items each, while the remaining 43 had four or less.[13] The number five is simply used as a mathematical cut off as it makes the trend of repertoire dominance by certain composers easily visible.

The table below relates to the ABRSM's repertoire, visually representing the dominance of a small number of composers over the total repertoire. The first column lists the name of the composer and the combined group for other composers. The second column lists the total number of repertoire items for the institution and how many of those repertoire items are allocated to a particular composer. The third column shows the percentage of the total repertoire that is comprised by the dominant composers collectively and the other composers collectively.

[12] This is an adaptation of methodology used by Bevers *et al* (2005) where composers with more than 2% of the total exam papers analysed were listed by name, and their percentage of the total was indicated.
[13] Refer to Chapter One for a detailed explanation of how a repertoire item is determined.

Composers with Five or more Repertoire Items (22)	No. of Repertoire Items (376 Total)	% of Total Repertoire by Composer	% of Total Repertoire by Group
Albeniz, I.	11	2,93%	
Bach, J.S.	30	7,98%	
Beethoven, L. van	27	7,18%	
Brahms, J.	21	5,59%	
Chopin, F.	21	5,59%	
Debussy, C.	28	7,45%	
Faure, G.	7	1,86%	
Granados, E.	6	1,60%	
Haydn, F.J.	6	1,60%	
Hindemith, P.	7	1,86%	
Liszt, F.	33	8,77%	**83,8%**
Mendelssohn, F.	7	1,86%	
Messiaen, O.	11	2,93%	
Mozart, W.A.	12	3,19%	
Prokofiev, S.	9	2.39%	
Rachmaninoff, S.	28	7,45%	
Ravel, M.	8	2,13%	
Scarlatti, P.	9	2,39%	
Schubert, F.	10	2, 66%	
Schumann, R.	12	3,19%	
Scriabin, A.	6	1,60%	
Shostakovich, D.	6	1,60%	
Other Composers (43)	61		**16,2%**

Table 1: ABRSM Repertoire Allocation

The table above highlights how a small number of composers make up a large percentage of the repertoire with regards to all three ABRSM exams: those dominant composers with more than five repertoire items comprise 33,8% of the total number of composers, but this group is allocated 83,8% of the total repertoire items. The remaining 66,2% of the composers (those with less than five repertoire items each) are allocated only 16,5% of the total repertoire. This indicates that indeed a small number of the composers exert dominance over the total repertoire in the ABRSM exams, indicating a bias towards certain composers, of whom Bach, Beethoven, Debussy, Liszt and Rachmaninoff have the most repertoire.

The same process was followed with the Trinity exam repertoire totals for the ATCL, FTCL and LTCL. The results are presented in Table 2 below.

Composers with Five or more Repertoire Items (22)	No. of Repertoire Items (510 Total)	% of Total Repertoire by Composer	% of Total Repertoire by Group
Bach, J.S.	46	9,02%	
Beethoven, L. van	29	5,68%	
Brahms, J.	18	3,53%	
Chopin, F.	36	7,06%	
Debussy, C.	27	5,29%	
Faure, G.	11	2,16%	
Granados, E.	7	1,37%	
Haydn, F.J.	10	1,96%	
Ireland, J.	5	0,98%	
Liszt, F.	60	11,76%	
Mendelssohn, F.	8	1,57%	**72,7%**
Messiaen, O.	9	1,76%	
Mozart, W.A.	12	2,35%	
Poulenc, F.	5	0,98%	
Prokofiev, S.	14	2,75%	
Rachmaninoff, S.	21	4,12%	
Ravel, M.	11	2,16%	
Rzewski, F.	5	0,98%	
Scarlatti, D.	6	1,18%	
Schubert, F.	12	2,35%	
Schumann, R.	14	2,75%	
Scriabin, A.	5	0,98%	
Other Composers (80)	139		**27,3%**

Table 2: Trinity Repertoire Allocation

Once again, it can be seen that a small percentage of the composers comprise the majority of the repertoire. The dominant composers make up only 21,6% of the total composers, but are allocated 72,7% of the repertoire. This means that the remaining 78,4% of composers are allocated 27,3% of the repertoire. Trinity does, however, have a smaller percentage of composers with more than five repertoire items than the ABRSM. The list of the composers with the most repertoire items is remarkably similar to the ABRSM: Bach, Beethoven, Chopin and Debussy, with Liszt having the most.

The same process was followed for UNISA, as presented below.

Composers with Five or more Repertoire Items (27)	No. of Repertoire Items (524 Total)	% of Total Repertoire by Composer	% of Total Repertoire by Group
Bach, J.S.	61	11,64%	
Beethoven, L. van	26	4,96%	
Brahms, J.	9	1,72%	
Chopin, F.	31	5,92%	
Debussy, C.	19	3,63%	
Griffes, C.	5	0,95%	
Handel, G.F.	5	0,95%	
Haydn, F.J.	9	1,72%	
Klatzow, P.	5	0,95%	
Liszt, F.	25	4,77%	
Mendelssohn, F.	8	1,53%	**78,6%**
Messiaen, O.	6	1,15%	
Mozart, W.A.	9	1,72%	
Prokofiev, S.	10	1,91%	
Rachmaninoff, S.	42	8,02%	
Rajna, T.	5	0,95%	
Ravel, M.	7	1,34%	
Roosenschoon, H.	6	1,15%	
Scarlatti, D.	10	1,91%	
Schubert, F.	8	1,53%	
Schumann, R.	13	2,48%	
Scriabin, A.	16	3,05%	
Shchedrin, R.	24	4,58%	
Shostakovich, D.	25	4,77%	
Smetana, B.	14	2,67%	
Suk, J.	8	1,53%	
Szymanowski, K.	6	1,15%	
Other Composers (75)	112		**21,4%**

Table 3: UNISA Repertoire Allocation

In South Africa, within the UNISA Performance Level Assessment exam 26,5% of the total number of composers had more than five repertoire items each - they make up 78,6% of the total repertoire. The remaining 73,5% of composers with fewer than five repertoire items are allocated just 21,4% of the total repertoire. Beethoven, Chopin, Liszt, Rachmaninoff and Shostakovich are the composers with the most repertoire items here, while Bach has the most.

The outcomes of this initial percentage-based analysis across all three examining bodies reinforce Gould's finding (as described in Chapter Two) that a small number of composers tend to dominate most of the repertoire in performance, or in this case, repertoire available for performance selection. With each examining body it was found that a small number of composers were allocated a significantly higher percentage of the total repertoire than others. The composers with the most

repertoire items here include Bach, Beethoven, Chopin, Liszt, Rachmaninoff and Debussy - all of whom have a high proportion of repertoire in the lists for all three examining bodies.

Having established that these repertoires are mostly dominated by a small number of composers, I now examine in closer detail further divisions in this repertoire including the creation of national cultural canons, the use of repertoire works, twentieth-century and contemporary works. After this I analyse the kinds of works included, expanding Gould's discussion of major and minor works (2005: 69).

3.2 The Establishment of National Cultural Canons - Past and Present

Ton Bever's concept of the "national cultural canon" (2005: 392) is applicable here as it defines how one country can promote its own culture through inclusion in exam syllabi and provide possible reasons for the inclusion of certain composers. While Bevers uses the concept largely in reference to the idea of one country upholding its own artistic heritage, I adapt it to include the promotion of any cultural canon defined by cultural movements whether local or foreign, repertoire or contemporary. Interwoven with this are discussions of Gilmore's divisions of repertoire works (pre-1900), works from the twentieth-century, and contemporary works (1993: 226).

3.2.1 German-Austrian, Russian and French Compositional Traditions

The most recognisable cultural canon in piano performance repertoire is the "German-Austrian tradition" (Gould 2005: 75), which falls almost entirely into Gilmore's repertoire category of works from the pre-1900 era.

This tradition is strongly represented in the exams of the ABRSM, Trinity, and UNISA. Across all three ABRSM exams there are several dominant composers from this tradition: Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, Haydn, Hindemith, Mendelssohn, Mozart, Schubert and Schumann all have five or more repertoire items out of the total. Of these composers Hindemith (active in the twentieth-century) is the only one who does not fall into the pre-1900 group. If results are included for all Austrian and German composers in the ABRSM performance-level syllabi there is not one contemporary Austrian or German composer, and Austrian music of the early twentieth-century, or Second Viennese School, is represented by Berg, who has one item of repertoire, Schoenberg, who has three and Webern who has one - minimal for a compositional period which holds such scholarly import. While Berg wrote relatively little for the piano and Webern's piano oeuvre is small (Hinson 2000: 808), Schoenberg's (Berg's teacher) piano works are considered "among the most significant contributions to the

repertoire" (Hinson 2000: 686). While Hinson's statement passes judgement on Schoenberg's output, it also reminds us that his work was significant to the development of piano music.

The situation is similar in the Trinity exams. The German-Austrian tradition is again prevalent: the dominant composers representing this tradition include Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, Haydn, Mendelssohn, Mozart, Schubert and Schumann (exactly the same list as the ABRSM bar the exclusion of Hindemith). Again there are no contemporary composers from Austria or Germany, but Berg, Schoenberg and Webern are present in the overall exam listings, as is Hindemith although none are attributed a notable amount of repertoire.

The UNISA exams extol the German-Austrian tradition through Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, Handel (the only new addition), Haydn, Mendelssohn, Mozart, Schubert and Schumann. In terms of other German and Austrian composers (who have less than five works listed) only one is still alive, Helmut Froschauer (who has only one repertoire item) and the others are from the twentieth-century and earlier: these include Hans Erich Apostel, Boris Blacher, Max Reger and Carl Maria von Weber (from Germany) and Berg, Ernst Toch and Egon Wellesz (from Austria) all of whom are allocated one repertoire item. While UNISA offers a more diverse selection of composers from these countries, the core composers of the tradition from the pre-1900 era are still the most prevalent.

All three examining bodies readily promote the existence and importance of the German-Austrian compositional period spanning the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. They seldom include works from the Second Viennese School of the early twentieth-century, and there is little recognition of contemporary composers from this geographical area. Whether this implies that the work of contemporary composers from these countries is seen as unimportant, or rather that these institutions prefer to source contemporary works from their own countries remains to be interrogated later in this chapter.

It is apparent that this section of the traditional performance repertoire continues to comprise a large proportion of the repertoire offered by these canonising institutions. Works from this tradition could be seen as forming the backbone of this repertoire, and as a result, more likely to be selected for performance.

Two other important instances of national cultural canons emerged from groups of Russian and French composers.

The ABRSM has a strong contingent of Russian composers representing works from the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Prokofiev, Rachmaninoff, Scriabin and Shostakovich are all

represented by more than five works across all three exam levels, while Kabalevsky, Medtner and Stravinsky are also included.

For the Trinity exams Prokofiev, Rachmaninoff and Scriabin are dominant, but they display a more diverse range of Russian composers, mostly from the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries including Balakirev, Glinka, Kabalevsky, Medtner, Shostakovich, Siloti and Stravinsky. Only Ukrainian Nikolai Kapustin could be considered contemporary from this group.

UNISA upholds a similar core of Russian composers. Prokofiev, Rachmaninoff, Scriabin and Shostakovich all dominate this repertoire along with Rodion Shchedrin, (who is included for his output of 24 *Preludes and Fugues*). There is a wide range of less well-represented Russian composers, mostly from the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Nikolai Kapustin and Rodion Shchedrin are the only two contemporary composers.

Across all three syllabi, Tchaikovsky is largely omitted, despite having composed two piano sonatas that could be viably included in these lists. It seems more than an oversight that he is only included on the basis of his *Dumka*, and *Theme and Variations* in F opus 19 no. 6. This perhaps suggests that his other output for solo piano is either not popular with pianists, or is not considered of a sufficient 'standard' for inclusion on either compositional or pianistic merits.

From this evidence there emerges a Russian compositional tradition of piano works rooted in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, with Prokofiev, Rachmaninoff and Scriabin as the leading composers.

Investigating the situation of French composers reveals similar findings about the state of the French compositional idiom being rooted in a past time-frame. Prominent French composers in the ABRSM syllabi are Debussy, Faure, Messiaen and Ravel, while works by Boulez, Franck and Poulenc receive less attention. Trinity upholds a similar core of French composers including Debussy, Faure, Messiaen, Poulenc and Ravel, but has a much wider range of less-represented composers, mostly from the nineteenth-century.

UNISA reinforces these results with Debussy, Messiaen and Ravel being the most prevalent, while including other French composers, again mostly from the nineteenth and twentieth-centuries.

Notably missing from the portrayal of French music in these exams is the work of Camille Saint-Saens, who only has one work available for selection in the UNISA repertoire, with nothing in the ARBSM or Trinity syllabi - all despite a sizeable output for solo piano including two sets of *etudes*: Opus 52 and Opus 111. Hinson suggests that Saint-Saens' piano writing can "glitter and flow without

much emotional depth" (2000: 664), although some of his music has found a place in the performed repertoire. Regardless, it appears that his work is not regarded by these examining bodies as sufficiently important in terms of emotional depth or aesthetic value, despite his significant contribution to the piano literature.

With the portrayal of both Russian and French music in these exams there seems to be a developing core of repertoire composers (I think it is fair that we start to consider twentieth-century music (pre-1940) in this category of standard works). A Russian tradition built mostly around Prokofiev, Rachmaninoff and Scriabin and a French school of Debussy, Messiaen and Ravel are particularly influential in these repertories. While there are instances of contemporary composers represented from these countries, they are not allocated sizable portions of the total repertoire. Ironically, the majority of repertoire prescribed by these institutions was composed for an instrument other than the piano (for example, the harpsichord) or for an earlier version of the modern concert grand piano, such as the clavichord or fortepiano, while the music that is written specifically for the modern instrument receives less attention.

3.2.2 Promotion of Local Cultural Canons

While all three examining bodies make use of the repertoire of the three compositional traditions mentioned above, they also tend to promote their own music, mostly from the twentieth-century and contemporary eras, in efforts to create national cultural canons.

For instance the ABRSM promotes composers from the United Kingdom, but no composer is singled out as the standard bearer. Instead a large number of composers are each given a small portion of the repertoire.

In the list of dominant composers compiled for the ABRSM there is not one from the United Kingdom. However, out of the 65 composers included in their repertoire a total of 19 come from the United Kingdom. The second highest number of composers is tied between France and Russia with seven composers each, while Austria and Germany have six apiece. There are nearly three times as many local composers as from any other country, but none have been allocated a substantial portion of the repertoire. In fact they all have only one work except for John Ireland who has four and Michael Tippett who has three. This is surprising because composers listed, such as Arnold Bax, Richard Rodney Bennett, Frank Bridge and Kenneth Leighton all wrote abundantly for the piano (Hinson 2000: 81, 106, 146, 473).

The majority of the composers from the United Kingdom are contemporary, and the rest wrote mostly in the twentieth-century. This appears to be an attempt to create a national cultural canon of English twentieth-century and contemporary music that is not really centred on any particular composer, but rather the idea of English composers as a collective. Strangely, the work of Benjamin Britten is not offered at all by the performance-level qualifications of the ABRSM despite the fact that his *Night Piece*, *Twelve Variations* and *Three Character Pieces* could all have been feasibly included. Furthermore, there is no significant representation of United Kingdom composers from the pre-1900 category.

Similar evidence for canonisation of this type is provided by the Trinity syllabi - only John Ireland ranks among the dominant composers from the United Kingdom. However, out of a total number of 102 composers, there are 16 from the United Kingdom. While this represents a smaller percentage of the total than for the ABRSM it is still more than any other country. Russia boasts 12 composers, and France 10. Again, out of these 16 from the UK the large majority are contemporary and twentieth-century composers. In fact John Ireland is the 'oldest' having been born in 1879. This presents a slightly less overt attempt at promoting composers from the United Kingdom than was seen with the ABRSM. It seems that the two examining bodies from England attempt to create a national cultural canon centred on United Kingdom composers from the twentieth-century and contemporary traditions in much the same way that Bevers found with the exam syllabi he analysed.

UNISA uses a similar approach to create a South African compositional tradition. Hans Roosenschoon is listed among the dominant composers, and out of 102 different composers 14 are from South Africa, only Russia has more with 15. The prevalence of South African composers could be seen as a reaction to the promotion of British composers by the other two examining bodies. Interestingly, there are only four composers from the United Kingdom in this syllabus (there is only one South African, Alexander Johnson, in both United Kingdom examining bodies' lists). All of the South African composers are either from the twentieth-century or contemporary traditions in the UNISA syllabus.

It would appear from this evidence that each examining body promotes composers from their own countries, but that they would rather promote a large number of composers with a small number of works each than offer several works by fewer composers (as is done with the more established Austrian-German, Russian and French traditions).

3.2.3 Smaller National Canons

There are a few other cases of national cultural canons in these examining bodies; related to the nationalist compositional movements of the nineteenth-century. Hungarian composers are represented mostly by Franz Liszt, who in the Trinity syllabus totals accounts for more than 10% of the repertoire on his own, and in the ABRSM syllabi he has more works than any other composer. Other Hungarian composers include Bartok, Kodaly, and Ligeti.

There is also minor representation of Spanish, Italian, Czech, and Polish composers. What is most interesting across all three examining bodies is the small amount of repertoire devoted to American composers. There are only two dominant American composers across all syllabi, Rzewski (who spent most of his life in Europe) in the Trinity exams and Griffes in the UNISA exams. ABRSM only has four American composers out of the 65 total, there are only nine out of 102 composers for Trinity and six out of 102 for UNISA. All the American composers across all three examining bodies are from either the twentieth-century or are contemporary composers. Interesting exclusions from the corpus of American piano music are works by Louis Moreau Gottschalk, Edward MacDowell and Philip Glass, among other contemporary composers.

This less significant representation of minor cultural canons serves not only to reinforce the dominant ones discussed above, but also highlights that no particular country emerges as the prevailing exponent of contemporary repertoire, despite the efforts of national promotion evident across all three examining bodies. This leads us to question from which countries the contemporary repertoire in the syllabi is drawn, and to what extent it is represented when compared to works from the pre-1900 and twentieth-century eras.

3.3 Representing Contemporary Composers: Change versus Conformity

Dowd *et al*'s relationship between 'conformity' versus 'change' referred to an analysis of repertoire shifts over an extended time period: they determined the factors that allowed contemporary composers to have their work included in the programmes of American symphony orchestras. This frame of reference is a helpful point of departure when considering the inclusion of contemporary composers in performance-level qualifications. While Dowd *et al*'s study examined how contemporary composers were included over an extended period of time; I am using this idea to analyse a cross-section of repertoire and the inclusion of contemporary composers.

In terms of contemporary works versus those of the twentieth-century and pre-1900 repertories, these repertoire lists provide fascinating results. In order to ascertain works that are considered contemporary, I have adapted Gilmore's (1993) approach of using a 30-year sliding scale (when his study looked at repertoire during 1970, this extended back to 1940). This means that in 2014, any work composed within the last 30 years (1984 onwards) can be considered as contemporary.

Of 161 composers across all the examining bodies, 37 composed works within the last 30 years. From the total 1410 repertoire items included in the syllabi for all three examining bodies, a total of 65 were composed during or after 1984. So composers who have composed contemporary works comprise 23% of the total composers, but repertoire that can be considered contemporary makes up only 4,6% of the total.

Although I have already established that the repertoire is dominated by a small number of composers, this seems like a very small percentage of contemporary works for a significant group of composers. Several of these contemporary composers come from the United Kingdom, which has 13 composers, including Howard Blake, Diana Burrell, James MacMillan, Edwin Roxburgh and Michael Tippett, while South Africa has 11, including Stefans Grove, Hendrik Hofmeyr, Alexander Johnson, Peter Klatzow, Hans Roosenschoon and Jeanne Zaidel-Rudolph.

This is the result of the attempts to promote national composers within the host country of the exams, even though the exams are taken in several countries around the world. Furthermore, these results allow us to examine what has become of certain compositional traditions outlined earlier, starting again with the German-Austrian tradition. This has been temporally framed in the past, as there are no contemporary German or Austrian composers included in the exams. Furthermore, the location of the French and Russian compositional traditions in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries is reinforced as there is only one contemporary composer from each country. Messiaen's *Le Merle Noir* was composed in 1985, while Nikolai Kapustin has three works which could be considered contemporary: *Five Etudes in Different Intervals*, *Sonata* Opus 102 No. 12 and *Variations* Opus 41.

America has four contemporary composers across the syllabi (John Adams, William Bolcom, Norman Dello Joio and Joseph Makholm), and the following countries all have one apiece: Australia, Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Japan, New Zealand and Turkey. This reinforces the trend mentioned earlier whereby the host countries of these exams attempt to promote contemporary music by local composers, moreover this seems to be done at the expense of contemporary music from other countries. We can only imagine that the results would be very different if there were an American

examining authority, which would no doubt show more of their contemporary composers. The majority of repertoire across all three exams is dominated by music of the past, from Gilmore's pre-1900 and twentieth-century eras, with little acknowledgement of contemporary composition.

3.4 Types of Available Repertoire: Major and Minor Works

Within these cultural canons there are further categories to be explored, including the types of works preferred. Gould's concept of works divided into "major and minor categories" (2005: 69) are expanded here to determine the genres offered for each compositional tradition and for each composer. This also allows one to gauge whether or not certain composers are included on the basis of works from specific periods in their output, or on a portion of their total output. Of course, not all compositions are classified so easily into major or minor works, but rather there exist more complex divisions within genres such as sonatas, etudes and suites.

3.4.1 Repertoire of the German-Austrian Tradition

In the German-Austrian tradition, in terms of types of work, J.S. Bach is represented in these exams by a reasonably broad selection of his music. From 30 works the ABRSM prescribes mostly his preludes and fugues, while including selected partitas and toccatas. Trinity offers 46 Bach works, mostly preludes and fugues, but includes all seven toccatas and selections from all of the partitas. They also offer selected French suites, and one of the English suites. In the UNISA syllabus, Bach is again strongly represented by his preludes and fugues. All six partitas are prescribed in their entirety, as well as all of the French and English *s*uites and all the toccatas. It seems that the majority of Bach's output for solo keyboard has been deemed suitable for inclusion in repertoire lists. Perhaps this is indicative of the retrospective way in which Bach was included in the performance canon (with the revival of his music by Mendelssohn). Instead of his works being canonised in his lifetime, most of them were re-discovered after his death, and perhaps a more balanced output was represented as a result - it is possible that a more complete selection of his works was available. Bach, Scarlatti and Handel are the earliest composers offered in these syllabi, demonstrating that they are considered the beginning of acceptable piano performance music while anything written earlier is excluded. Taruskin's use of the year 1685 as a "barrier, separating the music of common listening experience from a semiprehistoric repertoire" (Taruskin 2014: 'Class of 1685') is still prevalent in these institutional performance repertories.

Haydn and Mozart are both mostly represented by their sonata output. In the ABRSM five out of Haydn's six works are sonatas, for Trinity all 10 are sonatas, while in UNISA all nine of his works are sonatas. Mozart's works are also largely represented by his output of piano sonatas. In the ABRSM eight out of his 12 works are sonatas, with two sets of variations, his *Adagio* in B minor, and the *Rondo* in A minor. In the Trinity syllabus nine out his 12 works are sonatas, with two sets of variations and the same *Rondo* in A minor. In the UNISA syllabus seven of Mozart's nine works are sonatas, and the others are two sets of variations.

The focus on the sonata genre has a number of implications. Firstly it is possible that the examining bodies in question do not consider the other works of these composers to be of significant difficulty and value to be included in the repertoire lists. Of the perception of Mozart, Gould says "as was Mozart's contribution to the piano concerto his works for solo piano, a few acknowledged masterpieces apart, are not in fact very interesting" (2005: 70). It is possible that he is included mostly out of an obligation to his reputation in other genres than for his original contribution to the piano literature, whereas Haydn's piano sonatas are "finally being recognised as a major contribution to the repertoire" (Hinson 2000:381).

Otherwise, it is possible that the sonata genre that was developed in the eighteenth-century (traditionally referred to as the 'classical' period) is held in high esteem as a necessary form of expression with which pianists are required to be familiar, and that these institutions feel that a suitable offering of these works should be available to their candidates. Further evidence of the second possibility is found with the works of Beethoven. Here, my findings are similar to those of Gould who mentioned that "it is yet one more measure of Beethoven's greatness that his numerical preponderance… rests entirely on his role as a composer of major works" (Gould 2005: 69), in other words, he is included mostly for his output of piano sonatas.

In the ABRSM syllabi 24 of Beethoven's 27 works are from his piano sonatas, in the Trinity syllabi 24 of his 29 works are from his piano sonatas, and in the UNISA syllabus 22 of his 26 works are from the same. Across all the syllabi the other works are sets of variations, and Trinity syllabi offers his *Bagatelles* Opus 126, a rondo and a fantasia. Here too, this demonstrates that Beethoven is included mostly from his output of major works, which are almost all sonatas. Furthermore his last five sonatas, as well as his 'Waldstein' and 'Appassionata' sonatas, and his 'Eroica' variations are the only selection of his output included in the FRSM and the FTCL, demonstrating that these works could be considered the pinnacle of his piano oeuvre.

Meanwhile, Brahms and Schumann (of the German tradition) seem to enjoy a wide representation of their respective outputs. Brahms is represented by a selection of capriccios, intermezzi, ballades, rhapsodies and sonatas, as well as certain variations. Schumann is acknowledged through a selection of his smaller works including *Novelletten* Opus 21 and *Phantasiestücken* Opus 12, while his major works such as *Carnaval*, his *Fantasie* opus 17, his two piano sonatas, *Kreisleriana*, and *Symphonic Etudes* are widely listed across all three examining bodies. Both these composers are included on the basis of both their minor and major works, and there do not seem to be any significant exclusions of any portion of their works.

On the other hand, Austrian composer, Franz Schubert, seems to hold a similar status to Beethoven, though on a smaller scale. He is mostly included for his piano sonatas and his 'Wanderer' *Fantasy* Opus 15. Only Trinity seems interested in any of his other works including four of his impromptus, while UNISA allows candidates to select his *Moment Musicaux* Opus 94 No. 4, all despite his vast output of dances including minuets, waltzes, and écossaises. It would appear that these works have been excluded despite performances by such eminent pianists as Myra Hess (Allmusic 2014: 'Myra Hess: Dame Myra Hess: Live from the University of Illinois Vol. 1') and Alfred Brendel (Allmusic 2014: 'Alfred Brendel: Schubert: Piano Sonata in A, D. 959; 12 German Dances'). Schubert is portrayed as a composer of major works, while his charming output of shorter pieces is left mostly untouched.

3.4.2 Repertoire of the Russian and French Traditions

The next traditions to be considered are those of the Russian and French late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Prokofiev is largely represented by his output of sonatas, while his *Visions Fugitives* Opus 22, *Toccata* Opus 11, *Suggestion Diabolique* Opus 4 No. 4, and *Sarcasms* Opus 17 also appear. Rachmaninoff's *Preludes* Opus 23 and 32, his *Etudes Tableaux* Opus 33 and 39, and his *Variations on a Theme of Corelli* Opus 42 are common among all three examining bodies. Scriabin is represented by a small mixture of his output for solo piano. His *Preludes* Opus 11 and *Etudes* Opus 8 are both popular, but his collection of 10 published sonatas is only represented by the inclusion of those up to number five. The last five are nowhere to be found, despite enjoying a place in the performance repertoire of pianists such as Vladimir Horowitz (Amazon 2014: 'Horowitz plays Scriabin'). This suggests an aversion towards Scriabin's later works, and rather portrays his earlier styles of composition. His sonatas provide "an accurate chronicle of his evolution from the "Russian Chopin" to the mystical innovator of the avant-garde" (Hinson 2000: 718). It seems to be his contribution to the avant-garde that is most neglected across the three examining bodies.

Debussy is most prominent amongst the French composers in the exam repertories. Both books of his *Préludes*, his 12 *Etudes*, *Images*, and his *L'isle Joyeuse* are present in all three examining bodies' repertoire lists. Messiaen is mostly included on the basis of his *Vingt Regards sur l'Enfant Jésus*, while his *Catalogue d'oiseaux* is only found in the Trinity syllabus, despite being regarded as "perhaps unprecedented in the history of music" (Hinson 2000: 538). Ravel's output is represented by *Jeux d'eau*, *Miroirs*, selections from *Le tombeau de Couperin*, and *Gaspard de la Nuit*.

3.4.3 The Repertoire of Chopin and Liszt - Nationalist Forms and Technical Prowess

Two composers from the pre-1900 category, Chopin and Liszt, are strongly present in these repertoire lists, and it is worth considering which of their works are included. Chopin's output is covered extensively, notably, all of his ballades and scherzi are choices across all three examining bodies, as well as his second and third piano sonatas. Also present are selections from his two books of *Etudes* (Opus 10 and 25), various nocturnes, waltzes, polonaises and other smaller works. Notably missing from Chopin's output are his mazurkas, works which even he considered musically difficult: with reference to Opus 41/3 in B major "it is particularly difficult to render because of the tangle of groups of dancers changing direction at every moment" (Eigeldinger 1986: 76) and with reference to Opus 50/1 in G major "Chopin considered it difficult to play" (Ibid.). It seems that the focus is on his works with both technical and musical demand, and that the highly nuanced mazurkas are not considered sufficiently technically challenging. Also missing is his *first piano sonata* and his *Preludes* Opus 28, which are not offered at all, despite being "some of the most original works of the nineteenth century" (Hinson 2000: 199).

Liszt's representation in these exams is perhaps one of the most fascinating cases. Second only to Bach in terms of total number of works, there is, however, a significant omission in the exam lists. The ABRSM focusses mainly on his *Transcendental Etudes* S. 139, *Paganini Etudes* S. 141 and *Concert Etudes* (S. 144 and S. 145). Selected works from his *Years of Pilgrimage* are also listed, along with his *Sonata* in B minor (S. 178). Trinity offers all of his *Hungarian Rhapsodies*, as well as the *Transcendental Etudes* S. 139, *Paganini Etudes* S. 141, various works from *Years of Pilgrimage* and the *Sonata* in B minor S. 178. UNISA has a smaller selection of his works, including selected *Hungarian Rhapsodies*, selections from *Years of Pilgrimage*, selections from the *Paganini Etudes* S. 141, the *Transcendental Etudes* S. 139 and the *Sonata* in B minor S. 178.

Hence, it appears that Liszt is viewed mostly as a composer used for pianists to demonstrate technical ability. Furthermore, his original output for piano is emphasised and only three of his transcriptions are offered across all three examining bodies. This is surprising, not only as these

works could just as easily be used to demonstrate technical prowess, but also because of the large number of transcriptions he wrote, especially of songs for voice, and opera themes. Notably absent are selections of works from his final years such as the *Hungarian Historical Portraits* (1885), the *Bagatelle sans Tonalite* (1885), and the last *Mephisto Waltzes*, No. 2 (1881), No. 3 (1883), and No. 4 (1885) - although this last one was left incomplete. The only works close to this period are *Jeux d'eau a la Villa d'Este* and *Aux Cyprès de la Villa d'Este II* (composed between 1867 and 1877). This suggests an omission of works from Liszt's late period, when he composed his most harmonically interesting works: "which pushed well beyond the confines of traditional tonality" (Hinson 2000: 482). The exam syllabi further suggest a narrow view of Liszt's output, focussed mainly on his virtuosic middle period.

Having analysed the entire repertoire provided by three examining bodies that function as canonising institutions, certain trends emerge. It has been demonstrated that a small number of composers comprise a large majority of the repertoire. From this certain compositional traditions emerged which consisted of canonical composers from specific countries and time frames, such as the German-Austrian, Russian and French traditions. This led to a discussion on contemporary composers - how much repertoire are they allocated and from which countries do they come? It was found that each examining body made efforts to promote contemporary composers from their own countries, but they did not overshadow the traditional canonic composers from the traditions mentioned above. Music from the pre-1900 and twentieth-century eras is the most prevalent in this repertoire. Furthermore it was found that composers were included based on a small selection of their total compositional output, whether for perceived technical or musical discretion on the part of the examining bodies, this led to certain genres, such as the piano sonata being favoured over other kinds of works like sets of variations, especially in the Austrian Classical Period. Before discussing the broader implications of these trends for piano performance practice I determine whether similar trends exist in the repertoire of international piano competitions.

Chapter Four: The Repertoire of International Piano Competitions

This chapter subjects the repertoire of seven international piano competitions to a similar analysis in order to determine how the authority to canonise is realised. Once again this discussion is outlined according to categories defined in Chapter Two's literature. The international piano competition was established as a canoniser in Bohlman's sense of the term in Chapter One based on the power and authority it holds in the piano performance world.

The repertoire lists for competitions are not as extensive as those in the music exams, and there is slightly less information to be processed as a result. Repertoire trends are informed by a smaller sample of data. Competitions discussed include the Fourteenth Van Cliburn International Piano Competition (2013), the Ferruccio Busoni International Piano Competition (2013), the Leeds International Piano Competition (2013), the XIV International Tchaikovsky Competition (2011), the 14th Arthur Rubinstein International Piano Master Competition (2014), The 8th Hamamatsu Piano Competition (2012) and the 12th UNISA International Piano Competition (2012). While a portion of this repertoire was organised into a database similar to the one used for the qualifications, other information was taken directly from the repertoire guidelines published on the competition websites (see Chapter One for a reference to these repertoire requirements).

The structure of the piano competition repertoire requirements is slightly different from those in the performance-level qualifications. Competitions are divided into different rounds, each with varying requirements - no longer do the participants only play solo works, but chamber music and concerti with orchestra in the final rounds. The idea of dominance of a few composers over others in the repertoire is not prevalent to the extent that was found in the previous chapter. Instead, where composers are specifically required they are listed by name, but alternative choices are often given as the competitor's own choice with no restriction.

4.1 Establishing and Promoting National Cultural Canons

When analysing this repertoire it became apparent that each host country actively promotes the works of local composers, signifying an underlying attempt to create national cultural canons that takes two forms in the competitions analysed. For the two competitions that are named after specific composers, namely the Busoni and Tchaikovsky competitions, works by these composers are stipulated for performance. In the Busoni competition, competitors choose from 11 pieces by Busoni

in the semi-final round. The rest of this round is left to their own choice. In the solo final round, they play one of Busoni's transcriptions of Bach's works, as well as a commissioned work.

Similarly, participants in the Tchaikovsky competition have to play selections of his music. In the first round they play two contrasting works by Tchaikovsky, and in the final concerto rounds they choose between his first and second Piano Concertos. In addition in round two, phase one, the competitors play a Russian composition commissioned for the competition, and one or more other works by a Russian composer. The Leeds Competition specifies that Benjamin Britten's Night Piece 'Notturno' for piano is included in the semi-final round. This work was composed for the first Leeds International Pianoforte Competition in 1963.

Similarly, other competitions prescribe works by contemporary composers from the host country of the competition. The Van Cliburn includes a commissioned work by American composer Christopher Theofanidis. The Arthur Rubinstein competition gives competitors a choice between two Israeli works commissioned for the competition: *Reflections on Love* by Ella Milch-Sheriff, and *Musical Carpet* by Benjamin Yusupov, while in the Hamamatsu a commissioned work by Japanese composer Ikebe Shin-Ichiro is mandatory. Finally, the UNISA competition offers a choice between two commissioned South African works for piano - most recently Graham Newcater's *Toccata* and Peter Klatzow's *Dazzle*.

Two threads of national cultural canon (Bevers 2005: 392) creation emerge from analysing this repertoire in terms of prominent works and composers. The first is that seen in the Tchaikovsky, Busoni and Leeds competitions, which prescribe works by composers from the nineteenth and twentieth-centuries (Tchaikovsky, Busoni and Britten). The other requires more contemporary works by composers local to the host country, as seen in the Van Cliburn, the Rubinstein, Hamamatsu, and UNISA competitions. These works are normally written specifically for the competition. Interestingly, the Tchaikovsky and Busoni competitions call for contemporary works in addition to those by the titular composer.

The repertoire demands described above demonstrate how each competition promotes works of its own country by requesting that competitors play commissioned or pre-existing works by local composers. This confirms that Bevers' "National cultural values and repertoires" (2005: 388) are prominent in these canonising institutions and that all attempt to promote a national cultural canon of works and composers. In addition to these traditions, there is significant representation of more traditional canonic music from various compositional traditions.

4.2 Compositional Traditions Represented

Although the repertoire lists for the competitions in question are not as extensive as those provided for the music exams, certain compositional traditions are displayed in their repertoire. The discussion of this repertoire is organised by solo works first, followed by chamber music and concerto rounds, as different trends emerge from each category. Tendencies from these lists are less easy to categorise as there is more freedom of choice within the competitions, but can still be inferred from the requirements.

4.2.1 Solo Repertoire

In the solo requirements for these competitions the German-Austrian tradition espoused in the music exams is still represented (though not as prominently). Of the seven competitions the Busoni competition requires a Beethoven sonata in the solo final round, the Leeds stipulates in the First Stage that an 'important' work by J.S. Bach, Mozart, Haydn, Beethoven, Weber or Clementi (as an Italian he is the only one who does not form part of this compositional idiom) is required. Furthermore, in the second stage of the same competition competitors choose one 'major work' or group of works by: Schubert, Chopin, Schumann, Mendelssohn, Liszt, Brahms, Mussorgsky, Rachmaninov, Scriabin, Stravinsky, Bartók, Debussy, Ravel, Granados or Albéniz, of which Schubert, Schumann, Mendelssohn and Brahms are from the German-Austrian tradition, while the French and Russian traditions mentioned in Chapter Three are also noticeable.

In the first round of the Tchaikovsky Competition a sonata by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven or Schubert is requested, strongly representing the German-Austrian compositional idiom. The Hamamatsu competition a Bach Prelude and Fugue is compulsory in the first stage, as well as movements from sonatas by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven or Schubert exclusively and a piece by Mendelssohn, Chopin, Schumann, Liszt or Brahms. This represents the German-Austrian tradition to the exclusion of all except Liszt and Chopin.

The Rubinstein and UNISA competitions only stipulate a classical work or movement from a classical sonata respectively. This seems to hint at the German-Austrian tradition without stating it explicitly. It is of course possible to find classical works of this nature from other countries, such as sonatas by Clementi. However, the German-Austrian tradition as outlined by Gould (2005: 75) is still prevalent in these repertoire requirements.

Other discussions of competition solo repertoire are perhaps better organised by type of work, framed by Gould's divisions of major and minor works, which, as stated in Chapter Three, is expanded into further categories. Here there is a clear focus on technical virtuosity through the use of various études. The Busoni competition includes études by Chopin or Liszt, as well as a choice of études by Debussy, Bartok, Rachmaninoff, Prokofiev, Stravinsky, Scriabin or Ligeti. In the Hamamatsu second stage pianists perform any one or two études (which must not be by the same composer) by Chopin, Liszt, Debussy, Scriabin, Rachmaninoff, Bartok, Stravinsky or Ligeti. The UNISA competition requests any étude or toccata from the twentieth-century in the first round, as well as a virtuoso work in the same round. Unsurprisingly for piano competitions, several focus on works promoting technical prowess.

4.2.2 Chamber Repertoire

While not all the competitions require chamber music, it is worth considering those that do. The Van Cliburn offers a choice of four piano quintets by Brahms, Dvořák, Franck and Schumann. The Rubinstein gives a choice of one of the following: Beethoven's *Quintet* in E-flat major Opus 16, Mozart's *Quintet* in E-flat major K 452 (both for piano and woodwinds), Mozart's *Quartet* in G minor KV 478, Brahms *Quartet* in G minor Opus 25 and Schumann's *Quartet* in E-flat major Opus 47. The Hamamatsu presents a choice between Mozart *Quartet's* No. 1 in G minor K 478 or No. 2 in E-flat major K 493. All the chamber music repertoire is by European composers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. What is interesting here is the complete lack of any chamber music by twentieth-century or contemporary composers and the fact that all the pieces have four or five players; works for piano and one solo instrument, or piano trio are excluded. It seems that these competitions particularly value the string quartet (for instance) thus limiting the repertoire available to the competitors. There are no works for duo or trio presented, which could be because of practical concerns (it is easier just to assign four works to the string quartet) or this could indicate a preference for large scale chamber works.

4.2.3 Concerto Repertoire

All seven competitions include the concerti in the final rounds. The table below shows the concerti available for selection by each competition. The competitions are listed along the top, and the various concerti are listed down the left hand side. From this it is easily visible which concerti by various composers are preferred, and those that are not offered at all.

Concerto	Cliburn	Busoni	Leeds	Tchaikovsky	Rubinstein	Hamamatsu	UNISA
Beethoven: No.1	*	*	*		*	*	*
Beethoven: No. 2	*	*	*		*		*
Beethoven: No. 3	*	*	*		*	*	*
Beethoven: No. 4	*	*	*		*	*	*
Beethoven: No. 5	*	*	*		*	*	*
Mozart: K. 271		*	*	*			
Mozart: K. 414				*			
Mozart: K. 449		*					
Mozart: K. 453		*					
Mozart: K. 456		*					
Mozart: K. 466	*	*	*	*	*		*
Mozart: K. 467	*	*	*	*	*		
Mozart: K. 482	*				*		
Mozart: K. 488	*	*		*	*		*
Mozart: K. 491	*		*	*	*		*
Mozart: K. 537					*		
Mozart: K. 503			*		*		*
Mozart: K. 595	*	*		*	*		
Bartok: No. 2					*	*	
Bartok: No. 3		*	*		*	*	
Brahms: No.1		*	*		*	*	
Brahms: No. 2		*	*		*	*	
Chopin: No. 1		*	*		*	*	*
Chopin: No. 2		*	*		*	*	*
Ravel: G major		*			*	*	
Rachmaninoff: No. 1			*			*	
Rachmaninoff: No. 2			*		*	*	*
Rachmaninoff: No. 3		*	*		*	*	*
Rachmaninoff: No. 4		*					
Rachmaninoff: Paganini Rhapsody		*	*			*	*
Prokofiev: No. 2		*	*		*	*	
Prokofiev: No. 3		*	*		*	*	*
Prokofiev: No. 5		*					
Liszt: No. 1		*			*	*	*
Liszt: No. 2		*			*	*	
Tchaikovsky: No. 1		*		*	*	*	*
Tchaikovsky: No. 2				*			
Ligeti: Concerto		*					
Grieg: A minor			*		*		*
Schumann: A minor			*		*	*	*
Saint-Saëns: No. 4						*	*
Saint-Saëns: No. 5						*	*

Table 4: Concerto Appearances across seven Competitions

This table clearly demonstrates the prominence of Beethoven's piano concerti in all the competitions (with the exception of the Tchaikovsky). This competition only has Mozart concerti in round two - phase two, and a choice between Tchaikovsky's two concerti in round two - phase three,

where the other concerto is of the contestant's choice. Beethoven's complete concerti are offered in each competition, except for the Tchaikovsky competition, and the *Piano Concerto* Opus 19 No. 2 which is not offered in the Hamamatsu competition. It would seem that Edward Said's observation that Beethoven's piano concerti (and symphonies) are considered "a major oeuvre (some would say *the* major oeuvre) of Western music" still rings true (Barenboim and Said 2002: xv).

The other notable inclusion is the selection of Mozart's piano concerti across all the competitions except for the Hamamatsu. This analysis reveals that this repertoire has become a standard measure of musical proficiency in these competitions, some of which specify a 'Mozart Concerto' round. Other prominent selections are mostly from the standard Romantic concerto repertoire, with concerti by Schumann, Grieg, Chopin, Liszt, Brahms and Tchaikovsky being popular. Also prominent are twentieth-century concerti by Rachmaninoff, Ravel, Prokofiev and Bartok.

This list is revealing for its exclusion as well as its inclusion - there are no concerti by contemporary composers except Ligeti's *Piano Concerto* (composed between 1985 and 1988) in the Busoni competition. Furthermore, the entire concerto repertoire is taken from European or Russian composers, mostly from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and there are no concerti by American composers. This suggests that the concerto repertoire as a separate category in these competitions is focussed on music of the past, contemporary works in these competitions seem to be limited to the solo sections.

Interpretation of the information obtained from analysing the repertoire of two canonising institutions has been limited to the categories in which it is defined, including how a small number of composers are allocated a large amount of repertoire, the creation of national cultural canons, the representation of various compositional traditions and the different genres of repertoire canonised. However, what is the significance of this for piano performance repertoire choice and career development? The following chapter discusses the extent to which institutional repertoire is relevant and valid in a professional concert environment as opposed to how it functions solely within the institutions themselves. Following this I determine how these implications relate to and contribute to theoretical concepts of the canon.

Chapter Five: Practical Implications of Institutional Canons

This chapter questions the extent to which institutional repertoire requirements are congruent with actual concert experiences, located mostly in South Africa, but with international context and reference. Repertoire trends outlined in the previous two chapters are analysed in relation to actual repertoire choice in concert experience based on evidence from interviews with leading South African pianists and information from my Master's recital programmes and concert experience. International context is incorporated by using examples of leading international pianists and how they construct successful programmes and choose repertoire for their performances.

This chapter is organised in three broad sections. The first determines the pedagogical and performance value of institutional repertoire trends, then I discuss where this repertoire falls short in its preparation for actual concert experience and finally the chapter examines factors that influence repertoire in concert performances as well as suggesting alternative approaches to programme construction.

5.1 The Use and Value of Historically Constructed Repertoire

The idea of stylistic balance and a historical approach to repertoire is both explicitly stated and implied in the repertoire of the performance-level music exams and the international piano competitions discussed in the previous chapters.

The ABRSM requests competitors to "present a balanced programme that includes a contrast of repertoire from at least two distinct musical eras" (ABRSM Syllabus 2010: 11), Trinity requests that a "balanced recital programme is maintained" (Trinity Syllabus 2009: 10) and states that a candidate's "programme will be assessed for stylistic balance…" (Ibid.: 13) while UNISA stipulates for the Performance Level Assessments that "At least two contrasting styles must be included in the performance" (UNISA Syllabus 2012: 8). However, UNISA has further control over this conception of historical performance in that their repertoire list is divided loosely by style period into four sub-categories. Candidates must select one work from four lists that focus respectively on Baroque works and forms, consisting mostly of preludes and fugues; complete sonatas, mostly from the eighteenth and nineteenth-century repertoire; shorter concert works and works from the twentieth-century onwards, including contemporary South African music. This ensures that candidates cover a wide variety of historical styles.

The historical recital format (as described in Chapter Two) is also prevalent in the international piano competitions. The Van Cliburn competition first concerto round requires concerti by either Mozart or Beethoven, the Busoni and Tchaikovsky competitions both have a Mozart only concerto round, the Rubinstein competition also has a Mozart and Beethoven round as does the UNISA competition. Furthermore, repertoire analysis reveals that competitions organise music by style period. The UNISA competition stipulates "a work of the Baroque period (1600-1750); any complete sonata from the Classical period (c1750-c1830); any étude or toccata from the twentieth century" among others. The Rubinstein competition has similar stipulations: "a classical work; a romantic work", while other competitions often imply style periods in the choice of composers offered, as with the Leeds competition: "one important work by J.S. Bach, Mozart, Clementi, Haydn, Beethoven or Weber". The terms 'Baroque', 'Classical', 'Romantic' and 'Contemporary' refer to a somewhat outdated way of studying musical history according to 'style periods'. These are not necessarily in use by today's music historians, many of whom prefer nomenclature by century (Taruskin 2005; Grout et. al. 2010). However, they are still used frequently in institutional repertoire requirements, and, as such, provide useful terms for comparison.

While there are alternatives to historically-based programmes (to be discussed later in this chapter), there is also pedagogical value to be gained from a foundation in these canonic works, which can be considered important to the development of a pianist who is making the transition from student to professional, as evidence from my programmes demonstrates.

When constructing my Master's recital programmes, I started by making a list of my entire performed repertoire. In discussion with my teachers, Professor Malcolm Nay and Mrs Pauline Nossel, repertoire was chosen that would fill certain gaps in my performance and knowledge of canonical composers who are considered important to a pianist's development, similar to the ones used by the two institutions discussed, in an attempt to cover an important selection of musical genres and style periods. This repertoire was chosen with institutional repertoire in mind, both as a means of preparation for piano competitions and professional qualifications, showing that these institutions can be influential from a pedagogical as well as a performance perspective. The discussion that follows highlights the benefits and uses of these canonical works and composers in the musical development of a pianist.

Alfred Cortot talks about the importance of the canonic repertoire:[14]

[14] Cortot [1877-1962] was a French pianist of great renown in the twentieth-century, who prepared student editions of many of Chopin's works, with commentary on both musical and technical concerns.

> A Mozart andante, a musical phrase of Schubert or Chopin, the punctuation of one of Schumann's Kinderscenen, demands, in our opinion, a deeper knowledge of the resources of the instrument, than the most heavily scored pianistic writing, and some virtuoso, broken to the pianofortes [*sic*] most imperious exigencies, will perhaps be impotent when it comes to rendering the emotion springing from the simple virtue of sensitive and natural musical elocution (1930: 42).

Cortot argues that the established classical and romantic repertoire can be very important to a pianist, as it is through this music that one is able to learn basic musical understanding which is not possible through a narrow fixation on purely virtuosic repertoire. This knowledge includes core concepts of pianism including phrasing, tempo, articulation and an understanding of the stylistic and technical approaches needed to perform various composers.[15] Cortot's approach is espoused in my repertoire selection and the importance of this approach is validated through evidence from my interviews.

5.1.1 Master's Solo Recital

My solo recital comprises Domenico Scarlatti's *Sonata* in C-Sharp minor K. 247, Beethoven's *Piano Sonata* in A major Opus 101, Rachmaninoff's *Variations on a Theme of Corelli* Opus 42, Prokofiev's *Piano Sonata* No. 6 Opus 82 and his *Toccata* Opus 11, all chosen with different goals in mind. A discussion of the reasons behind this repertoire choice illuminates the value of the historical approach to works selected largely from a standard piano performance canon.

The Scarlatti was chosen as I had played several works by J.S. Bach, including preludes and fugues, and the *Partita* No. 2. In playing Scarlatti, one learns a touch and approach specific to playing Baroque music on the modern concert piano. Having learnt a selection of his sonatas (I prepared one other that is not included in my final programme) one is better prepared to tackle the rest of his output, which at over 500 keyboard sonatas is by no means insignificant: "their originality and emotional range span every mood and temperament and often require all the talent and skill the most virtuosic performer can deliver" (Hinson 2000: 674). Furthermore, "Scarlatti gave the binary form a variety and expressive range that has never been surpassed by any other composer" (Ibid.). In addition, Scarlatti incorporated elements from Iberian folk music (Orga 1999: 11), which distinguished his music from his contemporaries in Germany, thus expanding the pianist's knowledge of keyboard music from that time.

[15] See Sandor 1981, Neuhaus 1973, Wolff 1972 and Lhevinne 1972 for further discussion of these basic tenets of pianism.

Indeed this approach confers strongly with the repertoire analysed in the previous chapters: J.S. Bach and Scarlatti are the two most requested composers who could be categorised as epitomising the Baroque compositional era in institutional repertoire, although the forms used for their compositions are different. Other Baroque composers such as Handel and Soler are requested to a far lesser extent, while still more are excluded entirely. As such the Scarlatti sonatas form an important part of the piano repertoire, and a useful exploration of the possibilities of binary form, which could be applied to other works using this structure.

Prokofiev's *Toccata* is chosen as a suitable encore piece as several competitions now allow competitors to play encores, while others, such as the UNISA, require "any etude or toccata from the twentieth century". Furthermore, this piece makes substantial technical demands on the pianist and offers little respite from the motoric, driving rhythm. Indeed Prokofiev's approach to the piano and his "individual, percussive style" (Hinson 2000: 615) was "probably the most significant innovation in piano technique since Chopin" (Ibid.). His *Toccata* embodies the "Biting percussive effects, physical endurance, and a fine octave technique" (Ibid.: 616) that are required for his works, making this piece a useful addition to my repertoire and providing exposure to his pianistic style, which is expanded later in my programme.[16]

The Beethoven sonata is considered to be part of his late-period, and was chosen as I have already performed one of his early sonatas: Opus 22 in B-flat major. It is important for a pianist to be familiar with Beethoven's changing compositional techniques throughout his life, and this work covers output that was missing from my repertoire of his sonatas. His piano works "occupy a unique place in keyboard literature and demand the detailed attention of both the teacher and the serious student" (Hinson 2000: 87); showing an inherent pedagogical value to these works.

In conversation, South African pianist Jill Richards, confirms the pedagogical value of Beethoven's sonatas. Despite her focus on contemporary music, she highlights how learning various musical elements through a Beethoven sonata can better prepare one for learning later works by more recent composers:

> when you work on a Beethoven sonata, it's easier in the sense that you understand the harmonic language, you can see development, recap, and you think, but this guy is a genius, look how he's made the modulation, and that structure is obviously a function of many things, but it's a critical function, and then, later stuff that I've worked on, which could also be a sonata, and you can take that same blueprint, and the sense of deep understanding of the structure, into a new work, so that you can perceive the structure, and that makes for a better performance. You can learn those kinds of things. I've worked a lot with Kevin Volans, and he's very sensitive to sound, and would say, make a Brahms kind of a sound… or a

[16] See Rosen 2002: 215-216 for further discussion of the influences and influence of Prokofiev's pianistic style.

> Debussy kind of a sound, so it's extending your references as far as you can both ways (Author's Interview 2013).

Without a knowledge of these composers (Brahms and Debussy), one could not expect to recreate their characteristic sound in some contemporary music.

Nina Schumann also speaks of the importance of Beethoven to the pianist, noting that the reason one of her teachers "chose Beethoven specifically, is because he felt that all basic music principles, you can learn from a Beethoven score… with that knowledge you would be able to apply it to other composers" (Author's Interview 2012). As a pianist preparing repertoire for learning and performance requirements, the work of Beethoven cannot therefore be ignored, based on this interview evidence. His last five sonatas serve as the pinnacle of his output for the piano, making them a necessary addition to a pianist's repertoire.

This speaks of a further elevation of the status of Beethoven's music. Not only is it considered a pinnacle of performance output, as was discussed with the significant inclusion of his piano sonatas and concerti in the institutional repertoire, but his works have great pedagogical importance. The evidence above suggests that you can learn a fundamental musical and structural approach to piano repertoire through his music, which a pianist can then apply to other music by different composers. A clue as to this significance can be found in Hopkins's work:

> Beethoven has been described as a cautious revolutionary, but there is certainly no doubt that he changed the entire course of music. The first and last sonatas seem to belong to different worlds, and I doubt if any other composer in history, apart from Stravinsky, so transformed his own musical language (1971: 53).

It seems that through his transformation of his own musical expression, he covered such a variety of keyboard approaches that his music can be applied to the work of composers that either influenced him, or were subsequently influenced by him, to which Barenboim attests:

> By knowing your Boulez and your Carter, you see aspects of Beethoven in a different way. And this is what makes Beethoven eternal. And this is why we occupy ourselves with Beethoven today, and not so much with a minor contemporary of his such as John Field, who has much less to say as far as the eternal values of music or ways of expression of music (2002: 129-130).[17]

It appears that Beethoven's influence on music is inescapable and of essential understanding even to a pianist in the current performance arena. The obsession with his music is nothing new: Hans von Bulow, a major pianist of the nineteenth-century, referred to Beethoven's piano sonatas as the "New Testament of music" (Walker 1983: 175). This spiritual language is reinforced in the notes to a

[17] See Nicholas Cook's *Music: A Very Short Introduction* for a discussion of eternal values in relation to Beethoven.

Beethoven recording by Brendel: “To hear any of the piano sonatas is to experience a vital part of a spiritual journey which occupied Beethoven for some 30 years” (Haylock 1993: 2) providing evidence that Weber’s ideas of secular music being spiritualised are still in effect to this day.

Taruskin provides a modern update to Beethoven’s status in Western music today:

> The fact that after two centuries Beethoven is still the standard-bearer of the universalizing claims of classical music, and still receives the brickbats of resisters, is all the evidence we need of his centrality to the musical culture that we have inherited… (Taruskin 2005: 739).

Taruskin’s statement implies that Beethoven assumes great historical importance, and has come to symbolise the idea of Romantic aesthetics; he is still the central figure of a vast musical culture nearly two-hundred years after his death and as such a knowledge of his work is unavoidable to even the modern pianist. This language through which Beethoven is described demonstrates that Weber’s concept of ‘criticism’ (1999: 341) has further cemented Beethoven’s place in the canon and that craft, or “respect for the master composer” (1999: 341), certainly continues to influence performed music repertories.

Prokofiev’s challenging *Piano Sonata* No. 6 provides both a development of the sonata genre from Beethoven’s time, and a comparison of how two composers separated by over 150 years use the same format as an output for their musical expressions. Prokofiev’s sonatas are now “firmly established in the pianist’s repertoire” (Hinson 2000: 615), and the sixth is the “largest of the sonatas” (Ibid.) making it a worthy addition to any pianists repertoire. Despite writing over 40 years ago, Hopkins shows Prokofiev’s prolonged importance to the sonata repertoire: “In the twentieth century, only Prokofiev has added substantially to the repertoire, the sonatas of Skriabine [*sic*], Rachmaninoff or Hindemith all having failed to survive the hazards of changing fashions” (1971: 10). It seems that his assessment is still partly accurate, while sonatas by Scriabin, Rachmaninoff, and Hindemith are offered as institutional choices; Prokofiev’s sonatas still occupy the bulk of the sonata repertoire of the twentieth-century.

Interestingly, both the Beethoven and Prokofiev sonatas use themes from the opening movements as unifying material throughout the sonatas; suggesting that the sonata genre had still not outlived its usefulness as a musical form within Western Classical music in the twentieth-century. The genre of the sonata was found to be particularly important to the German-Austrian tradition in the institutional repertoire; it seems that it is used as a standard for pianists in both pedagogical and performance terms. This genre is still used by contemporary composers, of the few contemporary works in the exam syllabi seven are sonatas.

Rachmaninoff's *Variations on a Theme of Corelli* Opus 42 allow the pianist to show an affinity for a different genre from the sonatas mentioned above. Variation-playing requires quick changes of mood, musicality and technical approach; one must shift mind-set within a very short space of time to achieve the required contrast between the different manifestations of the theme, while they also display a more expansively lyrical aspect of the Russian compositional tradition than the music of Prokofiev.

While this repertoire was chosen to fill certain gaps in my performance repertoire, I could also satisfy many of the prescriptive requirements of the canonising institutions, such as a classical sonata (for which the Beethoven would suffice), or a virtuosic work (such as the Prokofiev *Toccata*), while the Scarlatti would count as a Baroque work. Through preparing works from the standard repertoire, I have gained works that would allow me to enter competitions or performance-level qualifications, as is further demonstrated with my chamber recital.

5.1.2 Master's Chamber Recital

Further evidence of the influence of competitions on repertoire is taken from my chamber recital, which consisted of Brahms' *Piano Quartet* in C minor No. 3 Opus 60, and Schubert's 'Trout' *Quintet* in A major Opus 114. From discussion with my piano teachers important reasons emerged both for choosing to play a chamber recital, and justification for the works included.

The chamber recital consisted of significant works from the standard repertoire of the type that would be requested in competitions. They are both large scale works (written to be played by piano and string trio and piano and string quartet respectively). This repertoire helps one to think in symphonic terms and to learn how to approach the piano in terms of playing with other instruments, to learn when to accompany the other instruments and when to play as a soloist within the chamber setting. This cultivates a manner of playing that is not attainable from only studying solo repertoire and provides variety in repertoire options for concerts which could be limited from a focus on solo or chamber repertoire individually.

While this discussion has largely focussed on standard repertoire, or pre-1900 and twentieth-century works, in an institutional performance context, there is also merit to the way in which contemporary music is included in these repertories.

5.1.3 Institutional Avenues for Contemporary Music

Evidence from my own exposure to contemporary music suggests that there may be value in the inclusion of this music in institutional repertories, which make specific requests for contemporary pieces, as was found in the promotion of national contemporary music.

Most of my encounters with contemporary music have come through similar requests to perform music for a specific concert or competitions, and not as part of a planned solo recital where I choose what to play. This is similar to the way in which competitors are required to perform a commissioned work in international competitions.

For example, performing contemporary South African composer Jeanne Zaidel-Rudolph's two-piano work, *Takes Two to Tango* (2011) and a selection from her *Youth Oratorio* (2009) arranged for choir and piano, has introduced me to music that I may not have approached otherwise. As a result I am playing the two-piano work in a subsequent performance. I was introduced to a South African contemporary work for clarinet and piano, Hendrik Hofmeyr's *Canto Notturno*, by a clarinettist and we have now performed the work several times. Similarly, I have played in competitions where a piece by a South African composer is required, which has put me in contact with music that I normally would not have chosen to play, and may use in future concerts.

Further evidence of the successful use of contemporary music in an institutional context can be gained from the example of a competition prize-winner. A case in point is Lukáš Vondráček, the winner of the 2012 UNISA International Piano Competition, who performed Peter Klatzow's *Dazzle* as the prescribed South African piece. He went on to perform *Dazzle* in his subsequent prize winner's tour throughout South Africa including Potchefstroom, Durban and Johannesburg (Artsmart 2013, Newsroom 2013, Artslink 2013). Requesting contemporary works in a competition can influence a pianist's repertoire after the competition, at least in the immediate future. This highlights that contemporary music can find a means of exposure through different institutions prescribing their works.

Having established that these institutions have a significant influence on international piano performance repertoire, the inclusion of contemporary composers could provide a meaningful boost to the performance of their music. However it would seem that these institutions could do more in this regard as a means of providing longevity for Western Classical music. So while the historical repertoire approach and exposure to contemporary music included in institutional repertoire can provide certain benefits for pianists, these institutions are purportedly preparing pianists for

professional concert careers, and their repertoire selections must now be assessed in terms of how successful they are in this regard.

5.2 The Shortcomings of the Institutional Approach to Repertoire

It appears that these institutions are at certain times out of touch with the realities of actual concert experience. Charles Rosen, a noted pianist and music historian, is particularly scathing about institutional repertoire, saying that music schools and piano competitions "tend to hinder the development of the direct and experimental approach to the repertory that would be most profitable" (2002: 94).

Interview evidence suggests that the historical approach to programme construction is not always appropriate; an approach that Jill Richards suggests "has outlived its usefulness" (Author's Interview 2013). She indicates that programmes can be constructed using "an intelligent juxtapositioning, and just leaving out the chronological" (Ibid.).

Albie van Schalkwyk expresses a similar sentiment, stating that he does not "…believe it [the historical recital format] at all. I mean I would as soon start a recital, with Prokofiev's *Fifth Sonata*, or a Haydn sonata; those mean exactly the same thing to me" (Author's Interview 2012).

This demonstrates that the historical recital format is not the only way of putting a concert programme together. While the institutions discussed do not impose restrictions on the order of performance, the repertoire selections are strongly categorised according to historical traditions of composition, such as the German-Austrian tradition mentioned in the previous chapters, showing that they are strongly grounded in a stylistic approach to musical history and tend to reinforce this approach to programme construction.

Jill Richards suggests that a historicist approach to building repertoire, as advocated by the institutions being discussed, could also be difficult when building a career: "You have to have something special about you, because everyone can play Beethoven sonatas, and so people are looking for different things to play or ways to programme" (Author's Interview 2013).

This suggests that there are several factors to be considered when selecting repertoire for public concerts, some of which are beyond the control of the performer. These factors need further exploration. As Rosen points out, competitions tend "to restrict even further than the conservatory the repertoire of the young pianist… this can become a handicap for life" (Rosen 2002: 102) and specifies that in terms of repertoire these institutions cultivate: "a limited repertory of relatively

familiar works that will be effective in front of a jury" (2002: 112) but not necessarily a public audience. This distinction between repertoire for public audiences and competition juries must be explored.

5.3 Audience Consideration when selecting Performance Music

The taste of the concert-going public is rarely the same as the taste of a competition jury (Ibid.), or also in this case, the same as the institutional repertoire offered by an examining body. These institutions offer professional qualifications or concert appearances to competition winners and provide an important grounding in terms of standard repertoire, but, I argue, offer limited preparation in terms of the repertoire that is appropriate in developing a unique approach to programme construction for a concert-going public.

The demographic of an audience is an important factor to be considered when constructing recital programmes, again Rosen is vocal about this subject with reference to institutional repertoire: "It is a common mistake, nevertheless, to think that this kind of repertoire will be the most useful for a concert career" (Ibid.: 103). South African pianists also highlight the importance of audience consideration.

Van Schalkwyk emphasises these practical concerns advocating: "Different types of music for different audiences" (Author's Interview 2012). He suggests that there is a need for a balance between what you want to play, and what the audience is willing or ready to hear. However, he recognises that if a pianist's reputation is established with an audience, they have more freedom to programme as they see fit as the audience will "trust the quality of the concert, and the repertoire can really then be open" (Ibid.).

Schumann agrees that the concerns of the audience can be especially important, showing that whereas the Johannesburg Philharmonic Orchestra, for example, used to give her "carte blanche" (Author's Interview 2012) in terms of her concerto repertoire, orchestras now have to be more circumspect in attempts to draw in an audience and often request a specific concerto as a result: one that is well-known and likely to draw in a large audience. Ironically, the institutional repertoire provided by piano competitions perhaps offers even more freedom than actual concert experience.

Jill Richards points out that there are different South African audiences that attend different types of classical music concerts. When asked about the difference between the JPO's audience as opposed to a concert of contemporary music she indicated that they would be completely different. She says

that the audience members who attend the JPO concerts are probably none of the same people who attend the concerts of contemporary music, where the "audiences are way younger, and they're way more mixed, which is just fantastic, in terms of population, demographics mix. It's still not representational in a demographic sense, but it's definitely heading in the right direction" (Author's Interview 2013). This suggests that contemporary music can be used to draw a new audience to concerts of Western Classical music, and may be a useful way for this music to find relevance and significance amongst a younger age group.

A fourth interview respondent suggests that "it's very rare that there'll be a full impressionist concert and the audience will be satisfied, the audience likes variety" (Author's Interview 2012). The implications are, therefore, that the institutional ideal of a stylistic balance of repertoire can have practical merit in terms of pleasing an audience, as it can provide a wide variety of repertoire. However, practical concerns in terms of audiences are of little consequence in the institutional repertoire examined.

5.4 Alternative Approaches to Programme Construction for Performance

While the audience at a concert provides a useful starting point to programme construction, there are also approaches that do not make use of the historical format outlined earlier. It is first worth discussing the instances where these institutions allow for greater freedom of repertoire.

One of the choices a pianist can make is to specialise in one kind of repertoire, composer or style: such specialisation is occasionally offered in the qualifications under consideration, but the options are limited. In the ABRSM's FRSM qualification, a candidate may "present a specialist programme which may concentrate on one composer or period" (ABRSM Syllabus 2010: 14), however, the statement is qualified, as the repertoire should be "internally balanced, containing sufficient contrast of mood and style" (Ibid.). Greater repertoire freedom is also present in certain competitions, for example, the opening rounds of the Van Cliburn competition allows "own choice works, complete works only" (Cliburn Requirements 2013) showing that there is room for a variety of repertoire to be included here.

An alternative approach to repertoire construction for recital programmes is to focus on contemporary music, an approach used by Jill Richards, who has recorded a significant amount of contemporary South African music and considers that "programme building is critical, it can kill a concert stone-dead if you get it wrong, and vice versa" (Author's Interview 2013).

She describes how new music electronic instrumentation can be a factor motivating repertoire choice, where one has to determine how different music works together in practical terms. She gives a further example of a concert programme constructed mostly of smaller works where "The key structure was intuition apart from those basic ideas, small pieces, old and new, and then it was how do they fit together, and does this work" (Author's Interview 2013) but says that she "didn't want to go for the chronological thing or the contrasts things in terms of one slow, and one fast" (Ibid.). The programme for this concert as follows:

> So I started with Debussy *pour le* "cinq doigts", the Liszt, *Bagatelle Sans Tonalatie*, Schoenberg, which is quite old, Schubert, *Moment Musicaux*, C major, James Tenney the *Essay after a Sonata* which is a very beautiful piece, Beethoven *Bagatelle*, Kevin Volans *Etude*, another Beethoven *Bagatelle*, Clare Loveday, Daniel Goode. They're relatively short, David Lang, *Piece on John Cage*, Rolf Wallin, he wrote this set of pieces called S*even Imperatives*, Chopin, and Nancarrow (Author's Interview 2013).

Richards also highlights how she would programme based around major works: "one programme I'd like to do is the Concord S*onata*, which I play, and put that with the Boulez S*econd Piano Sonata* which I am learning… they are monumental works in the twentieth-century repertoire, that could work as a programme" (Author's Interview 2013). Several alternative approaches to a historical programme construction are presented here, although concepts of "major and minor categories" (Gould 2005: 69) are still applicable.

Schumann proposes a further alternative, suggesting that programmes be connected by theme: "You can try and find some kind of connection, or a fantasy theme, or a sonata theme, so you end up working more in genres" (Author's Interview 2012).

Van Schalkwyk highlights other possibilities when constructing programmes including anniversary years for certain composers, or programmes constructed only of French repertoire for instance, or having to fit in with the programmes of other artists in a concert series to avoid repetition of the programme for a certain audience (a concept unthinkable to piano competitions).

While it would be possible to construct programmes of the various types mentioned above within institutional constraints, the prevailing trend is the historical approach to repertoire; furthermore these institutions do little to encourage a unique approach to programmed repertoire, which seems at odds with examples taken from successful international pianists.

Combining the performance of contemporary works with historical repertoire is an approach taken by Canadian pianist Marc-André Hamelin. He is well-known for his "fresh readings of the established repertoire and for his exploration of lesser known works of the 19th and 20th century" (Marc-André Hamelin 2013), while he also performs many premieres of contemporary works. Rosalyn Tureck,

who was known primarily for her performances of J.S. Bach on the piano, and performed works by other composers including Beethoven, Brahms, Debussy, Liszt, Mozart and Rameau (Tureck Bach Research Institute, Inc 2014), also premiered contemporary music recordings of works by David Diamond, William Schuman and Luigi Dallapiccola (Visual Artists International & VAI Audio 2000). British pianist, Joanna MacGregor is known for her eclectic repertoire, ranging from Bach, Mozart and Chopin to Birtwistle and Django Bates (Royal Academy of Music 2014).

The examples of Hamelin, Tureck and MacGregor demonstrate how the ability to create interesting and varied programmes, in addition to the quality of the performer, is important in attaining success in actual concert experience. The institutions discussed are more focussed on comparing and assessing the pianist than their ability to craft unique programmes which might prepare them more realistically for a concert platform.

While it is understood that from an institutional repertoire perspective, where a qualification is granted or a prize awarded it is necessary to require a reasonable amount of the standard repertoire, there is often not room for specialisation of the type mentioned above. In this way, these institutions seem to foster pianists playing mostly standard repertoire, but this can leave them unprepared for a concert career once they reach the 'cut-off' age for entering these events (many competitions have an age limit). Further questions of the type of performance that these institutions cultivate within this repertoire are beyond the range of this study, but would make for fascinating research.

What is clear from these discussions is that divisions of standard repertoire and contemporary music continue to exist in the value assigned to various works through institutional control. While the standard repertoire defines the institutional values required to attain qualification or success, contemporary music is often used out of necessity or for a particular performance.

Nevertheless, a key feature of these institutions remains their ability to "set themselves up on a lofty plane as guardians of the canonic tradition" (Weber 1999: 354). They still control a significant amount of the repertoire of young pianists and set themselves up as guardians of certain concert and career opportunities. The institutionalisation of repertoire from a very specific period of musical history has allowed this process to take hold. As a result, music from the past is still more valued than contemporary music, promoting a narrow conception of what constitutes acceptable performance repertoire that is not necessarily congruent with a real world application, but which can provide a useful musical knowledge to young pianists. Having assessed the construction of this repertoire, I now explore its implications for various conceptions of the musical canon.

Chapter Six: Theoretical Implications of Institutional Canons

In 1999 William Weber made a call for research that examined the canon by "studying collections separately, as idiosyncratic entities, and then together, as a complete musical context in a particular period" (Weber 1999: 338). The previous chapters analysed these trends of repertoire performance within performance-level music exams and international piano competitions. I then explored the extent to which institutional repertoire approaches set up young pianists with repertoire for concert careers with specific reference to a South African context.

This chapter applies these findings to the theoretical concept of the canon that shapes and informs them, to determine where they confer with, or develop, existing theoretical concepts of the canon. This discussion and subsequent conclusions are informed by evidence presented in the previous three chapters, including the institutional repertoire trends, interview evidence with leading South African pianists and my own experience as a pianist operating within the Western Classical music realm.

The trends of repertoire-use discussed previously have two important implications: not only do they define a repertoire for performance, they also create and influence theoretical considerations of the ways in which we listen to, disseminate, and consume this music. This chapter questions the extent to which the canon-concept in Western Classical music is still hegemonic and controls what pianists are required to perform, in order to be qualified or prepared for professional concert experience.

6.1 The Concept of the Musical Work

Chapter Two explained how the "work-concept" (Goehr 1992: 149), theorised by scholars including Kerman and Goehr, was essential to the development of the performing canon. This concept enabled music to be viewed as an entity separate from its social context, and used instead for study and performance. Furthermore, it created a philosophical ideal that profoundly influenced the way in which Western Classical music was perceived. This work-concept is a factor that underpins an institutional conception of music, and acts as a catalyst for institutional canonisation by functioning as the primary building block of musical performance.

The evidence analysed from the two canonising institutions that prescribe repertoire provides insight into how the work-concept still functions and how it continues to influence contemporary performance repertoire canonisation. The musical work-concept continues to be upheld, both

through direct acknowledgement, and through the ways in which performance music is described in the syllabi.

For instance in the Trinity syllabus the music used is constantly referred to by the 'work' moniker: "…a minimum of two works" (Trinity Syllabus 2009: 10), "…play any work that is listed…" (Ibid.). The same language is evident in the ABRSM syllabus: "…lists of instrumental and vocal works…" (ABRSM Syllabus 2010: 7), "…include in your programme a work or works…" (Ibid.). UNISA follows suit: "… an entire work or only part of it" (UNISA syllabus 2012: 1), "…any edition of the prescribed works" (Ibid.).

The same language is found in the repertoire requirements of the piano competitions. The Hamamatsu Competitions talk about "the score of the new work" (The 8th Hamamatsu International Piano Competition 2013), the UNISA competition refers to "a virtuoso work" (12th Unisa International Piano Competition 2012) and the Rubinstein Competition refers to "a Classical work" in its repertoire lists (The 14th Arthur Rubinstein International Piano Master Competition 2014).

Throughout the entire analysed repertoire, the term 'work' is used as the standard reference to a musical composition, indicating that this concept remains steadfast in the institutional domain, and underpins the canonical thinking that even prescribes music for performance in the first place.

A further implication of the work-concept is that this is the unit of musical organisation. Most of the repertoire lists organise the music of different composers by certain works; labelling the composition with the title and opus number. It is accepted that candidates and competitors perform selections from these musical works to gain qualification or success in a competition. None of the institutions allow the performers to improvise in a Western Classical music setting, and candidates and competitors are expected to perform these musical works as notated by the score.[18] This work-concept is linked to the elevation of the musical text as the bearer of meaning and separates the music from the meanings of its reception; or as Taruskin articulates, these works are now "artifacts of permanent value like the painter's coloured canvas or the architect's solid edifice" (2005: 639).

Furthermore, much of this music has been adapted or removed from its original "extra-musical" (Goehr 1992: 149) meanings and context for use in another setting. As Goehr contends, the use of the term 'musical work' is not necessarily congruent with the ways in which certain composers wrote and viewed their own music:

[18] In Mozart's time it was standard practice for performers to improvise or provide embellishments to a melody, and fixed notation in a musical score was not the only means of producing music. (See Goehr 1992: 189).

> Nowadays, no form of musical production is excluded a priori from being packaged in terms of works… though the music in question was not so packaged at its moment of origin… we often disregard the conceptual differences between a work and an improvisation or those between a work and a transcription (1992: 244).

This certainly seems to be the case in the institutional repertoire examined. The prescribed pieces in the performance-level music exams and the international piano competitions are packaged as musical works, even when this was not the way the music was originally conceived. Transcriptions are listed alongside compositions originally intended for the piano in their given form, although there are not a significant amount of transcriptions available in this repertoire, as was pointed out for Franz Liszt. Perhaps the distinction between an original work for the piano, and one adapted and reworked for the piano can account for this discrepancy, implying that transcriptions do not carry equal weight as original compositions.

Other instances of works removed from their original context can be found in the offerings of J.S. Bach's 48 preludes and fugues. Bach's original title "indicates the instructional emphasis Bach placed on this work, yet the musical world has chosen to place it among the loftiest of his creations" (Hinson 2000: 48).[19] So while the work was intended for teaching, more in line with Weber's "*pedagogical* canon" (1999: 339) [Italics original], it has been removed from this context here and is used for performance instead.

Goehr provides further evidence of music being removed from its original context. Writing of the classification of experimental works she contends, "We speak of the works of John Cage, Max Neuhaus, and Frederic Rzewski, even though these musicians do not think of themselves as composing within the romantic tradition" (1992: 244). Yet in the exam syllabus we find several works by Rzewski included for selection. It could be argued that the majority of the music included in these institutional repertoires was never intended for the purposes of examination, assessment and performance comparison, excepting the works that were commissioned for these purposes.

It is clear that the Romantic concept of the musical work, and the sentiment that "…rewriting the past was and remains one of the most characteristic ways for persons to legitimate their present…" (Ibid.: 245) are ideas that continue to influence contemporary institutional musical thought. While the concept of the musical work took hold in the early 1800s it continues to shape the way in which music (particularly Western Classical music) is conceived today, especially in these institutional

[19] Bach's title is: "The Well-Tempered Clavier or Preludes and Fugues through all the tones and semitones, both as regards the 'tertia major' or 'Ut Re Mi,' and as concerns the 'tertia minor' or 'Re Mi Fa.' For the Use and Profit of the Musical Youth Desirous of Learning, drawn up and written by Johann Sebastian Bach, Capellmeister to His Serene Highness the Prince of Anhalt-Cöthen, etc. and Director of His Chamber Music. Anno 1722" (Quoted in Hinson 2000: 48)

contexts. This enables the music of certain styles, time periods and various composers to become entrenched in the repertoire and the canonic thinking that informs it.

We are still left with institutionalised performance criteria that focus on the assessment of the performance of a musical work. The examination institutions discussed were shown to have a wide global reach, and piano competitions take place worldwide: the work-concept is still the primary manner in which they perceive music, possibly allowing this idea to influence more people than was previously possible. The result is that works in these canonic repertories continue to transcend both "temporal and spatial barriers" (Goehr 1992: 246).

Using canonical musical works to grant a qualification or to compare performers serves as a syllabus for evaluation, no longer of the music itself, but rather of the performer playing it. This process can be compared to studying a literary text in an institutional context, where a person assessing the candidates determines whether or not their interpretation is valid, rather than looking at the value of the work itself (which may be accepted as given). Indeed this phenomenon has influenced the discussion surrounding the canon, as Gilmore points out, performing works from the standard repertoire shifts focus from the work itself to the person performing it (1993: 224).

The musical work-concept has further implications for repertoire selection in performance, and the ways in which pianists construct programmes. As scholars including Weber and Goehr have described, the work-concept allowed musicians to include works by past composers in their concerts. There is substantial evidence to support the idea that this historicist approach to performance continued into the twentieth-century, becoming more streamlined and narrowly focussed in its use of certain historical composers.[20] At this point I assess the implications of this approach that comprises a balance of compositional styles from a selection of historical composers for performance repertoire.

6.2 The Implications of the Historical Recital Format

Previous chapters have demonstrated how institutional repertoire is largely conceived in historical terms. The underlying assumption here is that these style periods form part of a musical history organised in stylistic terms, such as Baroque, Classical, Romantic and Modernist compositional eras. The underlying philosophy of both institutions confirms the historical recital and the performance of music from the past as a measure of excellence in performance ability. The historical recital format continues in these institutions and pianists are required to be familiar with most of the accepted

[20] See Gould 2005: 'The Changing Repertoire of the Piano Recital from the Beginnings to 1980'.

styles to demonstrate versatility in this sense and to prove themselves worthy of qualification or career and concert opportunities. However, many performers are turning to different ways in which to construct concert programmes, as demonstrated in Chapter Five, demonstrating that this institutional 'musical work' based approach is no longer in line with real-world concert experience.

This focus on standard repertoire (mostly from the pre-1900 and twentieth-century eras) is further supported by certain repertoire trends that emerged during the analysis of this institutional repertoire, and the works included in my own Master's Recitals. The first is that of the dominance of a small number of composers over the majority of the repertoire. In Chapter Three certain composers are shown to dominate the repertoire of the performance-level music exams, while evidence from Chapter Four revealed similar trends in the repertoire of international piano competitions. Gilmore's repertoire classifications of pre-1900, twentieth-century and contemporary music proved useful in analysing the extent to which the historical performance model is prevalent, a format which is not necessarily present in actual concert experience, as evidenced from interview responses discussed in the previous chapter.

In the exam syllabi, it was found that almost all of the composers with the most works listed were from the pre-1900 and twentieth-century categories. Composers from the pre-1900 category were the most prolific, while composers who spanned the turn from the nineteenth to twentieth-centuries were also prominent. This approach to a variety of styles and use of historical repertoire was also used in my Master's recital programmes, and was found to have important pedagogical and performance value.

While there are contemporary composers included there appears to be no consensus on a dominant tradition of recently composed music between the three examining institutions or the international piano competitions. Compositional traditions from the past are ubiquitous, but contemporary compositional movements are more widespread and appear often as isolated instances - they are more often attached to a particular institution and country than universally accepted. As Weber says, the conflict between contemporary and standard repertoire music "has become institutionalized" (2003: 78) and there is a "stalemate between the contemporary and the classical" (Ibid.). From the findings discussed in the previous chapters it is possible to determine the extent to which Weber's 'stalemate' is still prevalent. Not only does new music have a "limited standing in the life of the average concertgoer" (Ibid.: 79) it seems that it is devoid of too much importance on an institutional level as well.

From a repertoire allocation perspective both of these canonising institutions focus almost exclusively on the music of the distant past. Weber's shift towards "discussion of actual pieces of music…" (1994: 493), instead of the theory that informs them, has translated into more practical terms and use. Furthermore, the status of the 'inhabitants' (works) in the 'musical museum' is constantly reinforced by using standard repertoire music as a means to validate the abilities of contemporary performers. The repertoire is used to measure and compare, but the comparison is no longer between different works as compositions, but the merits of different performers in the Western Classical music tradition. In other words, Weber's "respect for the master composer" (Ibid.: 341) and musical 'craft' (1999: 341) has been surpassed by the institutionalisation of the accepted musical value of these works.

The institutional repertoire here is no longer organised around a particular composer - rather the repertoire available is now so vast that it has been organised into groups of canonisation, within which certain dominant composers have emerged. Repertoire is now seen as forming part of larger national canons and the cultural heritage of different countries from various timeframes.

Within this further classifications of the types of repertoire available to performers exist, specifically from within genre divisions. The genre of the piano sonata came to exemplify the music of the Classical period defined mostly by the German-Austrian tradition, while piano concertos (mostly of the Classical and Romantic idioms) were vitally important in the international piano competitions. Concertos are used in the final, deciding rounds, of the contest, setting the pinnacle of performance standards. This provides further evidence of how these institutions continue to package music outside of its original contexts; musical or social.

6.3 The Implications of National Canons for Contemporary Music

The existence of these divisions has important theoretical implications for what constitutes an acceptable repertoire. Several performance canons, such as the Austrian-German, Russian and French traditions are still the most prevalent in the institutional repertoire analysed, showing that this music has acquired a hegemonic status in this repertoire. Additionally, these institutions all attempt to promote their own national culture through the work of contemporary local composers. Weber spoke of the development of performing canons based in certain countries (namely England and France), while Goehr demonstrated how a German musical canon developed as an attempt to distance national culture from political ideologies.

It is worth discussing the contemporary status of these hegemonic repertories in greater detail. While Weber refers to canons based more on ancient music from England and France, their performing canons seem to have been updated. In Weber's discussion, the English performing canon originated in the 1690s with the "Academy of Ancient Music" (1999: 345) while the French "Conservatoire Orchestra of Paris served as a musical museum" (Ibid.: 346). The canonising institutions discussed serve a similar role in contemporary society, although now the English canon focuses more on music of the twentieth-century and contemporary composers than music from the more distant past. However, the keyboard music of British composers such as Byrd, Gibbons and Bull could feasibly be included in this repertoire. For instance, South African born pianist Daniel-Ben Pienaar has released a compact disc entirely of music by Orlando Gibbons (Pienaar 2008). This music from the 'pre-Bach' compositional era lends itself to interpretation on the modern piano, and there seems to be no reason why these institutions should not allow candidates to select music from this time. The exclusion of this music suggests that they appear to be opposed to extending the piano performance history further into the past than what is referred to retrospectively as the 'Baroque' era.

The French compositional tradition has also been updated, focussing on music of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, while the German-Austrian tradition is still firmly rooted in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These traditions exclude new composers in the performance-level exams; German-Austrian, French and Russian traditions are not welcoming of new composers, possibly as a result of institutional pressure to maintain a strong sense of musical historicism in qualification and performance, and a further institutionalisation of the division between contemporary and repertoire music. This demonstrates that while attention is given to local contemporary culture within these institutions, the performance of past canons from foreign countries is still the dominant standard.

However, efforts to promote works by local composers are evident in each institution. The ABRSM and Trinity actively promote the works of twentieth-century and contemporary British composers, while UNISA does the same with South African composers. All of the piano competitions request works from local composers, either commissioned or composed previously. In this way, these institutions are also trying to create a musical museum of more recent works by composers from their local countries in an effort to promote and preserve their national cultural heritage. In addition, the cultural heritage of other countries is often unanimously accepted. The ubiquitous German-Austrian tradition is found in the entire institutional repertoire analysed, while the French and Russian traditions are also very prominent. Not only does this demonstrate that this repertoire is

favoured over other works, but it has come to define what is largely considered acceptable and valued piano repertoire. Institutional validation is powerful in assigning value to certain music and composers, creating a very specific historical performance-based approach, rather than performing contemporary music, as was mostly the case before the canon took hold.

6.4 Change and Conformity

This limited use of contemporary music has further implications for discussions of Dowd *et al*'s "change and conformity" (2002: 37) or Kopiez *et al*'s "novelty and tradition" (2009: 52). That music of the past continues to transcend its historical position and function, has certain implications for contemporary music and its composers, both in terms of the composers who are included alongside the esteemed 'past masters' and for those who are not. It was found that an insignificant portion of institutional repertoire favoured contemporary music, both in the performance-level music exams and the international piano competitions, despite minor efforts to include it.

In the case of these contemporary canonising institutions, 'change' still has no bearing on 'conformity'. Despite the restrained introduction of contemporary composers, it seems that the 'conformity', or the use of traditionally-accepted composers from established compositional traditions, still stands firm. Repertoire performance is still the accepted measure of pianistic professionalism, while the performance of contemporary music appears almost as a symbolic gesture instead of a true standard of excellence, despite its almost exclusive use by certain contemporary performers such as Jill Richards. If contemporary music was really valued it would be far easier to specialise, and there would be far less institutional control of the performance repertoire available. In this way these institutions function not only as librarians and preservers of a musical performance canon, but also as gatekeepers to the canon: they can decide what is included and what is excluded.

This could be due to a number of factors. First, it is possible that musicological questioning and interrogation of the performance canon and calls for de-canonisation and deconstruction of the canon have been successful only insofar as more contemporary music is performed, while the canon of standard repertoire from the pre-1900 and twentieth-century eras remains mostly untouched. Second, the canon as a core concept is still strong, but canonisation is a retrospective and slow process. Hence, the position of certain contemporary composers could still be cemented in the future. Third, it is possible that avant-garde contemporary music has a role more as a philosophical force than as a tradition dependent on repeat performance for success, as Weber says it can be

defined “as a moral cause for high art” (2003: 79) through “writing music beyond what most people would like or understand” (Ibid.).

Analysis of these repertoire trends has made important contributions to the theory of the canon, both reinforcing and expanding existing knowledge. This theoretical discussion has been mostly informed by institutional repertoire, with additional information being drawn from interview evidence and my own practical experience. What has become clear is that canonic repertoire is still valued and considered important in institutional repertories, even though this is not necessarily the repertoire that is most useful for public concerts. What are the meanings of this for continued performances and perceptions of what constitutes Western Classical music?

6.5 Conclusions

Upon embarking on this research, I had set out to explore the extent to which canonical works continued to influence contemporary piano performance with international reference and specific focus on the South African context. This was done in response to a significant amount of research which had started to question the hegemony of the canon in various spheres of Western Classical music, including performance, musicology and music history. Through engaging with existing research it became clear that these three aspects were linked and that any further research in this area would need to make use of theoretical concepts from each, a design followed in this dissertation. In-depth analyses of performance-level music exams and international piano competitions determined which works and composers were privileged. These findings were then related back to practical experience with evidence taken from interviews and my own practice.

In the process of determining the composers and repertoire valued by these institutions, other concerns emerged. Having found that the institutional repertoire examined was largely dominated by standard repertoire from the esteemed musical past, and that musical performance was still conceived in historical terms I was forced to question what this meant for the music of contemporary composers. If we are still playing accepted masterworks from previous centuries and still employing an essentially Romantic approach to performance through the work-concept, to what extent are we located in a state of musical contemporaneity?

Both institutions seem to be aware of this dilemma and have made various attempts to achieve balance in their repertoire selections. Piano competitions regularly commission works by contemporary composers that are to be performed by all the competitors, while music exams make efforts to include contemporary music in their syllabi, although this is mostly written by local

composers.[21] Contemporary composers can achieve greater exposure not only from trying to get their music heard through these institutions, but from finding specific performers to champion their music or through organising concerts of contemporary music specifically, which is probably a more viable option as these institutions are slow to include this music.

Despite these efforts, the music that these institutions promote is mostly from the period of standard practice, with a particular focus on music of the pre-1900 era, while the twentieth-century is also prominent. This is beneficial to young pianists, especially in terms of providing a good foundation in both performance repertoire, and musical knowledge that can be applied more easily to different works, including contemporary music, as became evident through interview responses.

At the start of this research I set out to provide an update to the canonic values and standards that started to take hold around the 1800s and appeared to continue to the present day. These canonic works are still idealised and the work-concept that has allowed them to take hold is even more streamlined and prominent than before. The canon as an ideal for musical performance is still a significant influence on institutional repertoire, but not exclusively so. There is a slowly growing space for contemporary music, and it seems that the institutions discussed could go a long way in exposing pianists to this repertoire. However, as the canon has been entrenched over hundreds of years, this will not be an immediate change.

Is it reasonable for performance music studies to be located so assuredly in the musical past? An institutionalised narrow focus on the discipline of performed musical history may tend to invalidate contemporary composers with an unfair comparison to music that is so firmly entrenched in a discipline.

While a historical approach sharply defined performances in the twentieth-century, the musical world may be moving away from this one-sided view. Many successful pianists have made careers from playing music outside of this conception, but still within the Western Classical repertoire, which as an 'institution' is being challenged by the music that is becoming part of it. Of particular significance is that this research examined South African institutional requirements and compared them with external norms. While the two were not found to be very different in their requirements, the research confirmed that the local approach continues to adopt outdated ways of thinking that reinforce ideas of what constitutes the Western canon in piano music.

[21] While it is commendable that these competitions commission new works by contemporary composers these works are generally not of a large scale, but are rather shorter works written specifically for the occasion of the competition. Whether or not they make a substantial contribution to the repertoire is open for question.

The future of the piano performance discipline will certainly be interesting as we observe where the performed repertoire develops from this point, having already seen that it is being challenged by the ways in which it is used for performance. In order for this music to continue to find an audience, and indeed to expand it, it needs to develop with a constantly evolving society and to find a way to move with it, while maintaining the sense of historicism that allowed it to become as significant as it has.

Appendix One: Sample Interview Schedule

1. Musical Background and Repertoire Choice

1.1 In what ways did your repertoire choice develop in your earlier years of music study?

a) How did your teachers influence your choices?

b) How did musical events, including competitions and festivals, influence your choices?

c) Do you think that repertoire learned in these years of study has influenced your choice of works today?

c.1) For teaching?

c.2) For Performance?

2. Repertoire Choice for Teaching

2.1 How do you choose repertoire when assigning works to students?

a) Regarding Interpretation?

b) Character?

c) Technique?

d) Sound?

2.2 How important is it for students to learn works of different style periods?

a) Baroque?

b) Classical?

c) Romantic?

d) Modern?

e) Contemporary?

2.3 How important is it for students to learn works by varied composers?

2.4 Has the repertoire choice of your students', during their studies, affected their choice of works upon completion of study?

a) If so, in what ways?

2.5 To what extent do you think your repertoire choices have influenced those of your students'?

a) In what ways?

3 Repertoire Choice for Performance

3.1 How do you construct programmes for your recitals?

a) Historical repertoire choice?

b) Based on audience? How have they responded to your choice of works? Do you think you find the same audiences at performances of contemporary music as at concerts of standard repertoire for instance?

c) Venue?

d) Event?

Bibliography

12th Unisa International Piano Competition 2012. 2012. 'Information Brochure'. http://www.unisa.ac.za/contents/cultural/docs/UIPC-brochure2012.pdf, accessed 22 April 2013.

ABRSM. 2013. 'About Us'. http://za.abrsm.org/en/about-us/ 2013, accessed 8 April 2013.

ABRSM. 2013. 'ABRSM history'. http://za.abrsm.org/en/about-us/abrsm-history/, accessed 25 June 2014.

ABRSM. 2013. 'More about ABRSM'. http://za.abrsm.org/en/about-us/more-about-abrsm/, accessed 8 April 2013.

Alink-Argerich Foundation. 2013. 'Alink-Argerich Foundation'. http://www.alink-argerich.org/foundation, accessed 05 March 2013.

Allmusic. 2014. 'Alfred Brendel: Schubert: Piano Sonata in A, D. 959; 12 German Dances'. http://www.allmusic.com/album/schubert-piano-sonata-in-a-d-959-12-german-dances-mw0001857691, accessed 30 June 2014.

Allmusic. 2014. 'Myra Hess: Dame Myra Hess: Live from the University of Illinois Vol. 1'. http://www.allmusic.com/album/dame-myra-hess-live-from-the-university-of-illinois-vol-1-mw0001941437, accessed 30 June 2014.

Amazon. 2014. 'Horowitz plays Scriabin'. http://www.amazon.com/Horowitz-Plays-Scriabin-Vladimir/dp/B0000CF325?SubscriptionId=AKIAJNW3SUXQYO4KKQIQ&tag=cdun09-20&linkCode=xm2&camp=2025&creative=165953&creativeASIN=B0000CF325, accessed 30 June 2014.

Artslink. 2013. 'Pianist Lukas Vondracek for JMS'. http://www.artlink.co.za/news_article.htm?contentID=32280, accessed 11 June 2014.

Artsmart: arts news from kwazulu-natal. 2013. 'FOM: LUKÁŠ VONDRÁČEK'. http://news.artsmart.co.za/2013/03/fom-lukas-vondracek.html, accessed 11 June 2014.

Bachus, Nancy. 2010. 'Competitions: Pinnacles and Pitfalls: an Interview with Daniel Pollack', *Clavier Companion*, January/February 2010, 10-18.

Badenhorst, Cecile. 2008. *Dissertation Writing: A Research Journey*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Barenboim, D., and E.W. Said. 2002. *Parallels and Paradoxes: Explorations in Music and Society*. London: Bloomsbury.

Beard, D., and K. Gloag. 2005. *Musicology: The Key Concepts*. Oxon: Routledge.

Bergeron, K., and P. Bohlman, eds. 1992. *Disciplining Music: Musicology and Its Canons*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bevers, Ton. 2005. 'Cultural education and the canon: A Comparative Analysis of the Content of Secondary School Exams for Music and Art in England, France, Germany, and the Netherlands, 1990-2004', *Poetics*, 33, 388-416.

Bloom, Harold. 1994. *The Western Canon: The Books and Schools of the Ages*. London: MacMillan.

Bohlman, Philip V. 1992. 'Epilogue: Musics and Canons'. In *Disciplining Music: Musicology and Its Canons*, eds. Bergeron, K. and P. Bohlman, 197-210. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Cook, N., and M. Everist, eds. 1999. *Rethinking Music*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cook, Nicholas. 1998. *Music: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cortot, Alfred. 1930. Chopin: 24 Preludes Op. 28: Student's Edition by Alfred Cortot, Translated by David Ponsonby. Paris: Editions Salabert.

Dowd, Timothy J., *et al*. 2002. 'Organizing the Musical Canon: The Repertoires of Major U.S. Symphony Orchestras, 1842 to 1969', *Poetics*, 30, 35-61.

Eigeldinger, Jean-Jacques. 1986. *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher - As Seen by his Pupils*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elliott, David J. 1995. *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Erauw, Willem. 1998. 'Canon Formation: Some More Reflections on Lydia Goehr's Imaginary Museum of Musical Works', *Acta Musicologica*, 70(2), 109-115.

Ferruccio Busoni: International Piano Competition Foundation. 2013. 'Musical Programme for the 2013 Competition'. http://www.concorsobusoni.it/, accessed 12 February 2013.

Gilmore, Samuel. 1993. 'Tradition and Novelty in Concert Programming: Bringing the Artist Back into Cultural Analysis', *Sociological Forum*, 8(2), 221-242.

Goehr, Lydia. 2002. 'In the Shadow of the Canon', *The Musical Quarterly*, 86(2), 307-328.

Goehr, Lydia. 1992. *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gould, John. 2005. 'What Did They Play?: The Changing Repertoire of the Piano Recital from the Beginnings to 1980', *The Musical Times*, 146, 61-76.

Grout, D. J., J. P. Burkholder and C. V. Palisca. 2010. *A History of Western Music, 8th Edition*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Hinson, Maurice. 2000. *Guide to the Pianist's Repertoire: Third Edition*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hopkins, Anthony. 1971. *Talking about Sonatas*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Johnson, Michael. 2010. 'The state of international piano competitions: A "frenzy for attention"', *Clavier Companion*, 2(1), 20-21.

Kehler, George. 1982. *The Piano in Concert*. Metuchen: Scarecrow.

Kerman, Joseph. 1983. 'A Few Canonic Variations', *Critical Inquiry*, 10(1), 107-125.

Kerman, Joseph. 1985. *Musicology*. London: Fontana Paperbacks and William Collins.

Kopiez, R., A.C. Lehmann and J. Klassen. 2009. 'Clara Schumann's Collection of Playbills: A Historiometric Analysis of Life-Span Development, Mobility, and Repertoire Canonization', *Poetics*, 37, 50-73.

Lhevinne, Josef. 1972 [1924]. *Basic Principles in Pianoforte Playing*. Toronto: General Publishing Company [Theo. Presser Company].

Marc-André Hamelin. 2013. 'Biography'. http://www.marcandrehamelin.com/biography.php, accessed 20 June 2014.

McClary, Susan. 1991. *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

McCormick, Lisa. 2009. 'Higher, Faster, Louder: Representations of the International Music Competition', *Cultural Sociology*, 3(1), 5-30.

McMillan, J.H., and S. Schumacher. 2010. *Research in Education: Evidence-Based Inquiry: Seventh Edition*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Merriam, Sharan B. 2009. *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Neuhaus, Heinrich. 1973. *The Art of Piano Playing*. London: Barrie and Jenkins.

Newsroom: NWU Potchefstroom Campus. 2013. 'Wonderful Opportunity to Hear Winner of Unisa Piano Competition'. http://potchnews.nwu.ac.za/n/en/58, accessed 11 June 2014.

Nina Schumann. 2014. 'Nina Schumann'. http://www.twopianists.com/Artists/schumann.html, accessed 19 June 2014.

Orga, Ateş. 1999. 'Eloquence Born of Understatement'. Notes for CD *Great Pianists of the 20th Century, Volume 45 - Myra Hess*. Philips 456 832-2.

Pienaar, Daniel-Ben. 2008. *Orlando Gibbons - Complete Keyboard Works*. Deux-Elles B000W043UQ.

Rosen, Charles. 2002. *Piano Notes: The Hidden World of the Pianist*. London: Penguin Books.

Royal Academy of Music. 2014. 'Professor Joanna MacGregor'. http://www.ram.ac.uk/find-people?pid=1458, accessed 20 June 2014.

Sadie, Stanley, ed. 2001. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians: Second Edition - Volume 5, Canon to Classic Rock*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Samson, Jim. 2001. 'Canon (iii)'. In *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians: Second Edition - Volume 5, Canon to Classic Rock* ed. S. Sadie, 6-7. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sandor, Gyorgy. 1981. *On Piano Playing: Motion, Sound and Expression*. New York: Schirmer Books.

Small, Christopher. 1998. *Musicking: the Meanings of Performing and Listening*. Hanover: University Press of New England.

South African College of Music. 2014. 'Staff: Albie van Schalkwyk'. http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/sacm/schalkwyk.html, accessed 19 June 2014.

Street, Alan. 1993. 'Review of *Disciplining Music: Musicology and Its Canons* edited by Katherine Bergeron and Philip V. Bohlman', *Journal of Music Theory*, 37(1), 169-176.

Takács, Peter. 1994. 'Review of Gustav A. Alink's *International Piano Competitions*', *Music Library Association*, Second Series, 51(2), 616-618.

Taruskin, Richard. 2005. *The Oxford History of Western Music: Volume Two*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Taruskin, Richard. 2014. 'Class of 1685'. http://www.oxfordwesternmusic.com/view/Volume2/actrade-9780195384826-chapter-06.xml, accessed 30 June 2014.

Taylor, Clara. 2011 [1982]. *These Music Exams: A Guide to ABRSM Exams for Candidates, Teachers and Parents*. London: The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music.

The 14th Arthur Rubinstein International Piano Master Competition. 2014. 'Rules and Repertoire'. http://www.arims.org.il/competition2014/index.php/rules-repertoire?view=featured, accessed 22 April 2013.

The 8th Hamamatsu International Piano Competition. 2013. 'Repertoire'. http://www.hipic.jp/eng/8th/prospectus/repertoire/, accessed 18 May 2014.

The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music. 2010. *Performance Diploma Full, Syllabus Updates 2010 reprint*. Thetford: The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music.

The Cliburn. 2011. 'Repertoire 2013'. http://www.cliburn.org/index.php?page=cliburn_competition, accessed 31 October 2011.

The Cliburn. 2013. '2013 Competition Commissioned Work'. http://www.cliburn.org/competitions/cliburn-competition/2013-competition/commissioned-work/, accessed 20 June 2014.

The Cliburn. 2014. '2013 Competition Awards & Competitors'. http://www.cliburn.org/competitions/cliburn-competition/2013-competition/awards-competitors/, accessed 25 June 2014.

The Leeds International Piano Competition. 2012. 'Repertoire 2012'. http://www.leedspiano.com/content/repertoire, accessed 22 April 2013.

Trinity College London. 2012. *Piano Syllabus: Grade Examinations: Piano, Piano Accompanying; Certificate examinations: Piano Solo, Piano Duet, Piano Six Hands 2012-2014 (Third Impression)*. London: Trinity College London.

Trinity College London. 2013. ‘About Trinity’. http://www.trinitycollege.co.uk/site/?id=6 2013, accessed 8 April 2013.

Trinity College London. 2013. *Diplomas in Music: Performance and Teaching from 2009 (Fifth Impression)*. London: Trinity College London.

Tureck Bach Research Institute, Inc. ‘Discography’. 2014. http://www.tureckbach.com/discography, accessed 20 June 2014.

UNISA. 2013. ‘A Brief History of the Department of Music of UNISA’. http://www.unisa.ac.za/Default.asp?Cmd=ViewContent&ContentID=2019 2013, accessed 12 February 2013.

University of South Africa. 2012. *UNISA Piano syllabus 2012 until further notice: Piano; Piano Duet, Two Pianos (four hands)*. Pretoria: The University of South Africa.

Visual Artists International & VAI Audio. 2000. ‘The Rosalyn Tureck Collection III - Première Performances’. http://vaimusic.com/CD/1124.htm, accessed 20 June 2014.

Weber, William. 1994. ‘The Intellectual Origins of Musical Canon in Eighteenth-Century England’, *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 47(3), 488-520.

Weber, William. 1999. ‘The History of Musical Canon’. In *Rethinking Music*, eds. N. Cook and M. Everist, 336-355. New York: Oxford University Press.

Weber, William. 2003. ‘Consequences of Canon: The Institutionalization of Enmity between Contemporary and Classical Music’, *Common Knowledge*, 9(1), 78-99.

Weiss, Robert S. 1994. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York: The Free Press.

Wolff, Konrad. 1972. *The Teaching of Artur Schnabel: A Guide to Interpretation*. London: Faber and Faber.

Wright, David C. H. 2012. *The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music: A Social and Cultural History*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

XIV International Tchaikovsky Competition. 2011. ‘Repertoire’. http://tchaikovsky-competition.com/en, accessed 22 April 2013.

Interviews

Respondent Four. Author's Interview, Stellenbosch, 30 March 2012.

Schumann, Nina. Author's Interview, Stellenbosch, 31 March 2012.

Richards, Jill. Author's Interview, Johannesburg, 21 October 2013.

Van Schalkwyk, Albie. Author's Interview, Stellenbosch, 29 March 2012.