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ABSTRACT

How Much Do We Practice?:
Defining a Course of Study for the Applied Pianist at
The Eastman School of Music, The Juilliard School, and The Curtis Institute of Music
from Their Inception to 1945

Janice Marciano Nimetz

Histories of higher education isolate the conservatory/music school from their purview by omission, while histories of music education and individual music schools give overviews but do not address in depth the traditions, development, effects, and tensions buried within courses of study and the particular needs of the music student. That consideration is the purpose of this study.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, professional music education emerged as independent schools, or schools and departments within university settings. As the university accepted and acknowledged a broad and diverse range of fields of study, it developed new areas of specialization in its curricula. Concurrently, ‘art’ music as a cultural pastime was finding its place in the American social consciousness and inviting, as a consequence, a means of education directed to this pursuit. Encouraged by European immigrants who themselves were musicians, or those for whom art music was a cultural tradition, and also by responsible philanthropy of new wealth acquired from the Industrial Revolution, America began to embrace the currents and interests of its immigrant population. In so doing it created a need for teachers of music, for improved instruments and organizations to engage in music-making, and for performers to provide entertainment. The recognition of professional education in new university institutions
made it an opportune time for music to establish itself as a viable part of American higher education. Music schools proliferated, standards notwithstanding with regard to courses of study, faculty, and student requirements. Gradually, however, America pooled its resources and called upon its own ingenuity to clarify the ideology of the professional musician and to define how the training and education for that ideology might be accomplished. By the twentieth century America could offer professional study for the applied musician on a par with its European counterparts.

This thesis considers the environments of three prominent music schools founded in the 1920s, the Eastman School of Music, The Juilliard School, and The Curtis Institute of Music. It reviews the administration, faculty, and the evolution of their curricula for the applied major from their inception to 1945, and observes how each defined and clarified its course of study. Thus it serves as a foundation for understanding the trajectory that brought these schools to their present place of recognition. In so doing it offers one perspective of professional education, that of training and educating for performance, and contributes to the narrative of the history of higher education.
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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

This thesis seeks to describe the development of curricula and methods of teaching at three music schools founded between 1921 and 1924 whose purpose from their inception was the training of the professional musician. This includes the performing musician, the composer, and the music educator. This study will touch upon the music curriculum in general and will consider in detail that for the applied music student whose major is piano performance. It will be limited to the first twenty to twenty-five years of each school and will compare their programs of study and the circumstances and intentions that shaped decisions as these programs evolved. As an example of professional education, the conservatory/music school may be examined in the larger context of higher education in America. Curriculum—what is offered and how it is implemented—is one lens through which the ideology of a profession may be viewed: the commitment to ideals of workmanship and competency, spoken and unspoken, particular to a given discipline. Curriculum also serves as one element that helps define admission standards and graduation requirements. This study will address each of these points.

In many ways, higher education in music paralleled the path of the emerging university, reflecting similar responses to societal pressures of serving the community and sharing similar concerns about curriculum and private funding. The proliferation of music schools in the mid-nineteenth century, either as departments within college/university settings or as independent conservatories, grew out of pressures from
an increasingly complex society whose wealth from industrialization allowed time for leisure and whose urbanization stimulated an interest in cultural capital—libraries, museums, theater, concerts. Along with demands from industry to transform the traditional classical course of study typical of the small liberal arts college into a university model of specialization and vocational training for a wide variety of professional fields, were those from a public looking to fill increasing leisure time. Its interest in cultural pursuits translated into the need for more American-trained musicians, performers, teachers of music, and, consequently, for institutions that could address this need. Specialization and the mounting importance of a college education not only encouraged but necessitated formal study—the “orderly synthesis” of professional training—and the music profession was no exception.¹

As with many other professional disciplines, that of music could fit comfortably into the fabric of the new university, but not without some compromise. Concurrently with the emerging university, the independent music school began to establish itself as an important institutional structure for training the professional musician, not unlike independent professional schools for the study of theology, law, education, and medicine that were forming outside of the university framework.

Initially the independent music school was based on the European tradition of musical training that separated academe from applied study. However, it did not remain free of the pressure in America for academic degrees, pressures significant enough to motivate these schools to create programs that met academic standards, to offer joint courses of study with academic institutions and, in time, for performance study to be offered within the university itself. This approach to higher education in music, a co-mingling of liberal studies with applied studies, was very much an American construct

and not without stimulus from those efforts for change to the traditional curriculum that went hand-in-hand with the emergence of the nineteenth-century university. Finding the balance between academics and applied music for the musician has been the ever-present challenge for the music student, his teachers, and the administration of his music school or conservatory: How much do we practice and how much do we study, namely, the ‘theoretical’ of music and the liberal arts.

In considering the history of professional schools in America and in particular the professional music school, it is helpful to review briefly the three factors that propelled the development of higher education in America up to the beginning of the twentieth century, the beginning of the time period for this thesis. First, the Age of Enlightenment sparked unbridled inquiry, an interest in scientific reasoning, and secularization. The classical foundations of education in America, a fixed and highly structured body of knowledge based on the ancient Trivium (grammar, rhetoric, logic) and Quadrivium (arithmetic, astronomy, geometry, and music), came into question. What segment of the population did it serve and what might be done on behalf of the remainder? What was the purpose of the college and of what use for a society then very much centered on rural enterprise? Such questions stirred reassessments of the college curriculum, its value, and consequently its modification. The impact of the demographic and economic shift from a rural, agricultural society to an urban, industrial one filtered down to education. Colleges responded by integrating professional studies into their curricula at the expense of traditional courses. Nevertheless, tradition falls away slowly, and core subjects grounded in the humanistic tradition remained entrenched in educational philosophy for many years to come. The influence of this philosophy would exert tensions as educators tried to

---

develop an academic basis for new fields of study. To some degree the ubiquitous debate for the musician—practice versus study—echoed those tensions. Yet visionary academics who championed a more flexible curriculum and a broader perspective to education—Francis Wayland, Charles Elliot, and James McCosh—opened up new possibilities for students’ individual interests and strengths and paved the way to a refashioning of American higher education.\(^3\) This new university would ultimately embrace the professional school within its walls.

A second factor that directed a reshaping of American colleges was the lure of study abroad. The exodus of students to European centers of learning included prominent educators as well as aspiring students seeking advanced education.\(^4\) As the role of music took root in this country, education for America’s music students ran a losing competition with European centers, particularly Germany. Significant numbers of aspiring American music students traveled abroad for study, as their academic compatriots, returning “Europeanized,” with progressive ideas about education, and they took up the cause to establish comparable centers here. In addition, émigrés found fertile soil on which to foster their musical traditions—as performers, as educators, and as founders of musical societies. The proliferation of music schools produced a confusing and messy mixture of standards. Yet out of this emerged an American model of higher education in music that


\(^4\)Between 1815 and WWI, more than 10,000 Americans attended German universities. Notable among them were Charles Eliot, appointed president of Harvard in 1869, Daniel Coit Gilman, who served as the first president of Johns Hopkins when it opened in 1876, Andrew D. White, first president of Cornell (1869), and President Frederick A. P. Barnard, President of Columbia, appointed in 1864, all academic reformers in the history of American higher education. For the most part the first wave of prominent American musicians also studied abroad.
would weaken the exodus and eventually reverse it somewhat with international students choosing to study here.

The third factor that helped shape American higher education was the establishment of land-grant colleges and institutes of technology that grew up after the Civil War. These were established either as free-standing schools or as part of larger university systems, and their prevalence unleashed a “spirit of vocationalism” on college campuses.\(^5\) Unlearned vocations (such as farming, manufacturing) now became learned professions (as law, medicine).\(^6\) Thus the nineteenth-century American university assumed responsibility for providing humanistic study along with formal professional education for a large number of new careers. That the university broadened its mission to include specialization for a wide variety of practical disciplines argues for consideration and inclusion of music schools, whether independent institutions or university affiliated, in the historical narrative of American higher education.

Histories of higher education have given little attention to the role of music as a discipline and applied music study in particular. Musicians, in general, may be responsible for this neglect. They would be able to describe from first-hand experience the environment of the music school setting, with insightful regard to both the tangibles such as course work, as well as the intangibles, such as the dynamic between teacher and student in the private music lesson, where a tacit ideology that embraces knowledge, skill, and attitude, is often transmitted in a powerful way. For the performing musician especially, efforts in research most often are directed toward performance practice and historically-informed editions of music. Histories of music in America give modest attention to music schools dating from the nineteenth century. It was not until the 1960s

\(^5\)Rudolph, 338.

\(^6\)Ibid., 340.
that a comprehensive overview of the American conservatory was written, a very important first of its kind, a dissertation that has not been replicated or expanded upon in any significant way since then. More recently the picture has gradually begun to fill out with isolated historical accounts of university schools of music and conservatories as well as dissertations devoted to a variety of topics concerning the musician and music study.

There remains opportunity, however, to reflect on the nature of preparing to be a musician, specifically a performing musician, by taking a closer look at what actually happens in those institutions designed for that very purpose: schools and conservatories of music.

In their study of liberal education and music and its historic underpinnings, Willis Wager and Earl McGrath wrote,

There is a difference between a music school and most of the other professional schools. When anyone who has had the training involved in a school of music (no matter what the particular name happened to be) says “music school,” he does not mean just any school where music figures in the curriculum; he means something rather definite by it.... A “music school” is something in the mind of one who has been through it in a way that a school

---


8 Among these and related to this study are published works of the school of music at Yale University, the Eastman School of Music, The Juilliard School, the New England Conservatory, and The Curtis Institute of Music, dissertations on the history of Oberlin and of Peabody, and on teachers and directors of these schools, and related topics concerning the profession.

9 Terminology is inconsistent: For example, Juilliard, an independent institution, was known for a period of time as a school of music. Eastman is known as a school of music, as are Yale and Indiana, each being a part of a larger university structure. Curtis, a free-standing institution, is referred to as institute, as is Cleveland. Cincinnati today is known as a college-conservatory because of its college affiliation; New England Conservatory of Music and Peabody Conservatory (today a division of Johns Hopkins) retain conservatory in their names. Applied music programs are offered at each of these institutions.
of journalism or of nursing or of public relations and communications is not.\textsuperscript{10}

One way of describing the “definite” (environment) implied by “music school” is to look closely at its curriculum and at how a student navigates a course of study for a specific goal—not a listing of courses but rather an explanation of what students actually did, how they were taught and by whom, how instruction was modified, and the implications of these specifics. These afford an in-depth understanding of the training and nurturing of talent in the music school/conservatory setting and the complex issues that must be balanced in this process. With curriculum and all that it encompasses as a point of departure—music and academic courses, studio lessons, structured opportunities for practical experience, and means of instructing—the construct of professional/vocational music education can be evaluated in the context of histories of higher education with better understanding and insight. The broad topic of curriculum reaches even further afield as a probable reflection of the ideology of founders, administration, and faculty. Tempered by the need to attract students, while seeking those that the school deems appropriate to its environment, schools adjust curriculum to reflect changes in society, along with other reasons. Its response to those changes through admission and graduation requirements ultimately influences how the profession serves society. The ethnologist Bruno Nettl writing on the conservatory describes it as

\begin{quote}

a complicated place, the Heartland music school, existing as it does at a number of crossroads. It’s a place that aims specifically to teach a set of values, and it does so not only through practical instruction but also through the presentation of a quasi-religious system. It’s a place that puts “the music” first and looks at music as if it were a reflection of a homogeneous human society. It is an umbrella under which different approaches to music coexist, interact, and argue. It collects many kinds of music, brought from many places and composed at many different times, putting them all under one roof but making them all march to the drummer of the central classical
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{10}Willis Wager and Earl McGrath, \textit{Liberal Education and Music} (New York: Teachers College, 1962), 204.
tradition. It reflects the culture in which it lives, but it also tries to direct that culture and music as the domain of the foreign and unintelligible.¹¹ Later he writes, “The music school is the analogue of factory, corporation, and scientific establishment; it reflects the society of which it is a part.”¹² And it reflects its environment.

This study reviews the implementations and implications of curricula at three music schools founded within the first quarter of the twentieth century—the Eastman School of Music in Rochester, New York, founded in 1921, the Juilliard Graduate School in New York City, and The Curtis Institute of Music in Philadelphia, both founded in 1924. The Institute of Musical Art was established in New York in 1905 and merged with the Juilliard Graduate School in 1926. As part of the larger history of Juilliard, it will be reviewed in this study as well. The thesis will examine and compare the histories of these schools from the perspective of how each school defined its identity by its programs of study, methods of teaching, and by its decisions in resolving conflicting issues relating to the needs of students for advanced musical training as needs either changed or became perceived in a different way.

The choice of schools for this study was based on three considerations. First, these were the first schools in America whose primary purpose was to train the performing musician. Their nineteenth-century predecessors, such as Peabody Conservatory, sought foremost to provide training for the teaching of music, although from the outset Peabody took as its model the European conservatory, separating academic from practical courses of instruction. Second, because of their bequests, the largest for any music school up to that time, these institutions were able to design programs according to their own standards. Their resources allowed them to invite artist teachers of international repute to...


¹²Ibid., 145.
join their faculties. They, in turn, attracted students of outstanding potential.

Consequently they were recognized as and became leaders in the field of performance training. It was to these schools that others turned to model their programs. Third, to further their goal of training “top talent,” Juilliard in its first two years was, and Curtis after its first two years became, tuition-free schools. Though not all of the student body shared the same potential, these schools to some degree were able to hand-pick students who could fulfill their highest expectations. Eastman’s stated mission (quite similar to that of Peabody’s), more broadly defined as “for the enrichment of community life,” nevertheless provided performance study of professionally high caliber.13 Finally, each institution was (and remains) unique: Eastman operated within a university structure; Curtis followed the style of the European conservatory; and Juilliard Graduate School fell somewhere in between, with the Institute of Musical Art serving as its undergraduate division. Yet in their sameness—training the performer—each achieved an outstanding reputation and sustained prominent recognition nationally and internationally, making America’s music schools viable contenders to those abroad.

The time frame for discussion will extend from the opening of these schools in the 1920s to approximately 1945, thus focusing on the early development of their core curricula and programs of study. These initial years place the discussion in direct proximity to the original purpose of their founding and provide a foundation for the changes that followed. The beginning of the twentieth century represents a second stage in America’s cultural history, a dynamic one both politically and economically, with the demand for musicians and music educators ever increasing. Looking back to the nineteenth century, higher education for the musician saw an already established group of

music schools and university music programs that would evolve into important and outstanding centers for musical training within the next fifty years: In 1865 Oberlin Conservatory was founded as an adjunct to Oberlin College, becoming the first conservatory to enter the field of higher education; New England Conservatory in Boston, along with the Boston and Cincinnati Conservatories of Music, followed in 1867; Peabody Conservatory of Music in Baltimore, “the first important conservatory to be conceived on a grand scale in North America,”\textsuperscript{14} followed in 1868, and Cleveland Institute shortly after in 1871.

Music departments in prominent colleges and universities were established. The 1864 college catalogue for Harvard lists instruction for those students who wished to study music and had sufficient background. Instruction in vocal music for the purpose of sacred services had been available since 1855. John Knowles Paine, considered among America’s leading nineteenth-century composers, had arrived at Harvard in 1862. Appointed Professor of Music in 1875, he offered five courses in music, including Harmony, Counterpoint, Canon, Fugue, and History of Music, but with “no cost, no credit, and no remuneration.”\textsuperscript{15}

Yale’s early history in music dates back to 1855-56, when a German émigré, Gustave Jakob Stoeckel, was appointed Instructor of Vocal Music in Yale College in addition to his duties as organist and Chapel Master. The catalogue for that year refers to a complete course of two years on the “scientific instruction in vocal music,” meeting twice during the week, with the focus on sacred music.\textsuperscript{16} His courses included organ, voice, music theory (harmony, counterpoint, and form), and composition, and he directed

\textsuperscript{14}Fitzpatrick, 232.


\textsuperscript{16}Thompson, 208-209.
the Glee Club. There were lectures as well on analysis, aesthetics, history, and biography. Not until 1890, however, were music courses approved for credit, marking the official beginning of Yale’s “Musical Department.” Upon Stoeckel’s retirement in 1894, American composer Horatio Parker, considered founder of the department, was named department chair. In the same year Yale received approval for the granting of the Bachelor of Music degree.

Edward MacDowell, another noted American composer, was appointed at Columbia in 1896. Michigan (1889), Indiana (1893), and Illinois (1895) are among the earliest state university music schools. Applied music was not, however, the main objective; teaching was. In some institutions, applied music never became an option for study. Harvard and Columbia have refrained from offering performance study to this day, although both have had affiliations with conservatories, New England and Juilliard respectively. Harvard was nevertheless known for its performing organizations: “The Instrumental Clubs make no pretense of representing anything but the lighter side of the college.... The members of these Clubs are deeply conscious of the responsibility which belongs to them in maintaining a high standard for this class of music, and for the impression they create as Harvard men.” Harvard granted degrees for New England Conservatory until 1929. Yale, on the other hand, developed an outstanding

17 Thompson, 209.
18 Ibid., 124.
19 Ibid., 111. This department had a separate endowment from that for the Department of Music Education at Teachers College. Thompson, 155.
professional music school, independent of its music department, with an excellent program in applied music. These, all “survivors,” are but a few of the many others that closed because they lacked financial resources and/or enough resiliency to sustain standards or improve them. By 1900 New England Conservatory and Peabody were revisiting their curricula as they sought to define their objectives more clearly, and New England was struggling to secure financial stability. New schools of music flourished: Along with Eastman, Juilliard, and Curtis, the first quarter of the new century gave rise to the Institute of Musical Art, Mannes College, Manhattan School of Music, the School of Music at Indiana University, and San Francisco Conservatory—schools that would assume a place of prominence as institutions to cultivate musical potential as the century progressed.

The turn of the century also gave rise to concerns and debate about music curricula, standards, and inconsistencies within courses of study that ultimately propelled the development of the National Association of Schools of Music in 1924. Members of NASM, administrators and music educators of independent and university-based music schools, strove to come to an agreement regarding curricula and performance expectations, and in particular with regard to the Bachelor of Music degree. At issue was the credibility of the professional music degree and of music study altogether as a discipline in higher education.

Music as a cultural pastime continued with ever-growing interest and verve. Concerts, mostly by Europeans, had become prevalent. Although the tradition of

22James Grande, “And Then There Were Seven: An Historical Case Study of the Seven Independent American Conservatories of Music That Survived the Twentieth Century” (Ed.D. diss., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 2001).
performance was in its infancy, many of America’s leading orchestras were now established, notably Philadelphia under the direction of Stokowski, Boston under Koussevitzky, and New York under Toscanini, all European directorships. To this list may be added the Metropolitan Opera and orchestras in Cleveland and Chicago. For the first time in its history America had musical ensembles and opera that matched the finest in the world. “The spread and acceptance of the idea of music as art was the most important musical development in America in the second half of the nineteenth century.”

Economic and political tensions in Europe continued to encourage emigration. As German immigration had figured so prominently in the development of musical activity in the nineteenth century, Russian émigrés seeking refuge from the effects of the Revolution—pianists such as Rachmaninoff, pedagogues such as Josef and Rosina Lhévinne, and composers such as Stravinsky—brought with them an extraordinary artistic standard that stimulated a new level of performance and a new stature for the profession of music that would ultimately result in a gradual shift from Europe to America as the desired place for music study.

The flourishing economy following the Civil War, and its accompanying social advancement, repeated itself with a stronger dynamic following World War I. An

---


unparalleled spread of affluence brought wealth and philanthropy to a new level, which, combined with the spirit of “enriching community life,”26 impacted on the cultural life of the country, a life that was teeming with vibrancy, discovery, and opportunity. The Roaring 20s marked the close of nineteenth-century decorum and tradition. It was a decade of new social freedom and exuberance, in some terms a decade tinged with decadence, and one heading toward an economic downturn of catastrophic proportions and another world war. Yet the effects of immigration, the dissemination of education and educational methods learned abroad from the previous century, as well as America’s involvement in World War I, inspired a new confidence in her initial steps as a world power and awakened a national and international awareness uncalled upon in her earlier history. This maturation and gradual independence from a Eurocentric focus, and a conscious withdrawal from European political socialism, had a direct bearing on possibilities for America’s art music, i.e., America’s classical music, bringing those possibilities in line with the best Europe had to offer.

Into this climate of social consciousness and development George Eastman of Eastman Kodak, the textile merchant Augustus Juilliard, and Mary Bok Curtis, who acquired her wealth from her father’s publishing endeavors, set about advancing the cause of music in America.

With a bequest that would ultimately total $17.5 million, Eastman built a music school, a community theater, and a library that today houses a world-renown music collection in Rochester, New York, for the enrichment of the Rochester community—not unlike the efforts of George Peabody a half-century earlier. One of the three great

26Lenti, 4.
American music schools founded in the 1920s, Eastman was originally intended to provide a liberal education for musicians but became a leading center for the training of performers as well.27

Upon his death in 1919, Augustus Juilliard bequeathed $20 million for the advancement of music. In 1920 the Juilliard Musical Foundation was established to manage that money. In 1924 the Foundation set aside $12 million for the creation of the Juilliard Graduate School whose purpose was to offer a complete musical education for worthy students.28 Two years later it merged with the Institute of Musical Art, founded nineteen years earlier with an original bequest of $500,000 from the financier John Loeb, to become the Juilliard School of Music.

A patron of the arts, Mary Curtis Bok bequeathed $12.5 million to establish The Curtis Institute of Music in 1924 for the purpose of teaching students “to think and express their thoughts against a background of quiet culture, with the stimulus of artist-teachers who represent the highest and finest in their art.”29

With such financial resources as these, each school was able to engage and to compete for an international artist faculty of outstanding caliber that would ultimately mold the artistic standards of its students while indirectly setting a standard of artistic endeavor for all who pursued music as a profession. The rich musical background of an international faculty was now at the doorstep of America’s most promising young

---


29Fitzpatrick, 554.
musicians. Although not the only schools providing a music education of the highest quality, these schools were exemplary in their training of professional musicians, graduating an extraordinary number of students who would become prominent in their fields. “For the first time America had schools of music, which could rank with the great universities,” and their influence on future generations of American musicians was incalculable.\textsuperscript{30}

Because of the stature they achieved, it is pertinent to ask how the environments of Eastman, Juilliard, and Curtis prepared their students for a career in music performance from their inception in the 1920s to 1945. To address this question fully, three points are considered: first, the intended purpose of each school for its founding; second, the larger conversation among founders, administrators, and music educators regarding curricula for and the training of the applied music student in America at this time; and finally, the similarities and differences in the curriculum at each of these schools during the same time period. The historical significance of such a study lies in giving voice to the role of applied music within the context of the history of higher education in America. Professional education, including music, receives coverage in histories of higher education as a general overview of its emergence, but not in detail, with analysis of a specific course of study that shows how skill, knowledge, and ideology evolve and are transmitted. How these schools brought this about expands the discussion of the nature of education itself—higher, liberal, professional—by reflecting on those qualities of thought these descriptions engender and how they may be attained through the study of music for performance. Further, individual histories of these music schools are

\textsuperscript{30}Howard and Bellows, 237.
concerned with an isolated narrative, but not with the broader historical picture of American education.

To place this topic in perspective, we begin by considering the emergence of the nineteenth-century university and its gradual acceptance of vocational/professional studies. Next, we review the development of music education in the nineteenth century with particular attention to three music schools that survived into the twentieth-century and exist today. The discussion of Eastman, Juilliard, and Curtis that follows is divided into two segments under each institution: the first relates to the historical underpinnings of each—founders, financial backers, and administrators; and the second examines curriculum and faculty. The final chapter summarizes and compares the ‘environments’ of each school and offers an analysis of the education each provided.

By 1945 a broad consensus on a curriculum for the professional musician had been arrived at, an American method of instruction based on past tradition had taken hold, and the internal workings and external image of these schools had been defined. The practice of educating, however, does not remain static, although the core curriculum for music underwent little change until approximately the 1970s. Nevertheless, efforts on behalf of intellectual pursuit and artistic development continued to be discussed and debated, with different schools addressing the tension between performance and academics in different ways, each seeking to maintain the highest professional standards while meeting the needs of the communities they served.

“The amount of practice necessary for a weekly or fortnightly lesson in music involves two or three times the moral or intellectual effort which an average student
expends on any other course work.”\textsuperscript{31} This succinctly describes the cause of conflict that lives within the walls of music schools—acquiring academic knowledge representative of advanced education and developing informed musicianship while meeting the demands of practice. How does one become an ‘educated’ musician? Depending on their goals, students weigh those schools that have a heavy concentration of academics against those where academics play a lesser role to performance. The result of trying to find a balanced solution, however, was the “startling indications of haphazard growth in music curricula and courses [and] the large variation among music schools in credits, course titles, degrees, and administrative practices” of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.\textsuperscript{32} Music educators tried to reign in this lack of consistency with the creation of the National Association of Schools of Music, one of whose purposes was to set standards for programs in higher music education. The problem, though, lies with applied music itself. “It is the nature of the way one learns music that he starts out fairly specifically and begins to concern himself with wider and more general matters only after he has reached a certain stage in his development as a musician.”\textsuperscript{33} In other words, one begins practicing and learning the mechanics, and then reflects on what he has been doing. With other professional programs—law, journalism, education, medicine—the process is reversed, beginning with the general and moving toward the specific.


\textsuperscript{32}Wager and McGrath, 152.

\textsuperscript{33}Ibid., 183.
The matter of balancing academic study with practice extended back to the first conservatories and music schools in America in the nineteenth century. Under the directorship of Charles Tourgée, founder in 1864 and its first director, the New England Conservatory of Music sought to educate the musician both ‘liberally’ and professionally. In collaboration with the College of Music of Boston University, New England offered courses in history, English literature, mathematics, natural sciences, languages, and philosophy, “a little university within itself,” from which a student could receive a Bachelor of Music degree. It is interesting to reflect on the ideology that guided this program:

This College is designed for students of the average proficiency of graduates of the best American conservatories. It is the only institution of its grade and kind in America.... Few persons devoting themselves to this profession are able to complete a liberal education before beginning their special musical training. Nor, indeed, ought they to do it. The best years for acquiring scholastic culture are also the best years for cultivating the voice, the ear, and the hand. A generous intellectual and aesthetic culture is needed by every professional musician; but it is best acquired, not before or after, but in connection with, his special studies. The lack of opportunities for such acquisition has been the chief defect of some of the most famous music schools of the world....

In a more insistent tone, Tourgée defined education as “the harmonious development of all one’s faculties to their highest power.... It must therefore be symmetrical, for man is a unit, and one part of his nature cannot be developed to the highest point without the cultivation of the other parts,” a point of view echoed seventy-five years later by Eastman’s Howard Hanson. Although Tourgée recognized the need
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for a highly developed performing skill, his purpose for higher education in music education was to secure teaching positions for the graduates of his music school—a visionary concept. He lamented that universities failed to employ musicians because of their limited educational background. His educational view was a practical attempt to merge music into higher education. An over-extended program that was intended to develop the musician into a ‘whole man’ and to provide teacher training for college and university, its emphasis nevertheless shifted with the appointment of his successors. Carl Faelten, a German by birth who had taught in Frankfurt-am-Main and at Peabody, and was appointed at New England Conservatory in 1890, and later the American George Chadwick both moved the curriculum toward the independent European conservatory model. Interestingly, the fourth director of Curtis Institute, the composer Randall Thompson, appointed in 1939, would unsuccessfully try to incorporate more academics into that school’s curriculum about fifty years after Tourgeé’s efforts.37

The influence of Eastman, Juilliard, and Curtis has been far-reaching. Along with those successful and older conservatories of the nineteenth century, they are among the most significant institutions that have educated and trained national and international musicians in the professional area of performance in addition to composition, teaching, and research. How a school evolves to achieve its goals, “…. may be attributed to an individual personality, to the quality of faculty and student bodies, to the excellence of the performing groups, or to . . . realistic and workable curriculums.”38 Each of these attributes created a basis of success for these schools and each school offered an example of how to bring these factors together.


38Fitzpatrick, 511, 550.
In 1924, twenty-eight year old Howard Hanson was appointed second director of the Eastman School of Music in Rochester, NY. “No one, not even Hanson himself, could have guessed that this would mark the beginning of his forty-year tenure in that position.”

In his interview response to Rush Rhees, then president of the University of Rochester, Hanson wrote, “Rochester is not a music center and for it to become a music center a great thought would have to be born there which by its very bigness and idealism would attract to it all those who believed in the same things.”

Almost concurrently with his appointment in Rochester, Hanson began serving as chair of the curriculum committee for the newly formed National Association of Schools of Music. He accepted this post believing his leadership for NASM would help place Eastman at the forefront of establishing high standards for music degrees and would exercise a strong influence on many school administrators. At Eastman his immediate concern was curriculum, beginning first with the program in theory: “I find students who have completed work in Advanced Form who apparently have had no work in Elementary Form; students who have passed to an advanced subject without having completed satisfactory work in the elementary subject; and students who have pursued work in an advanced and elementary subject at the same time to the detriment of both.”

The course in music history posed another kind of problem that pushed for significant revision. Interdisciplinary and comprehensive in its original format, the four-year course of study seemed more appropriate for the liberal arts major than the music major. The first year began with ethnomusicology, the second moved to medieval history to about 1600, the third to modern history from 1600 to 1880, and the last year to modern
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movements from about 1880 “closing with American composers.” For its first revision it was dramatically reduced to a two-year course—“a basic music history lecture course taken in freshman year and a history of fine arts taken in senior year.”\(^{42}\) It would be further revised to a one-year course.

Standards for admission and graduation, particularly as the school’s applicant pool increased, became more stringent in order to decrease the number of students who needed to be put on probation or who were dismissed during their first year. One of the assessment tools for admissions was the Seashore Test, a psychological test that measured musical potential. Such tests had become both popular and controversial by the time Eastman opened its doors. Though not the only qualifier for admissions, these tests were nevertheless used at Eastman for the next several years as Hanson believed them to be one useful tool for improving admission standards. “Stability [with regard to admissions] has been attained due to two factors, first a greater stability in our own curriculum and second, and more important, a more careful selection of applicants for the entering classes by using the Seashore psychological tests.”\(^{43}\)

When Hanson arrived in Rochester, the Eastman faculty was predominantly European trained. The largest single group, twenty-three in all, was the piano faculty, of whom only five were listed as “faculty for degree and certificate courses,” later known as major and secondary teachers for applied music.\(^{44}\) The principal string teachers had to be good solo performers with orchestral and chamber music experience, who had at least some previous teaching experience. Yet Hanson did not encourage his faculty to accept out-of-town performing commitments. Rather “a commitment to education and well-
being of the students was the sole reason for being a member of the faculty.”

(By comparison, one Juilliard artist faculty would herself express surprise at being hired to teach piano because she had not had any previous teaching experience. As well, the 1924/25 catalogue for Curtis states a somewhat vague policy “to employ as teachers, artists who combine pedagogic qualities with practical musicianship,” leaving the matter of experienced teaching somewhat vague.)

With all of his interest in a substantial music curriculum that encouraged broad educational values, it must be understood that Howard Hanson molded his ideas about advanced music training around a reasonable balance between subjects supporting musical knowledge and skills with those for a general education: “We must, I believe, try to overcome the long established academic prejudices against the performing arts. We must, in my opinion, realize—and teach others to realize—that the successful performance of a Bartók piano concerto not only with technical facility but with an understanding of its historic, theoretical, and aesthetic implications, is not merely a feat of digital dexterity but an accomplishment which deserves our respect, even as academicians.”

Mary Louise Curtis Bok began her career as an administrator for the Settlement School of Philadelphia and organized many fundraising events on its behalf. As the Settlement continued to grow and as needs for more space became apparent Mrs. Bok
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46 Ibid., 195. When approached by Eugene Noble to consider a contract to teach piano at Juilliard, Olga Samaroff answered that she had never taught. Noble replied, “... but we know that you have yourself done what we want you to teach.” Olga Samaroff Stokowski, An American Musician’s Story, 174-175, as quoted in Olmstead, 77.
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donated money from her mother’s estate for a new building, creating a conservatory division for the most gifted youngsters. A separate school emerged out of the Settlement’s conservatory division, serving as its nucleus. Mrs. Bok’s concept of a “thorough musical education,” included “the history of music, the laws of its making, languages, ear training and music appreciation....” In keeping with her mission, courses in such subjects as psychology, literature and foreign languages were offered. Faculty came from major academic institutions to teach these courses, among which the University of Pennsylvania and Bryn Mawr, in addition to guests who gave lectures on the comparative arts. In this setting, quite typical of all applied music students, the relationship between teacher and student is sensitive, requiring unquestioned dedication on the part of the student, and often times a strong constitution for criticism:

Despite—or perhaps of—the abundance of big names, it was not always smooth sailing between mentors and their protégés. Many of the faculty were new to teaching having spent their professional lives performing. Since English was frequently not their native tongue, they resorted to using their limited vocabulary emphatically and, sometimes, with a tone of sarcasm.... And, because they were famous, they were accustomed to royal treatment.

In addition, their unique temperaments produced unique teaching styles. One example at Curtis was a voice teacher who believed “that if you could teach a student to sing one song correctly, the entire repertoire would follow.”

Wanting Curtis graduates to be known for their musical excellence rather than their academic achievements, the third director of the school, appointed in 1927, famed pianist Josef Hofmann, resisted a formal commencement for six years. He finally acquiesced and
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on May 22, 1934, ten years after the opening of the school, Curtis graduated its first official class of students, some retroactively.\footnote{Ibid., 34.}

Frank Damrosch, founder of the Institute of Musical Art, added yet another dimension to the topic of training musicians. As music supervisor of the New York City Public Schools until his directorship of the Institute, Damrosch embraced a larger picture for educating the musician, one determined by the service he/she might provide to the community at large. He distinguished between those careers planned for teaching and those for performing. For teachers: “In addition to the usual academic and pedagogic training, I feel that he needs a special training in those subjects which are the sources from which poets, painters, sculptors and musicians have drawn their chief inspiration, namely mythology, folk-lore and romance.”\footnote{Wager and McGrath, 73.}

For the performer, on the other hand, he expressed a different pragmatic view that expresses an essential core of artistic endeavor:

\begin{quote}
It is true that many colleges combine a musical together with an academic course, but I doubt if they lead to any great artistic results. The academic atmosphere which of necessity reigns in an academic institution rarely permits the creation of the artistic atmosphere required for the generation and cultivation of the imagination without which no work or art no matter how correctly performed, can be properly interpreted.\footnote{Ibid., 154.}

European music schools generally lacked a coherent program of study for the music student and any connection of faculty to school objectives, nor were there meetings for the discussion of such matters.\footnote{Fitzpatrick, 513.}
\end{quote}

In contrast, the Institute of Musical Art appointed faculty dedicated to the school and to teaching its students, structured a course of study...
for each student that progressed logically, and strove for “an environment that [conveyed] high manifestations of the art.”

In 1924 the Juilliard Foundation opened a school for the professional training of musicians naming it the Juilliard Graduate School, after its benefactor, Augustus Juilliard. The term ‘graduate’ here simply implied a school for advanced study on an instrument or in voice. For the first two years of its existence, it was a tuition-free school. There was no set curriculum but after two or three years’ study students went out into the profession. In 1926 the Juilliard Graduate School merged with the Institute of Musical Art, the Institute serving somewhat as its undergraduate arm. Once again Europeans were in significant number on the faculty, bringing with them their professional experience and also their temperaments and personalities. For example, Olga Samaroff, teacher of piano, believed that “being an artist is a question of who a person is.” Paul Kochanski, teacher of violin “had an uncanny ability to recognize talent (or lack of it) in young students... He judged students less by their technical equipment than by deeper spiritual hints, indications of their inner life and of the direction in which they were likely to develop.”

These statements, though interesting in themselves, invite clarification in order to understand how they may underlie a ‘method of teaching’: Did personal traits and ‘spiritual hints’ affect the choice of repertory? Did they imply a lesser virtuosic ability or tendency? Did they mean a student would have the fortitude to sustain a career? It is difficult to determine what goes on in the private teaching studio between mentor and student. There are accounts that relate moments and events, and indeed they give some idea of the personalities involved. Much can be learned by reports from students, by
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comments of teachers either in articles or in personal notes, and by looking into lineage—
this one studied with that one who studied with that one—although how those traditions
are passed along and are digested remain mysterious. Taken together such observations
may build a viable commentary on a mentor’s general attitude to the discipline, an
approach to teaching style, and those characteristics that are concrete in some ways and
subtle in others. At best, however, the relationship is elusive and no written account can
really capture how that energy is transmitted. But those interconnections among faculty
and students, curriculum and school ideology form the backbone of professional ideology
and the nurturing of talent, and how they come together in the training of the applied
music student bears significantly on the future career of the student musician.

As more students moved into professional programs, requirements for admission
gradually became more stringent, calling for a broader general knowledge based on the
liberal arts or sciences. Professional practice was lifted out of “empirical routine.”60
Perhaps it was this trend that influenced Charles Tourgée in designing a curriculum with
significant academic content for music students at New England Conservatory. During
the first quarter of the twentieth century the number of applicants for professional schools
surpassed the number of openings, enabling these schools through more rigorous
admission requirements to come up to university standards. As professional programs
enlarged their content in support of theory it became more economically feasible to
affiliate with a university. Some schools, especially those for technology and mechanical
arts, remained independent while expanding their curriculum. Although bringing together
a faculty well versed both in theory and in practice was a challenge, nevertheless a
stronger curriculum, improved teaching methods, and self-regulation within the

60Rudolph, 338.
professions, all contributed to raising standards.61 As scholarship grew in depth and breath, the necessity of graduate schools as well as a need for more course flexibility at the expense of core requirements became apparent—a curriculum in flux to better serve the community.

Struggling for a place in the nineteenth-century university, professional education juggled the tension between utility and abstraction. Mental discipline came into conflict with the needs of “real life,” transforming the academic goal into one of public service.62 Somewhat moral in tone in its desire to uplift society, a faculty sympathetic to this academic philosophy took the position that, “With culture as an end, educational systems have no business. Society ... can not consider education apart from its use.”63 Interestingly, music is representative of cultural endeavor while its training seems to imply quite the opposite. ‘Professional’ competency and prestige as a musician are earned from acquiring specialized skills in specific areas with little reward for generalized abilities. “Every music department in higher education is a collection of professional specialists who consider themselves neither qualified nor professionally interested in many areas beyond their own chosen specialty. What they have in common with their colleagues is a collective concern about the core curriculum through which every student, theirs as well as others, must proceed ...,”64 a dim picture of intellectual life in the music department of the university but maybe not totally accurate. Not qualified in many areas—perhaps true, and perhaps true of many departments academic

61Ibid., 206.


and otherwise. Not interested—this study attempts to elucidate the degree to which that premise may or may not be valid.

Nonetheless the spirit of innovation propelled academic change and the acceptance of all career studies: “merchants, journalists, manufacturers, chemists, teachers, inventors, artists, musicians, dieticians, pharmacists, scientific farmers, and engineers [became] equal [to] . . . students of law, theology, and medicine.” In addressing the remarkable diversity of ideas and content under the umbrella of higher education, Frederick Rudolph in The American College and University asks, “What is an American university?”65 Raising that question with regard to the American conservatory of music, we look at three schools to compare similarities and differences in the professional training they sought to give their students. What is the American conservatory/music school? To the body of material that follows the development of the American university movement, this unexplored synthesis of advanced music education is one facet of American higher education, and as such contributes another perspective—the path to becoming a professional musician. More broadly, the reckoning of developing skill while pursuing academics anticipates the current domain of the liberal arts college—practice versus abstraction.

For this study standard historical method has been followed. Documents have been collected and gathered from the archives of the three schools under discussion. They have been submitted to external and internal criticism from which this narrative is drawn. The archives visited include the Eastman School of Music (Sibley Music Library), The Juilliard School (Lila Acheson Wallace Library), The Curtis Institute of Music (John De Lancie Library), and Columbia University (Rare Book and Manuscript Collection, Butler Library). Administrative records, minutes to faculty meetings, faculty teaching records,  

65Ibid., 341, 332.
school catalogues and bulletins, scrapbooks, newspaper clippings, memoires, letters, journals, and unpublished histories that pertain to this area of investigation have been reviewed. In addition, published presentations and reports of meetings from 1905 to 1945 of the Music Teachers National Association and the National Association of Schools of Music have been reviewed, these documents indicating type of document, audience, and purpose in their citation.

The following resources were available from the Eastman School of Music Archives: annual catalogues and some personal papers of Howard Hanson. Archivist David Coppen and school historian Vincent Lenti contributed additional information through e-mail correspondence. The following resources were available from The Juilliard School Archives: general administrative records from the Office of the President, the Office of the Dean, and the Office of the Administrative Dean; minutes to faculty meetings; scrapbooks for the Institute of Musical Art, for John Erskine, and for Ernest Hutcheson; scrapbooks and news clippings on general school information; a history of the Institute of Musical Art; catalogues; school publications; the personal papers of Ernest Hutcheson, and copies of unidentified student records. The personal papers of John Erskine were also reviewed at Butler Library of Columbia University. The following resources were available from The Curtis Institute of Music: reports of the Dean and records of class work. School catalogues and school publications were available on-line.

- For admission and graduation requirements, course offerings, and changes to curriculum during the period under study, school catalogues, student records and faculty minutes were reviewed.

- For administrative and faculty deliberations concerning changes to requirements, offerings, and curriculum choices in general, administrative records, minutes to faculty meetings, and school bulletins were reviewed.
• For a discussion concerning ‘ethos’ and professional ideology, personal papers were reviewed.

• For a general overview of the contemporary debate concerning curriculum, published presentations and reports from the Music Teachers National Association and from the National Association of Schools of Music were reviewed.

Central to the life of the music school/conservatory is the artist teacher—one transmitter of professional ideology and tradition, the tradition of how one goes about playing the instrument and the tradition of musical interpretation. To give a perspective of this aspect of applied music, the personal papers of pianist Ernest Hutcheson, who served both as Dean and President of Juilliard while a member of the piano faculty, were examined, and dissertations relating to specific teachers and serving as secondary sources were reviewed. The brief discussion entitled “The Artist as Teacher” (Appendix A) serves as commentary on studio teaching during these years of early American music training.

Secondary sources were consulted to round out this narrative with general information concerning the history and important personalities of each school and their nineteenth-century precursors. In addition, secondary sources have been used to provide a brief overview of the history of higher education and professional education.
Applied music study in the historical context of American higher education finds its place in the story of professional education. The story is uniquely American, one modeled on European patterns adapted to American needs, influenced by the ideal of democracy, and one that eludes a singular description. It begins with the classical curriculum of the Colonial College and follows a path to the emerging university of the mid-nineteenth century, whose role would be to provide knowledge and validity for a broad array of academic and vocational pursuits and interests. As part of this transformation, music was included among the litany of those course offerings and programs, albeit with reservation and perhaps a suspicious eye. Whether a department or school within the university or an independent institution, the concerns surrounding an appropriate course of study for the applied music student centered around the development of requirements, both music and academic, within an environment particular to the professional music student, considered by some necessary, and relatively foreign to other academic/professional pursuits. Music played no role in the academic life of the early settlers. However a review of the evolution of higher education from the Colonial College to the mid-nineteenth century, when advanced applied music study begins to have a footing in America, provides the background for the issues relating to performance education and training. These issues concern the goals, conflicts, and compromises that
came into play in developing an appropriate curriculum for the professional musician in three of America’s highly regarded schools of music.

Past traditions and values, austerity and discipline, and a sense of mission to create civil and social structures well grounded morally, intellectually, and culturally guided the Puritans as they sought to build their community in the New World. *New England’s First Fruits*, a little promotional pamphlet of 1643 intended to generate funds from England, describes their purposes: Having arrived safely and “had builded [sic] our houses, provided necessaries for our livelihood, reared convenient places for God’s worship, and settled the civil government, one of the next things we longed for, and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity.”\(^1\) An educated clergy, educated civil leaders, and a cultured social fabric, aspirations solidly grounded in strong Puritan theology carried over from the Old World, could be best achieved by education. To advance and preserve these ideals of learning the Puritans turned to Oxford and Cambridge on which to model their newly established Harvard College in 1636. Solidly ensconced in Christian teaching based on the medieval notion of the royal, priestly, and prophetic roles of Christ, Harvard and its early followers nevertheless leaned toward philosophic and theological diversity from its beginnings, in keeping with the heterogeneous and diverse nature of the American population.\(^2\) For example, governing boards, unlike their English counterparts, were non-sectarian and not exclusively academic; and admission requirements or the granting of degrees did not require tests on religious doctrine.\(^3\)

\(^1\)Lucas, 103-104.


\(^3\)Ibid., 8.
With the Great Awakening of the 1740s educational institutions divided into two camps. Described as a “pan-Protestant arousal of enthusiastic religiosity that swept across the colonies in the mid-1700’s,” the movement separated the older institutions of more discreet religious persuasion, such as Harvard and Yale, from newer ones of more religious fervor, such as Dartmouth and Princeton. However strong, this movement could not offset the need for colleges to accommodate the pluralistic nature of the colonies. More to the point, in spite of the religious tendency of colleges, governance remained a blurred melding of public and private funds through state subsidies, and liberal education remained the ticket to attract students. Although the central element in the founding of the colonial college and its intellectual world was a Christian foundation, it is clear from their charters that their intention was to train for other civic professions in addition to the ministry.

The curriculum at these early institutions reflects the strength of educational tradition brought over from the Old World. Influenced by the English university, it combined medieval studies, which grew out of the Trivium and the Quadrivium, with Renaissance arts and literature and Reformation theology, law, and medicine. Greek and Latin were basic, to which was added Hebrew as it was thought to be a direct link to the divine. These along with logic, rhetoric, natural and moral philosophy, mathematics and metaphysics formed the core curriculum, a classical course of study serving as a body of immutable truth to be absorbed and not questioned. This shaped American education for several years. It was not intended for one professional purpose but provided the foundation for success in the learned professions of law, theology, and medicine.
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However grounded in unquestioned acceptance, its gradual erosion began by early to mid eighteenth-century. The availability of books on science and the effects of the Enlightenment with its ideals of French deism, rationalism, skepticism, learning, and self independence, liberated colleges, making them aware of new possibilities and new responsibilities, while at the same time the dynamics of religious affiliations persisted. Among the colleges offering science and mathematics were Harvard, Yale, King’s College, and the College of Philadelphia. Of particular interest was a pamphlet for the latter that mentions a separate course for the “mechanic profession” in addition to the traditional classical curriculum. A later version divided the curriculum into thirds—Latin and Greek, science and mathematics with related subjects, and logic and ethics with related subjects. Although a small school, the significance of its visionary concepts of education would influence larger and better-known institutions. As for music, it remained consigned to the hymns and chants of Puritan worship, but there was no place for it in a college curriculum. It would take the new immigration of the nineteenth-century to foster that interest.

The earliest requirement for admission to the colonial college was knowledge of Latin and Greek, basic to the professions of law, medicine, and theology, a concept that would carry through until nineteenth-century educational reform. As secondary education expanded so did college requirements, first to include arithmetic and then history, geography, and English. This was the pattern followed by most colleges throughout the country. The improvement of secondary schools and colleges went hand-in-hand because as colleges sought to advance their courses of study, they relegated to the secondary
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schools their less advanced subjects.\textsuperscript{10} Methods of instruction, an art in itself, included the class recitation, lectures, and disputations conducted in Latin. (In the nineteenth century laboratory experiments would give structure to scientific experiments: define the problem, collect data, form a hypothesis, test results.) Generally a whole class studied the same subjects together over four years. College was available to all but experienced by few. The majority of youth remained on their farms, explored the frontier, or simply ‘became’ by means of their own determination. The limited resources of elementary and secondary schooling, often left to parents, tutors, or clergy, suggest that education on any level was a highly individual pursuit.

Although the effectiveness of the colonial college may be disputed, it left a legacy committed to three principles: First, its education was not the exclusive property of the aristocracy. True, it reached a very small segment of the population and its methods of learning may have been aristocratic. Yet this was balanced by the belief in and support of self-improvement for all. Second, it remained staunch in its ideal to educate for the common welfare with an emphasis on character and piety for its student body, which, in the Progressive Era, would evolve into a broad commitment to community service as evidenced by the settlement school movement. Finally, with all of its shortcomings, it served as the prototype of the many liberal arts colleges that would begin to dot the American landscape in the next century, and its graduates, though very few, formed the intellectual core of the country that would impact every aspect of American society.

The American Revolution brought significant changes to the young republic, changes that would trickle into the college movement. A new sense of identity and

\textsuperscript{10}The colonial colleges granted to themselves the right to award degrees as well as the standards for degrees, with the exception that the Bachelor of Arts degree required four years of study and the Master of Arts three years, the latter with no prescribed subjects. By mid-century colleges required students to show proficiency in required languages, logic, and other courses of their instruction. The first honorary degree was awarded in 1692 by Harvard and not another was awarded until 1753. Brubacher and Rudy, 20.
national pride, increased affluence, western migration, the spirit of missionary purpose by religious sects, and the desire of localities to create their own immediate centers of learning to offset the vastness of the land encouraged an uncontrolled proliferation of colleges following the war. Enlightened ideals “created a new class of duties” and the need “to examine ... former habits.”\textsuperscript{11} College education should pave the way for a useful life, one that could usefully serve the community. Yet could schools of higher learning that had embraced an elite population, a population aristocratic in principle, adapt to the new democratic order?\textsuperscript{12} It is a time of searching for a national identity and for a means to answer the needs of a developing society. “Why should we send our sons to Europe to finish their education?”—a question later echoed by educators of the twentieth-century music conservatory.\textsuperscript{13} The American looked to its cultural and political leaders for definition: character through James Fennimore Cooper, foreign policy through John Quincy Adams, and domestic policy through Henry Clay. The election of Jackson in 1828 ushered in a new tension between elitism and privilege with egalitarian ideals gaining a firmer grasp on the social fabric. The common man of modest means and the self-made man of wealth coexisted side by side, a new social balance that paved the way for the success of American capitalism and manufacturing and one that called for training in subjects to keep up with this new order.\textsuperscript{14}

The college movement continued to grow. Yet no force was greater than denominational ambition in fostering its growth throughout the country at the beginning

\textsuperscript{11}Benjamin Rush wrote that “The business of education has acquired a new complexion by the independence of our country.” Quoted in Lucas, 113.

\textsuperscript{12}Lucas, 113.

\textsuperscript{13}Rudolph, 50.

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., 40, 200. This did not include women or minority groups, however. Each of these groups would engage in its own struggle for recognition at a latter time.
of the nineteenth century. In reaction to enlightened thinking, the religiously awakened sought to renew Christian principles in society through schools of higher education: Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Calvinists, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers, Unitarians—the list goes on … Each sought to establish its intellectual foothold for its flock of believers as each preserved its intended purpose to serve a democratic society in a democratic way. Graduates were both masters within society and servants of it.\textsuperscript{15} Although institutions such as Western Reserve, Antioch, Grinnell, Pomona, Amherst, Wheaton, Williams, Bowdoin, and Oberlin refrained from the pettiness of sectarianism, treating sect with informality while maintaining a strong religious commitment, Revivalism repeatedly renewed itself on college campuses with its typical precepts that tended to stifle the desire for academic freedom and change.\textsuperscript{16}

On the other hand curriculum continued to respond to the new Jacksonian sense of utility, purpose, and equality. Gradually more scientific subjects, not for research but for study, became a part of course offerings along with elective subjects that would prove useful.\textsuperscript{17} As more courses entered the curriculum, core classical subjects were either eliminated or diluted because the college year was not lengthened to accommodate all of the offerings. Two responses to these events deserve special mention: Thomas Jefferson’s concept for the University of Virginia adopted in 1824 and the Yale Report of 1828. The first “combined an attention to the popular and practical new subjects with an intellectual orientation of university dimensions.”\textsuperscript{18} Not connected to any religious sect and served

\textsuperscript{15}\textsuperscript{Ibid., 59.}

\textsuperscript{16}Walter P. Metzger, \textit{Academic Freedom in the Age of the University} (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), 5.

\textsuperscript{17}For such courses certificates were awarded, not degrees, a trend carried over into the music conservatory.

\textsuperscript{18}Rudolph, 125.
by a distinguished faculty drawn largely from abroad, much like the early schools of music, Virginia offered students free election of courses, advanced study, and specialization. In short, Jefferson’s university was the first viable attempt to bring together professional education and a ‘core’ liberal education.

The university was divided into eight independent schools—ancient languages, modern languages, mathematics, natural philosophy, natural history, anatomy and medicine, moral philosophy, and law. Each school was assigned a particular location with one professor whose department could be expanded depending on demand. Students were free to attend the schools of their choice. No degrees were granted. Instead, a diploma was awarded upon the completion of a certain body of work. The diploma carried the same amount of weight as a degree. In 1831 the Master of Arts degree was introduced and offered to students who had received diplomas in one of the five schools that covered what was becoming the standard classical course of study—ancient languages, mathematics, natural philosophy, chemistry, and moral philosophy. A man of intellectual curiosity, Jefferson clearly recognized the need for training in applied subjects. “The great virtue of the University of Virginia system of schools was its avoidance of superficiality and compulsion, the two evils which finally undermined the classical course of study, and let loose an elective system of significant proportions.”\textsuperscript{19} Its inability to be sustained was financial but its concept filtered into the later emergence of the American university.

That the antebellum college was unresponsive to reform during the first half of the nineteenth century is a mistaken notion: “In point of fact, the American college’s course of study was never rigid, and it evolved continuously over time in both form and

\textsuperscript{19}Rudolph, 126-127.
content.” Princeton, Union College, and the University of Pennsylvania, for example, merged both scientific and classical subjects in some way. Nevertheless, the controversy among educators and college presidents—how to balance a core curriculum—persisted. Yale’s then president, Jeremiah Day, formed a committee to address the proposal to eliminate “dead languages” from the school’s curriculum. What resulted was an historic educational document defending classical education, “a magnificent assertion of humanist tradition and ... of unquestionable importance in liberating the American college from excessive religious orientation.” At the same time it supported inertia. The Yale Report of 1828 concluded that the purpose of education is to ‘discipline’ the mind by expanding its powers and to ‘furnish’ it with knowledge. Branches of study should develop attention, powers of analysis, judgment, and control of imagination, among other attributes (goals similar, we note, to the discipline of advanced music study). Recognizing that college can not be all things to all people, it nevertheless held that the classics should be the foundation for all pursuits, intellectual and professional, as they informed a sense of values. Although the significance of the report cannot be overestimated, it did not quell the debate or the questioning, nor did it diminish the call for a broader range of useful, practical subjects.

By mid-century, industrial expansion, increased material wealth, along with philanthropic largess, growing emphasis on scholarship, the impact of the Civil War on the nation, and most significantly Darwinism pushed the prevailing order beyond its limits. Darwin brought into question the certainty of divine authority and in so doing paved the way for science and religion to find some means of reconciliation. All of the

\[20\text{Lucas, 131.} \]
\[21\text{Rudolph, 134.} \]
\[22\text{Lucas, 133.} \]
above contributed to a new social and economic mobility and to a new psychology
cognizant of individual differences and needs, thus fueling the growth of the middle
class. In addition to these new social attitudes, federal land-grant subsidies for colleges
and the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 brought to higher education government
involvement and support, both state and federal, for popular and practical courses of
study. Each state was given public lands to sell, the proceeds from which would be turned
over to new colleges “to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and
the mechanic arts.”23 These subsidies encouraged the expansion of the state university
system and by implication in their purpose paved the way for the incorporation of
vocational studies in higher education. Adding new fields of endeavor was but a short
step.

More than nine thousand students flocked to Germany for advanced study during
the nineteenth century, heightening an awareness of the German university and its
educational possibilities.24 The European tradition structured its studies around four main
faculties: law, medicine, theology, and the arts. What the German model offered was a
dedication to scholarship and research not for usefulness but for the intrinsic value of
knowledge in and of itself and the pursuit of such unfettered by administrative
restrictions. *Lernfreiheit* allowed students free choice of courses and the opportunity to
move from university to university for study; *Lehrfreiheit* allowed professors freedom to
inquire, to teach, to study, and to report findings in a supportive academic atmosphere.25
Scholarship in the true sense of the word, *Wissenschaft*, was a sacred endeavor in search
of truth.

---

23 Rudolph, 252.

24 Ibid., 126.

25 Ibid., 412.
The first American to travel abroad for advanced study was George Ticknor. A graduate of Dartmouth and appointed professor at Harvard in 1819, he called for elective classes and for sectioning students by ability. Following in Ticknor’s footsteps, a new wave of academic leaders continued to press for change. Francis Wayland of Brown supported courses of study that would benefit all classes in the community and that would enable students to carry course work to completion. His proposal to incorporate programs in applied science, agriculture, law, and teaching at Brown was approved. Ultimately these new ideas gave way to the limitations of faculty support, insufficient course offerings, and a student population of modest ability.

His efforts at reform were just ahead of their time. Half a generation later educational leaders such as Charles Eliot of Harvard, Andrew D. White of Cornell, and Daniel Coit Gilman of Johns Hopkins were able to match in education what John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and Washington Duke were accomplishing in industry. Eliot instituted electives at Harvard diminishing the singular importance of a prescribed course of study. In so doing he acknowledged the significance of natural aptitude and individual interest in education. Cornell, the first private institution to be founded partly as a land-grant institution, equated courses in agriculture, science, and technology with the classical subjects. Its founder, Ezra Cornell “would found an institution where any person can find instruction in any study.” Cornell’s free election of courses and its spirit of free inquiry made it in truth a university. Johns Hopkins went a step further in its role as a graduate university based on the German model. For Gilman, the faculty was the cornerstone of the school, and students were expected to be sufficiently well prepared.

26 Ibid., 238.

27 Ibid., 266.
both to challenge and to motivate their mentors. The purpose of scholarship was to stimulate both human betterment and material progress.

The spirit of reform was summed up with the founding of the University of Chicago in 1892 by the generosity of John D. Rockefeller. Its program of four years of study was divided into two equal parts, the first a preparatory junior college and the second a university college of advanced study. Major and minor courses were permitted, thus allowing a student to pursue one field in depth and another less so. Chicago’s President William Harper made investigation primary, instruction secondary, and publication the access to promotion. His efforts were to become a remarkable achievement in the history of higher education in America and a role model for the American university.\textsuperscript{28}

By the end of the nineteenth century the innovations of the preceding decades had come to embrace diverse fields of study, depth of scholarship, and a broad range of commitments to a broad range of interests. The American university that emerged defies definition: Each school was its own particular model. It distinguished itself from its European counterparts by the highly varied student body it served and by the scope of its offerings, by its “unsystemitized diversity,” by its desire to address the needs of particular constituencies, by its voluntary means of setting standards, and by the incorporation of extracurricular activities.\textsuperscript{29} Education now liberated from uniformity and tradition had given way to a new agency for the “promotion and diffusion of knowledge.” With a new \textit{modus operandi}, the university movement acknowledged rigorous professional training as its responsibility to serve the community, supplanting “the system of apprenticeship in

\textsuperscript{28}In the early part of the next century Chicago would embrace a Great Books plan of study promoting general learning shared by all educated people. The Great Books plan was designed by Columbia professor, John Erskine, who would later become the first president of the Juilliard Graduate School. Lucas, 215.

\textsuperscript{29}Brubacher and Rudy, 424-428.
the old professions” and infusing the substance of vocational endeavor with professional status. In so doing it created a new credibility and encouraged a new standard of achievement both for schools within its domain as well as for free-standing institutions.

**Professional Education: A Place for Music**

The underlying struggle is to find legitimate purpose for any education—one word, purpose, but multifaceted in its implications and interpretations. A refinement of inner spirit, an expression for native ability and interest, an avenue for contributing to society, a means of self and or social betterment: Education—college, university or professional school—addresses all of these in varying degrees. Initially with the Colonial College there was no difference between the cultivation of the mind and preparation for a profession. The liberal arts, namely the classical languages Latin and Greek, accomplished both, serving as general training for the recognized professions of medicine, law, and theology, since knowledge of these professions was in its infancy and not demanding of in-depth study. “The liberal arts—*artes liberalis*—in their original sense, it should be observed, originally did not designate fixed fields of study so much as they referred to activities or techniques ... a way of *doing* something, as in the ‘art’ of engaging in rhetorical, logical, grammatical, or literary analysis.”

As curriculum expanded to include modern languages, history, science, and the social sciences, the definition of liberal arts become clouded. New technology and an expanding economy demanded more specialization in a wide variety of fields. “Curriculum is not simply a sampling of independent and autonomous information available to society in a given historical moment, but, in a deeper sense, is an organic outgrowth of the society and the

---

30Rudolph, 340.

31Lucas, 308.
forms of consciousness it permits or allows.”\textsuperscript{32} At the same time some systematic organization of course work is necessary for intellectual coherence. One debate, then, centered on how to balance professional and liberal aims and how to legitimize new fields of study emerging by the mid-nineteenth century.

An outgrowth of the medieval guilds, the apprenticeship system is the earliest example of professional education in America. As the apprentice master became surrounded by a small cluster of students, small schools run for profit known as proprietary schools developed. At the same time colleges began establishing chairs in theology, law, and medicine. Generally speaking, apprenticeships, proprietary schools, and professional college programs had poor if any standards for admission, for study, and for assessment, and no effort was made to improve the situation: No one group wished to chance the possibility of losing students by demanding more than its competition.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century it became apparent that these professional arrangements were too limiting. A broader knowledge was called for, one combining the specifics of apprenticeship with the general education of college study. Andover Theological Seminary, founded in 1808, was the first professional school to respond by including history and languages such as Hebrew in its curriculum. Harvard addressed the matter of standards in 1829 when it began admitting only college graduates to its new program in general law. At a later date the decision by Charles Eliot to require a bachelor’s degree for admission to the course in law and to raise tuition at the same time further heightened standards. As expected, student admission declined but only until the quality of the program became known. Other schools followed suit, augmenting their professional courses with liberal arts and expanding their vocational fields of study in quantity and with more in-depth specialization. These academic settings took form in a

\textsuperscript{32}Ibid., 314.
variety of ways, either as departments or divisions within the university/college governance, or as independent professional schools, art and music certainly among them. The flexibility of terminology, conservatories within the university or schools of art and music outside of it, for example, did not necessarily clarify the nature of these institutions.

Specialization need not be at odds with liberal education or at odds with an intellectual spirit. John Dewey, the American educational philosopher, believed in the practical application of education in relation to society. There were no fixed values: Great works serve as a guide to understanding the present. “The problem of securing to the liberal arts college its due function in a democratic society is that of seeing to it that the technical subjects which are now socially necessary acquire a humane direction.”33 Another way of understanding this fusion of liberal and specialized was expressed in an address at the meeting of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in 1953: “It is nearer the truth to say that there is no subject matter, worthy of a place in the curriculum of a modern Land-Grant College or state university, which cannot be taught either as a professional specialty or as a liberal subject.”34

An overview of how the early professions evolved gives credence to this philosophy. The study of law, for example, began typically as an apprenticeship in a legal office. To augment this experience, students could direct themselves by independent reading since admission to the bar was hardly rigorous.35 More entrepreneurial lawyers established influential law schools in which lectures based on texts served as the means

33Brubacher and Rudy, 302.


of imparting knowledge, but the notion that everyone, anyone, had the right to practice law encouraged students to spend minimum time in such schools. Consequently standards suffered significantly. As scientific theory gained more acceptance in teaching practice, its application to law was found in the analysis of case studies that connected experience to reality providing the opportunity to understand how legal principle might apply to a specific situation. As legal practice became more developed, lawyers began to function as advocates for business, and in this new role an understanding of the social implications of their work became necessary.\textsuperscript{36} Here professional education confronted the need for those qualities of thought that liberal education seeks to develop.

Music training developed in a similar fashion. From historical beginnings musicians learned their art through apprenticeships as composers and performers—and the two generally went hand-in-hand. Baroque Era composers such as Bach and Handel began their study under the tutelage of a parent or other apprentice-teacher. The next step was that of journeyman in a church or court position where musicians both studied and practiced their skills until becoming a master. As masters they took on younger apprentices, but even as masters they traveled by foot to hear the great performer-composers of their day or to play, in the case of Bach, a special new organ in another town. For post-Renaissance composers it was not atypical to have a profession other than and unrelated to music. Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century musicians followed a similar pattern of study, conservatory training coming into vogue in the mid- to late-nineteenth century. In Italy, however, conservatories began in the sixteenth century, evolving out of orphanages, especially renowned in Naples and Venice, where orphans were taught musical skills initially for church service and then as a means of livelihood outside of the church. The conservatory offered a body of courses to be taken which, over a period of

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., 78.
time, would become more structured and formalized. It may be posited that the concept of ‘apprentice’ has always obtained for the student of applied music who ‘apprentices’ under an artist teacher, whether in private lesson or in class lesson.

The journey was similar for other professions, where in their infancy knowledge and depth of application remained relatively uncomplicated, superficial perhaps, with standards haphazard at best. In raising their standards, schools such as Harvard and Johns Hopkins brought the level of professions to a maturation that could assume a new civic responsibility involving judgment, values, and social consciousness based in philosophic and historical questions. Thus the goals of professional education must be comprehensive if they are to be effective in equipping an individual for the intricacies and complications of an ever evolving society. First, its education must develop those principles and ideals that give the profession its cohesiveness and identity—knowledge, skills, and the distinctive character and traits of personality that define the profession. Second, its education should be encompassing enough to enable responsible citizenship and participation in a democratic society. And finally, it should foster through its curriculum a philosophic grounding that serves as a stabilizing core for the uncertainties and unrelated events of life, a moral basis to a world view. On the side of liberal education it may be said that its goals are similar: to provide basic skills and knowledge, to allow for in-depth study, and to cultivate attitudes that represent a liberally educated mind. Oberlin and New England Conservatory of Music grappled with these ideals even in their early years in the nineteenth century by designing their professional courses of study with strong academic components, a symbiotic educational pattern distinctive of American musical education as opposed to the European university and conservatory system.

37Wager and McGrath, 6.

38Ibid., 6.
The term profession originally meant a public declaration, and in the Middle Ages included those occupations publicly offered. By the sixteenth century profession became a service between a principal and a client that required a particular knowledge along with a theoretical basis obtained through a lengthy period of study in any institution of higher learning. Gradually the status of a profession became linked to whether or not, or to the manner in which its education was institutionalized. Those professions having higher status and monetary value were those with ‘training’ within a university environment. However, the relationship between professions and institutions of higher learning are complex. One problem lies with the repetitive practice of psycho-motor skills necessary for some professions. Applied music and performance, for example, may not be compatible with the educational purposes of some colleges and universities for this reason. Harvard does not grant academic credit for applied music, although its performing groups are outstanding and recognized as so. On the surface of it, the act of repetitive doing is not an intellectual furthering of knowledge and “not within the province of general education,” although it was accepted “that one or more courses in music should be designed and given for the purposes of general education.” (The other side of the argument should not be left unsaid: Behind any significant performance are both mechanical drill, as a means, and an informed and an in-depth reading of the musical score as an end—no less than an informed and in-depth reading of Othello or of Moby Dick.)


40Peter Jarvis, Professional Education (London: Croom Helm, 1983), 54.

41Archibald Davison, a long-time professor at Harvard, referred to playing the piano as “a purely physical matter in which the intellect plays a relatively small part.” See Wager and McGrath, 18, 24n and 25n.
Another difficult issue to reconcile concerns master teachers of professional practice who may not have academic degrees but whose role within a degree-granting institution is a dominant one. Their practical knowledge places them in a better position than administrators or other faculty “to spotlight demands” of the profession.\textsuperscript{42} As a result, what should be taught, methods of teaching, and how to assess are based on ‘professional authority’ legitimized by colleagues, peers, and students in the profession rather than on degree standing. Again Harvard serves as commentary: In 1862 John Knowles Paine, organist and music director at Harvard, was permitted to give free lectures on musical form, later adding harmony and counterpoint, on the condition that no academic credit be given for them. It was not until 1873 that these subjects were granted credit and that he was reimbursed for his teaching of them.\textsuperscript{43} In 1875 he assumed the newly created professorship of music at Harvard.

The student of applied music shares characteristics applicable to other professional endeavors. His community is defined by a common identity, by common values, and by peers who circumscribe the nature of the profession.\textsuperscript{44} Professionals usually remain in their professions throughout their career and are responsible for producing their next generation of professionals, the role of the artist teacher. The student musician identifies primarily with the profession of music, then with his area of performance, and finally

\textsuperscript{42}Ibid., 54.

\textsuperscript{43}John Knowles Paine (1839-1906) was an American composer who studied organ, orchestration, and composition in Germany and organized the first music department at Harvard. He was awarded an honorary Master of Arts degree from Harvard in 1869, having begun his teaching career there in 1862, and an honorary doctorate from Yale in 1890. Nicolas Slonimsky, ed., \textit{Baker’s Biographical Dictionary of Music and Musicians}, 5\textsuperscript{th} edition (New York: Schirmer, 1950), 1199.

with his artist teacher. An identity with his school is usually not as strong as these three. However it is the ideology inherent in the school as well as the teaching studio that encourages and nurtures self-development of individual perception and style (originality and one’s own voice), the daily discipline of practice, and an exacting self-critical awareness with the interest, commitment, and the tools to continually improve. These are instilled in the ideology of the performing musician and serve him in order to maintain high standards throughout his career. Ideology is both a spoken and unspoken work ethic practiced by the teacher and acquired by the student as much intuitively as tangibly. It includes the desire to continue to learn and to accept as a professional standard only what is good and competent.

The school and studio seek to refine and balance an emotional response to musical sounds with imagination and an essential intellectual foundation through the study of theoretical subjects, history of music, and some liberal studies. Competition is intense and ongoing; perfection is the standard; and evaluation is based on competence and is subjective. The personality of the performing musician must have enough ego to develop self-confidence and to give his playing authority, yet enough humility to accept and evaluate the criticism of others and to respect the music he is playing. For the concert performer there are tangibles and intangibles, that which can be taught and that which is inborn: technical skill can be taught and developed in large measure, artistic spark and power of communication cannot; stage presence can, showmanship perhaps not. The professional musician is “routined,” that is musically ‘right on’ (dependable) unlike a

45 Hendrich, 93.
46 Jarvis, 34.
47 Hendrich, 91.
good amateur who is allowed the leeway of an ‘occasional miss.’ He must be able to collaborate with fellow musicians and to interact with concert managers and with civic music personnel. Finally, a knowledge of the science of acoustics, the psychology of the audience, and the business of music lend an acumen to his otherwise elusive work.

Altogether professional education at its pinnacle is the summation of educational process and accomplishment. It allows for the synthesis and application of knowledge and skill, it fosters problem solving (to arrive at a compelling interpretation) through analytical and disciplined thought, and it requires the insight to learn from experience and the flexibility to remain current. Some professions fit into the structure of the traditional educational system; some adapt the system to fit their needs; and some develop their structures outside the system. Perhaps because both musicology and music composition produce a body of work on paper, clear evidence of work done and something that lends itself to traditional means of assessment, these courses of study could more easily be considered academically valid. Applied music with sound as its body of work is more problematic. The notable conductor Bruno Walter pointed out that the joy of music-making comes first—a direct activity with the production of the sound; then follows the analysis of the greatness of the work. The daily time frame for the musician is different than that for most other professions. Music cannot be learned by intellectual effort alone; the skill (muscular control) necessary ‘to do it’ requires persistent drill. The commitment to the career of the performing musician comes early in life; training begins at a young age and must be reinforced by regular practice to reach and sustain professional status.

Everett Timm, “Training Requirements for Musical Careers” (Ph.D. diss., The Eastman School of Music of the University of Rochester, 1948), 93.

Cook, 13.

Richard LeBlond, “Professionalization and the Bureaucratization of the Performance of Serious Music in the United States” (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1968), 76, as quoted in Hendrich, 154n.
By the time a student enters music school and “because the student-teacher relationship in performance training is uniquely one-to-one, entering students are already specialists.”  

How the music school designs its curriculum reflects how the profession seeks to achieve recognition and academic validity through its students and should represent no less a search for truth, social consciousness, and relevance than that of the mid-nineteenth century emerging university. 

51 Hendrich, 69.

52 The musician is not without social responsibility and value judgment. Examples abound from World War II when German music was banned from some concert programs and when the moral judgments of some prominent musicians were questioned and found to be disturbing. (Leonard Bernstein was among those musicians questioned during the McCarthy Era.)
Chapter III

PRECURSORS: MUSIC SCHOOLS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Although music had but a marginal place in the life of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century college, and would struggle to find its place in the new university, the nineteenth century brought together a confluence of events that changed its course. Great prosperity and the success of music in public school education gave rise to a cultural awareness and sophistication that generated a desire for organizations, schools, and events that would support these interests. The century saw the creation of major symphony orchestras—in Chicago, Philadelphia, New York, Boston—and the Metropolitan Opera. Suddenly, “musicians, the most mistrusted of the country’s artists,” were called upon to fill a cultural vacuum.¹ Consequently conservatories proliferated and proliferated, sometimes next door to each other. Anyone could ‘open’ a school, and in many cases ‘anyone’ did. In spite of this, some nineteenth-century efforts became outstanding examples of advanced training for the musician and gave impetus to the successes that followed in the next century.

The factors that came to bear on the development of higher education in music distinguished American patterns from their European counterparts. True, American music schools were founded with the European conservatory model in mind, namely from Germany, England, and France. However, in transplanting this model, adaptations were

made to address American educational values. Among those values was the desire from the outset to incorporate in the training of musicians a wide cultural and academic background and to allow liberal arts students the benefit of a musical environment, especially for the undergraduate. A variety of institutional arrangements resulted from these interests, from music departments within college/university settings, to schools of music as part of a university, to independent conservatories, where many formed affiliations in some way with colleges or universities. The European model allowed for no such cooperation but maintained the division between academic-university and professional-conservatory. Further, even for the performer a degree would eventually and most often replace the diploma, a reflection on the stature of higher education among the masses, of its gradual necessity for advancement, and of the move toward standardization of academic programs.

Embedded in these educational ideals was a philosophic belief in the betterment of society through music, evinced by the importance of music in settlement schools throughout the country, and by the desire to educate American society with a cultural sensibility, notably one for music. Another notable factor was the preference for private support and endowment rather than state support, as in Europe, giving philanthropists and the business community a prominent voice in educational and cultural matters. Finally, for all its complexity American music education was able to accommodate its social and educational needs, admittedly by trial and error, since it designed its system from the ground up.

The European conservatory served as the nineteenth-century cornerstone for advanced music study in this country. Just as numerous college and university students flocked to Europe for academic pursuits and returned with new ideas that would directly impact on American education, so too for numerous musicians. The education of a serious music student was not complete without this exposure, often accompanied by a
few years of concertizing abroad. The same may be said of music educators who visited
European music schools to study their methods of teaching. Practically no institution for
higher education in music was without this dominant influence and guidance. A vast
number of founders and faculty across the country were either European by birth or had
trained there. Although “Why study abroad?” was echoed time and again, it would not be
until three major twentieth-century schools were founded—Eastman, Juilliard, and
Curtis—that a significant reversal began to take place.

The European model offered a flexible program of study with no fixed curriculum.
The curriculum pursued was purely musical: harmony, counterpoint, fugue, form and
analysis, solfège, music history and literature, composition, conducting, ensemble
playing, practical instruction in a variety of instruments and voice, Italian for singers, and
“other areas of performance competencies.”² The course of study usually lasted three
years, but this varied depending on interest and ability. Students participated in large
ensembles, orchestra and chorus, and attended concerts both at the school and in the
community.³ Attendance at class was relaxed and students were free to travel from school
to school for their course work. In spite of this ease of structure, examinations were
rigorous. Requirements for admission were: sufficient general education and sufficient
proficiency in German to understand lectures and lessons; musical talent with adequate
previous instruction; a certified record of good moral behavior; and proper travel
documents for foreigners.⁴

²Hendrich, 46.

³One of the advantages of the European schools was their location, often in major cities,
with a wealth of musical activity available to the concertgoer.

⁴Elam Douglas Bamberger, “The German Musical Training of American Music Students,
1850-1900” (Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, 1991), 15.
Applied music lessons were scheduled in class groupings of two or three students or three or four taught together. Not only was this a more profitable arrangement for the school than individual lessons, it also allowed those with limited economic resources the opportunity of study. Its educational benefits were viewed as “[promoting] industry and [spurring] ... emulation” and “[preserving] against one-sidedness of education and taste.”

There was no interest in awarding degrees; and although diplomas were valued, they had little meaning since artists got jobs performing merely on their ability to play. Essentially it was a performance trade school. Advanced music training was one of the few areas of study open to women during a time when German society opposed advanced education for women. In nineteenth-century America, women outnumbered men in music school enrollments and the music profession provided an avenue for advancement for them as teachers.

The acceptance of music in the public schools in the early part of the century was one of the contributing factors that encouraged the proliferation of music departments, schools, and conservatories in America. Its story begins with the first attempt to organize music instruction on the college level in Boston in 1832 when Lowell Mason, considered the father of public school education, along with a group of other Boston musicians and businessmen, founded the Boston Academy of Music. What we would today consider a private music school rather than a college nevertheless influenced numerous students, for as many as one thousand went through its doors in the course of a year. Mason was born in 1792 in Medfield, Massachusetts, to a prosperous political family with a strong New England musical heritage of singing in church choirs, playing musical instruments, and

5Wager and McGrath, 43.

6Consider that in 1832 what would later become the ‘canon’ for advanced piano study was either recently discovered (Bach), recently written (Beethoven and Schubert), currently being written (Schumann and Chopin), or yet to be written (Brahms) at this time.
music teaching. As a child he attended singing school and studied music with a private teacher in Dedham. He became a church musician, music teacher, and collector of music.

Not European trained, with a modest music background by today’s standards, Mason based his Academy presumably on Pestalozzian principles. Instruction was offered free to both children and adults. “One of the objectives of the Academy was the introduction of ‘vocal music into [public] schools by the aid of such teachers, each of whom [would] instruct classes alternately in a number of schools.’” The success of Mason’s efforts gave American public school music education its uniqueness on two accounts: First, music assumed its place along side major subjects of reading, grammar, and arithmetic at the elementary level, an accomplishment difficult to achieve later in higher education. And second, all pupils were given the chance to develop their musical abilities. The purpose of the Boston Academy was to form “a class of instruction in the methods of teaching music, which may be composed of teachers, parents and all other persons desirous to qualify themselves for teaching vocal music ... [and to establish] a course of scientific lectures ... for teachers, choristers and others desirous of understanding the science of music.”

Expanding his area of influence, Mason used the Academy as the center for a new convention movement that would later become known as the National Music Convention, a kind of “national school of music pedagogy, conducting, and voice culture,” that would

7Johann Pestalozzi (1724-1827) was a Swiss educator whose theory of education centered on a secure environment for the child, sensory learning, and life activities as a path to education. The two broad goals of his education philosophy were morality and citizenship, and he believed the only way to elevate social status was through education. Mark & Gary, 131.


9Wager and McGrath, 31.

10Mark and Gary, 130.
eventually spread throughout the country and evolve into teaching (normal) institutes. Some of these schools would later develop into conservatories. For the most part the curriculum covered three broad areas of musical study: vocal training, instrumental study, and theory. Julia Ettie Crane, who founded The Crane Institute (now of SUNY Potsdam) and who had trained at a normal institute, put forth the premise that anyone pursuing a career in music in whatever form must first be trained as a musician and these three areas of study were considered essential to that task. This philosophy served as the basis for music curricula until the end of the twentieth century and helped to keep music departments with a variety of sub-specialties intact. More to the point, these institutes were educational endeavors on a vast scale, training teachers whose work would help to create informed audiences for present and future musical enterprises.

With the improvement of American pianos, with many excellent European musicians touring America, with the large increase of an immigrant population, particularly Germans among whom were musicians and music-lovers, music students were exposed to a new wave of musical possibilities, among which performance and teaching were both an option and a need.

By the end of the nineteenth century in addition to conservatory training American educators had accepted music as a vital part of a liberal education, first through elective status, then finally as a concentration for a liberal arts degree. The combination of “legitimacy” by means of this liberal arts status and pedagogical necessity for teacher training made music one of the essential disciplines for all types of colleges.

The educational transformation and administrative structures of three music schools, Oberlin, Peabody, and New England Conservatory of Music, serve as examples of successful nineteenth-century American conservatories. Oberlin is considered an

---

11Ibid., 132.

integral part of a college or university, Peabody, as part of a large cultural endeavor, and New England Conservatory as an independent school. As such their patterns of formation in some ways foretell of the younger institutions that would come into being in the twentieth century.

Of these three, the roots of music at Oberlin Conservatory were the earliest, and indirectly led to its development as a prominent music program. During the religious revivals throughout the country in the first half of the nineteenth century two missionaries established a community of Christian families in Elyria, Ohio, in 1832. Among the resources of the community was Oberlin Collegiate Institute created in 1833 for the purpose both of educating children and of training adults for religious work.\textsuperscript{13} Music was a strong component at the College from its beginnings fulfilling a religious need to teach Christian workers how to sing. More to the point, Oberlin’s development as an important institution for music education had to do with the strong interest and support for music of its first president, Charles Grandison Finney, not a trained musician but an avid devotée. That women were a part of the student community afforded the opportunity of singing great choral works in four-parts, another if subtle encouragement for the furtherance of music.

The 1835 Catalogue listed Rev. Elihu Ingersoll from Yale University as Professor of Music but he seems to have taught singing classes in addition to being named director of the Preparatory Department. He left his position after one year. Although considered the first music professorship in this country, the distinction should more appropriately be granted to George Allen, a graduate of Oberlin, who in 1841 was appointed Professor of

\textsuperscript{13}Women and blacks were admitted to the Institute making Oberlin within two years of its founding a leader in higher education for both these groups. In fact, the first two women in this country to receive the Bachelor of Arts degree were Oberlin graduates in 1841. And as an active supporter of Unionism and anti-slavery Oberlin became an important station of the ‘underground railroad.’
Sacred Music. He also taught natural history and upon his retirement in 1864, geology, and served as Principal of the Preparatory Department and Secretary and Treasurer of the College. Instruction in sacred music was free to all. Although the first ‘suggestion’ of instrumental music occurs in the 1842/43 Catalogue, where the word sacred is omitted, a department of instrumental music was actually authorized in 1855. Because of the strong religious foundation at Oberlin, the introduction of instrumental music proved difficult.

Piano and organ were taught and tuition was charged but no credit granted, as these studies were perhaps considered extracurricular. Ten years later, at the end of the Civil War, the Oberlin Conservatory was founded and established under the guidance of two men who were instructors of music there and who had had “German advantages,” both having studied at Leipzig: J. P. Morgan and G. W. Steele. Initially the conservatory was autonomous but within two years it became a department within Oberlin College, remaining, however, financially independent.

In 1872 the directorship was taken over by Fenlon Rice, an American who also had studied in Leipzig. The mission of the conservatory broadened in its singular focus on sacred music “to cultivate [rather] all noble music religiously.” By 1889, although the number of graduates was still very small, a policy to train its own teachers for positions at its school by selecting the most successful students and sending them abroad had been put into place.

The first courses of instruction for conservatory students were divided into two categories—a school of sacred music that included organ, solo and choral singing, and


15Fitzpatrick, 282n; Skrymn, 28.

directing; and a school of secular music, that included the study of piano, solo and choral singing, solo playing and accompanying, and ensemble playing. Gradually violin, viola, cello, and other orchestral instruments were added to the catalogue. Theory was taught in both courses initially over two and then three years: the first year, basic elements; the second year, harmony and counterpoint; the third year, the completion of harmony, double counterpoint, fugue, form, and composition. Lectures were given in laws of sound (acoustics), history and aesthetics, and art and science. Instruction in instruments followed the European class method in which a group of two, three, or four students were taught together. This method prevailed until the onset of music degrees. More able students were encouraged to further their study in Europe just as many of the faculty had done. In addition, students at the College could take classes and lessons at the Conservatory with the requirement that they enroll in harmony classes. The integration of conservatory and college fostered a philosophy grounded in a balance of practical and liberal education, an earmark of Oberlin that distinguished it from the many other schools of music in the nineteenth century. Disciplinary rules of the College obtained for the Conservatory, unlike the unsupervised European system.

The course in theory underwent continual revision. In the 1870s the program incorporated two texts in translation by two German theorists who taught at the Leipzig Conservatory, one for its basic course and another for advanced work in counterpoint, canon, and fugue. By the 1880s the theory course had grown to ten approximately four-

---

17Fitzpatrick, 286; Skrymn, 40-41.

18“Piano-forte instruction is given on the principles adopted at all the conservatories of Europe ... [and] organ is taught in the most thorough manner, the system used combining the excellencies of the Leipzig school.” Oberlin Conservatory of Music, Courses of Instruction (1866), 1, as quoted in Fitzpatrick, 286n.

19Also in the 1870s a preparatory school was formed to compensate for deficiencies in theory, voice, or instrument training for admission to the conservatory. An entrance examination
week terms, each devoted to specific topics. The awarding of a diploma required two areas of applied study—string instruments now among the offerings—along with a three-year program in theory. The length of time for the study of an instrument depended on ability, application, and the level of playing when the student was admitted. Numerical credit points were not granted for applied study but theory (harmony and counterpoint) was awarded 2/5ths of a regular college credit after a student had completed two twelve-week terms. By 1885 a musical thesis was required of students in their last two terms if they wished to receive credit in advanced work in other [musical] studies. By 1896 the conservatory course of study had developed into five areas of concentration:

- Harmony (4 terms)
- Counterpoint, single and double (6 terms)
- Ear training (2 terms)
- Musical analysis (3 terms)
- Music history (3 terms)

Ear training was considered so important that no student was admitted into the fourth term of harmony without passing an exam in this skill.

For the piano student the catalogue specified technical studies to be learned with specific tempos for playing. The faculty selected these studies and reviewed their grade level carefully prior to the publication of the catalogue. The choice of repertoire, however, was left to the teacher with the expectation that works by the major composers for piano would be taught and learned. Among these were Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Mendelssohn, Chopin, and Schumann. Eventually the specifics of technique would be eliminated, replacing this instead with a brief statement to choose music that

---

20 Fitzpatrick, 299.
would develop “a musical touch and a refined and intelligent style of playing.”\textsuperscript{21} From its beginnings Oberlin required courses in harmony, counterpoint, fugue, and form and analysis for graduation. By the 1890s the academic requirement for graduation included a college course of only one semester, so that the conservatory student might “pass with ease among educated people,” along with ten terms of theory and notably three terms of music history.\textsuperscript{22}

The educational philosophy at Oberlin Conservatory that took shape during these early years may be attributed to its connection to the College and to the faculty that developed its courses of instruction. Edward Dickinson, whose Professorship of Music History and Appreciation at Oberlin in the 1880s was another first in this country, had studied at Amherst, New England Conservatory, and in Berlin. His own training brought together the practical and the liberal, the natural gifts of musical talent “subjected to a thorough technical and aesthetical training and ... supplemented by the most liberal collegiate education.”\textsuperscript{23} The fusion of conservatory and college defined Oberlin’s position to prepare its students for more advanced study in Europe while providing the opportunity for sound scholarship in its school. It described itself as “a college and not a university of music [for] it sends many of its graduates to complete their musical studies ... to the great schools of Germany and France, where they invariably take excellent training.”\textsuperscript{24}

In June of 1903 Oberlin initiated a Bachelor of Music degree program of eleven terms offered to students who completed a prescribed course along with public

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21}Ibid., 300.
\item \textsuperscript{22}Skyrm, 103.
\item \textsuperscript{23}Edward Dickinson, “The Higher Musical Education in America,” \textit{Music}, July 1, 1893 (reprint), as quoted in Fitzpatrick, 296n.
\item \textsuperscript{24}Fitzpatrick, 297.
\end{itemize}
performance and private lessons in their applied area.\textsuperscript{25} It was in fact a five-year program. Admission requirements included fifteen high school units, four of which could be in music. By 1910 required subjects and unit value were listed. The emphasis on high school academics enabled students to concentrate on practical study once at the Conservatory. The degree course consisted of

- five terms of harmony,
- two of ear-training,
- two of counterpoint,
- three of canon and fugue, free composition, history of music, harmonic analysis, and form.

Majors were offered in piano, organ, voice, violin, cello, or in theory, texts for which were now by American authors. Secondary piano study was required for instrumental majors. With a degree program in place, private instruction replaced class instruction for applied music.

By 1927 Oberlin offered the Bachelor of Music degree at the Conservatory and the Bachelor of Arts degree from the College, which included course study in the Conservatory. The Bachelor of Music now defined requirements in credit hours rather than terms, and was a practical course where even electives were in music. The Bachelor of Arts with a major in music, on the other hand, included the following courses:

1. English composition, bible, ancient languages or math, modern languages, physical education, psychology or philosophy,
2. Electives in music ensemble or courses in the College of Arts and Sciences,
3. Theory was studied during the first three years with no practical music in the first year but offered in the second, third, and fourth years for credit.

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid., 300.
The equivalent of one more semester of theory was necessary to fulfill the 124 credit-hour requirement. The student was then able to enter the conservatory to earn a Bachelor or Music degree, which could be completed in two and a half years, similar to the graduate program offered at New England Conservatory forty years earlier.26

The early efforts at Oberlin that formed the foundation of its musical education were intended to reach beyond the limitations of vocational training, unlike the European model, although Oberlin encouraged European study for its advanced graduates. This concern was appropriately described by James Harris Fairchild, president of Oberlin from 1866 to 1889:

This is not a mere Conservatory training … Music in its bearing on human character and life is the great thought … The man who knows music and nothing else is greatly lacking in the elements of substantial character … A school of general learning, therefore, is the natural and desirable place for a training in music. In such a neighborhood music will stand in its proper relations in the general thought, other forms of culture will be appreciated and secured, and the music and the musician will share in the benefit.27

Peabody Conservatory presents another kind of administrative organization and a different story of purpose, mission, and transformation. Founded in Baltimore, Maryland, in 1857 by the textile merchant-philanthropist George Peabody it was part of a large cultural enterprise for the city of Baltimore that reflected a broad social consciousness with a realistic concern for the public good. His full enterprise included a library, the core of the project, a lecture series on science and literature, an academy of music, and an art gallery, to improve “the moral, intellectual culture of the inhabitants of Baltimore.”28

26Fitzpatrick, 311.

27James H. Fairchild, “Place and Work of a School of Music in Connection with Oberlin College,” Order of Exercises at the Dedication of Werner Hall, Oberlin Conservatory of Music (Oberlin, Ohio: I. W. Mattison, 1885) 21-22, as quoted in Fitzpatrick, 318n.

Although Baltimore was a leading commercial center in America it lacked a cultural nucleus. From his wisdom and experience living in London, Peabody believed that a community supporting cultural activities would also sustain the support necessary for sound commercial wealth. Peabody had created a Lyceum in his hometown in Massachusetts that served as a small model for his vision for Baltimore. For the Baltimore project, the library was completed first and remains in existence today. The lectures were discontinued in 1910 because such resources had become available at Johns Hopkins, and so too the art gallery, which was supplanted by the Baltimore Museum of Art. The purpose of the music academy was to provide professional training for composers, teachers, and performers. “Here music has for the first time in our country been brought into a system of education, as a coordinate element to hold an equal rank with the other teachings of the University. We believe [that] in no other institution of note among us has music been assigned a seat in such alliance with philosophy.”29 This was not to say that it was part of a university structure, which would happen about one hundred years later when it merged with Johns Hopkins, but that the strength of its educational program would be on a par with that of any university. Its training “was intended to furnish that sort of instruction ... for which there has heretofore been no provision, and which students have been obliged to seek abroad.”30 Three teachers taught piano, organ, violin, theory, and orchestra when the academy opened in 1868. Two of the teachers were American, one of whom, Lucien Southard, also served as director; the third was a Dane and European trained. The course of study was intended to take at least three years for completion and was organized into three main divisions within which classes

29The Peabody Institute of the City of Baltimore: The Founder’s Letters and the Papers Relating to Its Dedication and Its History (Baltimore: Boyle, 1868), 2, as quoted in Fitzpatrick, 233n.

30Academy of Music of the Peabody Institute of the City of Baltimore (Baltimore: September 15, 1868), 1, as quoted in Fitzpatrick, 233n.
would be assembled by the director into three grades (levels, perhaps), designated A, B, and C. The divisions offered the following:

**First division:**

- 72 class lessons in applied music—voice or an instrument,
- 36 in theory—*solfège* or thorough bass,
- 36 lectures on the development of the voice, articulation, analysis, and expression, totaling 144 lessons and classes,
- 12 private concerts, and 12 public ones over a period of 36 weeks.

The tuition was $60 and considered affordable for all.

**Second division:**

- 72 class lessons in singing or instrumental study,
- 36 classes in theory—*solfège* and declamation for singing classes; harmony and counterpoint for instrumental classes,
- 36 lectures in music history and literature, church music and other subjects,
- 36 rehearsals in chorus,
- 36 lessons in Italian, and
- 12 private and 12 public concerts over 36 weeks.

The tuition was $80.

**Third division:**

- 72 classes in singing and 72 in instrumental study,
- 36 in theory as in division two, rehearsals as in division two,
- 36 in music history and literature,
- 12 private and 12 public concerts.

The tuition was $100.
(The fourth and fifth divisions seem to have been intended for interested amateurs. The fourth offered no applied instruction, only classes in theory and attendance at concerts, and the fifth was primarily a rehearsal division.)\textsuperscript{31} Exams were given twice during the school year.\textsuperscript{32} In 1868 requirements for graduation stated that pupils who completed the course of instruction to the satisfaction of the director and a committee would be entitled to a diploma. The assessment would review courses taken, the degree of excellence attained, and general musical ability. Level of musicianship, not length of time of study was the determining factor.

The new music academy did not meet with easy success. The community did not accept the need to pay for concerts or for instruction, it did not respond to the orchestra, and it did not like the director. Southard resigned in 1873 and was replaced by Asger Hamerick, a Dane born in Copenhagen, and trained in Copenhagen, Berlin, and Paris as a pianist and composer. He was an outstanding musician who, although European, was sympathetic to the performance of works by Americans. His direction extended from 1871 to 1898 and impacted significantly on raising standards for admission and for the educational program in general. Requirements for piano, for example, now specified a basic knowledge of notation and of major and minor keys and the ability to play technical studies by Plaidy and Czerny and easy sonatas by Haydn, Mozart, and Kuhlau. The course of instruction—one vocal and one instrumental—intended for three years of study, included the cultivation, training, and development of the voice, oratorio and dramatic singing, or piano, organ, and all orchestral instruments along with counterpoint, compositional form, fugue, composition, and instrumentation. Theory and lectures on general musical topics were a part of the complete program of study. In 1874 the

\textsuperscript{31}Fitzpatrick, 234-236.

\textsuperscript{32}Robinson, 149-150.
academy was officially renamed Conservatory of Music of the Peabody Institute and its curriculum expanded to offer majors in theory, performance, and orchestra, with additional music classes in harmony, reading at sight, and music history.

In 1876 the Conservatory established two distinct graduate citations, a Certificate of Proficiency based on attendance and accomplishment and a Diploma of Distinguished Musicianship. In essence this separated the career path of the teacher from the performer. For the pianist the Diploma represented the completion of the foundational and traditional theoretical courses of harmony, counterpoint, musical form, and fugue. It also meant the completion of an assigned repertory of Cramer Etudes and studies by Clementi entitled *Gradus ad Parnassum*, works by Bach, sonatas and concertos by Beethoven and other classical and modern composers, and the ability to accompany, to transpose, to read music at sight, and to improvise through all the keys—advanced keyboard skills. In 1893 the Certificate of Proficiency became a pre-requisite for the Diploma. The Diploma course was intended to be three years in length concluding with an oral exam before a faculty committee in all subjects studied. Candidates were also expected to prepare a large work for orchestra. Statistically speaking, however, only about one Diploma was awarded each year, the other hundred or so students either not measuring up to its demands or choosing a shorter term of study.

In spite of the high standards of musicianship demanded during Hamerick’s tenure, the 1890s brought a gradual shift of emphasis from the European trade school toward a concern for a broader educational background.

The changing role of higher education in America and its resultant effect upon college curricula in music [helped usher in an] era of transition at Peabody at this time. The arts were finally gaining acceptance by the public at large. Concurrently there was also a demand for an informed citizenry with emphasis on general education rather than specialized training for the college student.33

33Robinson, 244.
By the end of the 1890s and under the new directorship of Harold Randolph from 1898 to 1927, Peabody looked toward the granting of degrees and accreditation that in some ways also allowed for more flexibility in its course offerings and in its demands. Randolph had been trained at Peabody under teachers of European background. Significantly, he was among the very few musicians of the time who had not studied in Europe but nevertheless recognized the importance of that influence in the musician’s training. A “purely American product who possessed a critical balance between the intellectual and emotional, the ideal and the practical, so necessary for musical leadership in the twentieth century,” Randolph was a presciently suitable choice for Peabody at this time of change in its history.34 Less rigid than his predecessor, he leaned toward a more compromising compliance with regard to standards.

I should like to see a considerable development in our methods of diagnosis whereby we might avoid breaking the spirit of the less gifted by holding them up too rigidly to what for them is an impossible standard.... We are making an especial effort at the Peabody Conservatory of Music to solve this problem through application of modern methods of applied psychology.35

Among his teachers, Randolph had studied piano at Peabody with Carl Faelten, a former student of Franz Liszt and director of New England Conservatory from 1891 to 1896. The nature of Faelten’s teaching enabled him to study on his own, “a valuable thing for any teacher to be able to do. Every student presents his own problems so that it is difficult to fix any general rules or prescribe any particular specialized system.”36 This recognition of different abilities of students was in the air of educational psychology and methodology in general and was one argument in favor of private instruction for applied

34Robinson, 279.


36Robinson, 276.
music versus class instruction. Private instruction was first mentioned in the 1900/01 Catalogue, although the class method was still encouraged.\textsuperscript{37}

In 1915 Peabody established a Research Department in Music under Otto Ortmann, a graduate of the Conservatory with an artist’s diploma in piano, who became known for his scientific work involving the production of piano sound, the physics of sound, musical experience, and \textit{Gestalt} psychology. He was one of the country’s leading musical scholars with a committed interest in academics. One of his objectives was to find a means of measuring musical talent that would enable a music school to admit and place students appropriately.\textsuperscript{38} As Peabody’s fourth director, Ortmann brought a new dimension of ‘scholarship’ and research to his directorship. Among his accomplishments were systemizing requirements in each major field of study, integrating subject material, and adding courses in pedagogy. He believed in a multi-purpose role for the school that fostered a strong humanities component and supported the advancement of musicological research.\textsuperscript{39}

By the time Randolph resigned in 1928 Peabody had entered into an affiliation with Johns Hopkins to accept some course work for credit. Three years later a Bachelor of Science degree was offered in conjunction with Johns Hopkins of which half of the required 120 points were in music. On the other hand the introduction of the Bachelor of Music degree in 1928 was announced with something of an apology: “The Conservatory

\begin{footnotes}
\item[37] Fitzpatrick, 248.
\item[38] Robinson, 328. His work influenced Carl Seashore, who developed a ‘musical talent test’ that was used for several years by the Eastman School of Music.
\item[39] Robinson, 325. Otto Ortmann was born in Baltimore and educated at Peabody. He was a piano student both of Max Landow, who would eventually move to Eastman School, and Ernest Hutcheson, who would become Dean of the Juilliard Graduate School. Among his published works, \textit{Physiological Mechanics of Piano Technique} presented an in-depth study of the human anatomy and the science of piano sound production. Reginald R. Gerig, \textit{Famous Pianists and Their Technique} (New York: Robert B. Luce, Inc., 1974), 411.
\end{footnotes}
has had under consideration for some time past the granting of degrees, since the demand for them on the part of students—due chiefly to the growing importance attached to them by academic and state authorities—can no longer be disregarded.”

Admission to the four-year course for a Bachelor of Music degree required fifteen high school units, three allowed in music, a knowledge of elementary theory, and an appropriate level of proficiency in the applied subject. The degree itself required a minimum of eighteen liberal arts credits, six of which had to be in English and six in a foreign language, with a maximum total of 30 credits. Music requirements were not given in credit hours but in number of classes, typical of the nineteenth century.

Under Randolph the conservatory answered its founder’s hopes of serving a wide public through its publications, its extension classes, and its community music programs. An American-trained musician, Randolph nevertheless recognized the importance for European artist-teachers to impart their standards and ideals of musical professionalism to the American music student. Yet he remained sympathetic to the value of general and liberal education and to a kind of education that would embrace a wider number of students. With this inclination and his informed understanding of the demands of the profession, he channeled the Conservatory in a direction that addressed the new interests of the twentieth century, making Peabody an independent music school that gradually adjusted to American purposes without sacrificing its original mission.

New England Conservatory of Music also opened as an independent school but American interests were acknowledged from the beginning: “It is the first example of a music school that in its early years had a connection with a university, Boston University, through which the Bachelor of Music degree was early offered in the United States.”

---

40 Peabody Catalogue, 1927/1928, as quoted in Fitzpatrick, 258.

41 Wager and McGrath, 41.
founder, Eben Tourjée, avidly promoted public school music education, as Lowell Mason had a few years earlier, and understood that for his students to play a major role in higher education they would have to compete on academic as well as musical grounds.

Born in Warwick, Rhode Island, in 1834, Tourjée studied singing, was a self-taught organist, and served as the village church musician. His modest beginnings as a textile worker at the age of eight, then as the owner of a music store that he expanded to include dry goods, then as founder of the Newport Musical Institute, speak to his organizational ability, determination, and commitment to music and education. He taught music in the public schools in Newport. At twenty-five he began teaching at the East Greenwich Seminary, where he had earlier studied, and in 1859 secured a charter from Rhode Island for a Musical Institute, considered the first music school in the country “in the true sense.” He also worked for Christian missionaries and served as president of the Music Teachers National Association, for the founding of which he was indirectly responsible.

In 1863 Tourjée traveled to Europe to study the conservatory systems, methods, and textbooks in France, Italy, and Germany. Upon his return in 1864 he moved the Musical Institute to Providence and called it a Conservatory of Music. Three years later he again moved his conservatory, this time to Boston, re-naming it the New England Conservatory. It was incorporated in 1870 and in 1883 was reorganized similarly to Harvard, directing all profits to the conservatory to keep tuition costs low and to increase resources for the school:

For thirty years it has been the aim and effort of my life to found and equip an institution which should bring within the reach of the many the priceless benefits of a first-class musical education, that these in turn might become missionaries for its universal diffusion. The struggle through which I had to

---

42Ibid., 42.

43The Music Teachers National Association was founded in 1876 to support the value of music study and the professionalism of music teachers.
pass, and the difficulties which I had to overcome in obtaining even the fragmentary education in music which this country could then afford, led me to this determination.\textsuperscript{44}

Tourjée’s ambition was to provide his school with a “generous liberal culture with music as the fundamental element.”\textsuperscript{45} The New England Conservatory developed into eleven individual schools with a post-graduate course: for the piano; for the organ; for the formation and cultivation of the voice, lyric art and opera; for the violin, orchestra, quartet and ensemble playing, orchestral and band instruments, and conducting; for harmony, composition, theory, orchestration; for sight-reading and vocal music in public schools; for tuning pianos and organs, for general literature and languages; for oratory and forensic art; for fine arts; for physical culture; and for the College of Music. Students had access to Tourjée’s private library, and there was a “Christian home for young women.”\textsuperscript{46}

The relationship with Boston University, being organized at about the same time as the Conservatory, deserves mention. Unlike many universities that started out as colleges, Boston University began as a collection of professional schools to which was later added a liberal arts college. The first part of the university proper was the Boston Theological Seminary, established in 1871. Two years later a School of Law and a College of Music were opened. The latter was “the first ever established in America, adapted to the needs of graduates of musical conservatories and schools,” the implication being that a student may graduate from a conservatory or school of music with a diploma and then continue

\textsuperscript{44} Matthews, 454.

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., 464. “Music opens the way for a broad general culture, that the impression that the concentration of effort, necessary to secure the success of students pursuing a musical course, precludes all possibility of culture, is false.”

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 457.
in a graduate program leading to a Bachelor of Music degree.\textsuperscript{47} Again the discussion of general education and specialized studies came into focus:

... a University ought neither to generalize education merely, nor to specialize it merely, but to do both at one and the same time.... It should do this by carrying the general education of each pupil as high as possible before giving him the special, and by giving the most favored in respect to general education some practical adaptation to serve the world....\textsuperscript{48}

This point of view took the position that all knowledge should be connected to some practical application and that the bridge between academic and professional should be minimized:

Each fails to see how vilifying and fruitful are the action and reaction of the two classes of studies and of students upon each other.... In their most exclusive days even Oxford and Cambridge were in a sense schools of applied science. They were as studiously adapted to fit men for certain prospective careers in actual life, as is the Law School....\textsuperscript{49}

Tourjée was Dean of the College of Music. The requirements for admission to the College were the same as those for graduation from the conservatory (or equivalent private study) or, if adequately prepared, the degree: “Those who have specially distinguished themselves by their talents and scholarship, if graduates of any college of arts, will receive the degree of Bachelor of Music.”\textsuperscript{50} Upon entering the College and after three years of study the student was eligible for the University diploma. He would qualify for a Bachelor of Music degree if he already had a Bachelor of Arts. If not, then he could qualify by passing an examination in courses equivalent to the Bachelor of Arts. In both instances successful completion of music courses at the conservatory with three

\textsuperscript{47}Wager and McGrath, 44.

\textsuperscript{48}Wager and McGrath, 45. (First issue of Boston University Yearbook, 1874, 21-21, Wager and McGrath, 44n.).

\textsuperscript{49}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{50}Wager and McGrath, 47.
additional years of study were necessary for the advanced degree. By 1886 the academic courses listed for candidacy for the Bachelor of Music were as follows:

1) English grammar, rhetoric, composition;
2) English literature and history;
3) Outline of ancient and modern history and history of England and the United States;
4) Arithmetic, algebra, geometry;
5) Physics and one of three other specified sciences;
6) Sight-reading of easy Latin prose;
7) the same of French, German, or Italian;
8) Mental philosophy;
9) Moral science.

In addition there was an exam in logic and in two of four prescribed literary works.\textsuperscript{51} The Doctor of Music degree was available for those who attained the Bachelor of Music or its equivalent and who passed with satisfaction an exam in fugue, form and orchestration, musical literature, history of music, the piano, violin, or organ.

The educational philosophy behind this degree program was similar to the views expressed by Edwin Dickinson at Oberlin and foretelling of those of Howard Hanson, the second director of the Eastman School:

\begin{quote}
Education is conceded to be the harmonious development of all one's faculties to their highest power.... It must therefore be symmetrical, for man is a unit, and one part of his nature cannot be developed to the highest point without the cultivation of the other parts.... Hundreds of would-be musicians are failing to take the highest positions in our colleges and universities because of their limitations in this respect.\textsuperscript{52}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{51}Fitzpatrick, 50.

\textsuperscript{52}Annual Souvenir of the New England Conservatory of Music ..., 1890 and 1891, 34, as quoted in Wager and McGrath, 51.
For Tourjée it was important that music education for those who desired it be affordable and that his graduates be able to procure jobs, as some did at Indiana University, De Paul University, Cornell College, Dartmouth, and others.

However successful the program was on paper, it was not so in fact with academic demands almost diminishing musical ones. Very few students enrolled for the degree. By 1890 the equivalency exam for the Bachelor of Arts had been reduced to two of the following languages—Latin, German, French, Italian—and logic. Financial difficulties ensued, Tourjée had died, and in 1891 Boston University College of Music was discontinued, its work being transferred into the remaining schools of the Conservatory. With the appointment of the second director, the pianist Carl Faelten, in 1891, a European who had taught at Peabody, and the next director in 1896, George Chadwick, an American composer, a new direction was set. The affiliation with Boston University terminated under Faelten and both directors returned to European traditions with emphasis on practical training for their music students.

The Conservatory course of study in 1872 had consisted of instruction in

• sight-singing—three times weekly;
• lectures on harmony—weekly;
• oratorio rehearsals—weekly;
• pupils’ recitals—weekly;
• artists’ concerts—three each term;
• orchestral concerts—approximately one each term;
• lectures—three each term;
• organ recital—three each term;
• analysis of organ and piano works—three each term.
By 1882 the catalogue had broadened to include a language department of seven instructors headed by Maximilian Berlitz.\footnote{Berlitz established his first language school in Providence, Rhode Island, in 1878.} For graduation all regular course students were required to take one year of harmony or counterpoint followed by one year of theory of music. All students were also advised to take sight-singing and teaching in public schools, and organ students were advised to take church music. In addition, the school catalogue listed, along with English, “arithmetic, algebra, geometry, natural philosophy, physiology, botany, geology, astronomy, history, political economy, mental science, moral philosophy, Latin” as being available to students if a sufficient number requested a particular course. It is doubtful that this occurred with any frequency.\footnote{Fitzpatrick, 350-351.} The distinction between certificates and diplomas was clarified in the 1883/84 catalogue. Certificates were awarded to those who completed the course in harmony and theory or that on any instrument. Diplomas were awarded to those who completed the course on any instrument or voice along with the course in harmony and theory.\footnote{Virginia Ruth Mountney. “A History of the Bachelors Degree in the Field of Music in the United States” (D.M.A. diss., Boston University, 1961), 198.}

Under Carl Faelton, sight-singing (solfège) was made compulsory following European teaching and the eleven schools were reduced to five: 1) Music; 2) Piano and organ tuning; 3) Department of general literature and languages; 4) Department of elocution and physical culture; 5) Department of fine arts.\footnote{Fitzpatrick, 359.} Students were required to take an entrance exam for admission and examiners traveled to several parts of the country for this purpose. Musicians from the symphony were hired to instruct wind students. A post-graduate diploma was introduced in 1897-98, intended for applied proficiency and requiring two more years of study. Nine years later a reciprocal...
arrangement with Harvard was formed allowing Conservatory students the opportunity to take courses in English, German, French, fine arts, and physics. The arrangement lasted until the Bachelor of Music degree was re-instituted in 1925, when the Conservatory became a member of NASM.\textsuperscript{57}

Earlier, in 1914, the curriculum was reorganized into two divisions: the academic department, which led to a full diploma, and the department of special students, in which the majority of students were enrolled and for which there were no requirements. In reality the academic department was a practical course of study, since only English literature, diction, French, German, and Italian were taught at the Conservatory. The diploma could be taken for three or four years. In either case the applied music major was required to take only two academic points, one for English Literature and one for Musical History. Twenty-two points were directed to applied study with a recital required in the third, or junior, year. The additional ninety-four required points could be taken in \textit{solfège}, dictation, harmony, harmonic analysis, theory, piano sight-reading, ensemble playing, orchestra, and additional lectures in music history.\textsuperscript{58} The class system of instruction remained available to students until 1940, the degree having no bearing on individual versus class lessons, as with Oberlin and Peabody.

By 1930, the year that Chadwick retired, New England Conservatory had gone from a school accommodating a large number of students with varied abilities and academic interests to one of European professional rigor, and finally to one of high professional standards with a manageable academic component that lent validity to its

\textsuperscript{57}Members of the National Association of Schools of Music, founded in 1924, were working toward a consensus regarding minimum music degree requirements and standardization of credits.

\textsuperscript{58}Fitzpatrick, 373; Mountney, 80.
Bachelor of Music degree. Through much transformation it became, in a sense, the embodiment of what many schools of music in the twentieth century sought to achieve.

Clearly New England’s early association with Boston University in offering the Bachelor of Music degree suggests a graduate program beyond that of the Bachelor of Arts. In some way it was similar in concept to the Bachelor of Music degree of fifteenth-century England, when a recipient had sufficient background in liberal studies to teach or lecture in a variety of academic topics. Then a proficiency in music was but one aspect of professional practice, since in many cases the Bachelor of Arts and sometimes a Master of Arts had been acquired before the specialization in music. The music degree was granted after many years of study, performance, and the writing of a large-scale composition. As other areas of liberal arts studies entered into the curriculum with the humanistic ideals of the Renaissance and religious ideals of the Reformation, music was gradually weeded out. When the degree re-entered nineteenth-century American music schools, its requirements were unclear, ranging from specialized graduate study after meeting rigorous academic standards—the case at New England Conservatory—to a loosely conceived degree with minimal academic requirements—true of many college-university programs. Not until the advent of National Association of Schools of Music did the degree find some stability with regard to requirements and standards.\(^59\) Although the recommendations allowed flexibility, NASM suggested a basic program of 120 credit hours spread over applied study, lower and upper level theory courses, and eighteen to thirty credits in liberal studies. By having total credit hours equal those of the Bachelor of Arts, it sought to give the music degree as much stature.\(^60\)

\(^{59}\)Wager and McGrath, 22.

\(^{60}\)Mountney, 255. Lower level theory courses consisted of two years of harmony, sight-singing, and dictation, and one year of keyboard harmony, form and analysis, and history of music. Upper level courses consisted of smaller forms of composition, elementary counterpoint, and large-scale composition.
Many music schools came into being during the century, many of which were short-lived and some that went on to become important twentieth-century music institutions. To mention but a few, in Boston the Boston Conservatory of Music, founded by a European in the same year as New England Conservatory, excelled in the teaching of the violin. In New York, The Grand Conservatory of Music of the City of New York, 1874, granted a Bachelor of Music degree to anyone who passed a required exam and who produced a composition with polyphonic writing in four parts. A Master of Music was granted with the addition of a work for chorus and orchestra, and the Doctorate was conferred on artists who by their service warranted the degree. The New York College of Music, 1878, eventually became incorporated into New York University. The National Conservatory of Music, 1885, was an attempt to establish a government-funded school of music that provided free tuition to highly talented students, full scholarships to African-American students, and a very modest tuition to all others. From 1892 to 1895 its director was the Czech composer Antonín Dvořák, who strove to support American music and education. Many outstanding musicians graduated during its thirty-year history but it nevertheless remained privately funded.

Chicago also claimed many schools—the Chicago Musical College, later absorbed into Roosevelt University, the Chicago Conservatory of Music, the American Conservatory, the Chicago College of Vocal and Instrumental Art, and the Balatka’s Academy of Musical Art. Northwestern University’s Conservatory, which began in 1873, achieved special recognition because of the outstanding music educator, Peter G. Lutkin, who headed the music department from 1891 to 1928. He instituted many classes that became the basis of the modern curriculum and instituted a system of formal examination for applied music students. He did not believe, however, in awarding a

---

61 Matthews, 495-496.
Bachelor of Music for applied study, but instead held to the English tradition of awarding the degree for the completion of a large-scale composition using soloists, chorus, and orchestra. In 1917, one year after Howard Hanson was awarded the degree, the faculty modified those requirements.62

Philadelphia had its share of schools: The Musical Academy, founded in 1870, absorbed both the Hahn Conservatory and later the Philadelphia Conservatory of Music, and today exists as part of the University of the Arts of Philadelphia. The Combs Conservatory founded in 1885 remained in existence until 1990.

The schools established in Cincinnati also survived the nineteenth century, and as merged institutions continue today to offer outstanding musical training. Founded in 1867 by Clara Baur in a woman’s boarding house, the Cincinnati Conservatory, her conservatory as she called it, was based on the European model.63 Within two years it grew to offer a full musical course of harmony, solfège, some counterpoint, and some analysis, along with French, German, and Italian. Clara Baur conceived of the conservatory as an aristocratic environment for female music students. Though courses were intended to develop the complete individual, the core of the curriculum was applied music. Consequently, for students pursuing a professional performing career, Baur engaged artist faculty from Europe or Americans trained in Europe. For the others who would become teachers, assistant instructors were employed, mostly outstanding graduates of the Conservatory itself. Certificates were awarded for five terms of study and Diplomas for an additional year. Within the same city the Cincinnati College of Music was begun in 1878 by businessmen who were interested in the cultural life of the city. Its first director was the conductor Theodore Thomas, who was conductor for the

62Miller, 42.
63Fitzpatrick, 425.
New York Philharmonic and for the Chicago Orchestra.\textsuperscript{64} Both schools co-existed until 1955 when they merged into the College-Conservatory of Music of Cincinnati. In 1962 the new institution became part of the University of Cincinnati.

This sparse overview skims only the surface, but is enough to suggest the flourishing of musical activity generated by a new social consciousness and an awareness supported by sufficient economic growth to put into practice the desire to enjoy European cultural traditions. These schools may have been serious in intent, but the method of educating American music students was not uniform either philosophically or practically—certainly not in quality—until a clearer definition emerged in the twentieth century. However, the nineteenth century provided a pathway and helped clarify the ‘environment’ of higher education for the American performing musician. Among the outstanding examples, Oberlin, Peabody, and New England Conservatory shaped the ideals of this education. Each arose from a different source, in two instances quite modest: Oberlin was rooted in religious necessity, Peabody in cultural development, and New England in educational opportunity for whoever wished. The schools were distinct in their ‘environments’: They reflected the mission of their founders and made adjustments according to the ideals of their directors in balance with the demands of society. Yet they were consistent in what they took from the European model—proficiency in performance and a grasp of musical language acquired through the knowledge of theoretical subjects and the necessity of concert experience both as listeners and as participants.

There was no standard course of study, but theory in its broadest sense was essential, and each school had its specific requirements with regard to amount of time and course work for the certificate or diploma. Entrance requirements were lean and little was

\textsuperscript{64}Howard and Bellows, 142, 145.
specified with regard to repertory for instrumental study except that the time required to qualify for a certificate or diploma depended on the level of playing when the student first entered the music program. Nevertheless outstanding talent was recognized and nurtured as such: Peabody developed a musical aptitude test, distinctions were made with regard to level of proficiency, highlighting outstanding achievement and indirectly singling out special ability, and artist teachers were reserved for those students with performance capabilities. On these terms alone the profession was defined. The ‘artist teacher’ was passing on the tools of the trade not only in the instruction of technique and interpretation but also in the traditions of performance, in life style, and in the ideology and spirit of the musician.

The music school ‘environment’ from its very beginning was one of ‘making’ music—first and foremost—and its responsibility, to varying degrees, lay outside the domain of academics. Yet even with the early efforts to construct a viable curriculum, the concern for, and struggle with, a more broadly based education was apparent. Oberlin Conservatory took advantage of its College academic courses; Peabody adapted its European model in response to the call for degree-based education; and New England Conservatory sought to establish music in the provenance of graduate specialization with a music degree program to follow that of academic study. It may be that without a strong tradition of ‘art’ music by itself, American society needed the security of an academic foundation in its professional-educational pursuits. It may be that the educational heritage of the English colonists could be compromised enough to allow for a wide spectrum of professional studies but not so completely as to undo the belief in the importance of liberal studies in cultivating one’s full potential. It is an interesting juxtaposition of philosophies that raises the question, “How much do we practice?” That these schools confronted this issue by looking to Europe while trying to make their own way opened up the possibility of advanced American music education for the professional musician to
stand as an equal among its academic and European counterparts. This would be more fully realized with the new schools of the early twentieth century.
Chapter IV

THREE TWENTIETH-CENTURY SCHOOLS:

EASTMAN, JUILLIARD, CURTIS

Eastman School of Music

"Why study abroad?"\footnote{Irmgart Hutcheson, “Why Study Abroad?” Miscellaneous Booklet, The Juilliard School Archives.} For the serious nineteenth-century American music student that option still proved more desirable—Europe with its renown teachers, schools, and successful track records in place, and a kind of study that steeped the musician in a world of culture, musical activity, and opportunity. Europe had a great musical tradition; America was just on the threshold of hers. Nineteenth-century immigration awakened interest, industrialization provided resources; and by the beginning of the second decade of the new century America had entered the international political arena while continuing to offer a haven for a new wave of immigrants. The country was ready to establish itself as a musical center for study and performance.

Regardless of the periods of financial unrest or administrative adjustments, a group of nineteenth-century schools had survived their challenges and in so doing became successful educational role models that furnished some basic dos and don’ts for their twentieth-century offspring. Similarities could be found between the older and the newer institutions, perhaps unintended, but schools such as Oberlin, Peabody, and New England Conservatory established a point of departure for debate among music educators on how
advanced music education should serve the American student. Change is a gradual unfolding of direction encouraged by events and circumstances. So too for music schools as they sifted through the successes of and obstacles to their efforts to train young musicians.

**Its Founder**

George Eastman was born in 1854 and moved to Rochester, New York when he was five. At fourteen he left school to support his widowed mother and two older sisters working as a messenger in an insurance company and studying accounting in his spare time. His experiments with photography, begun in 1877, led to a system of roll film for cameras, and three years later he opened the Eastman Dry Plate Company. By the end of the 1880s he had developed the Kodak camera, thus essentially making photography available to anyone and creating for himself a large fortune, much of which would find its way to the University of Rochester. Beginning in 1904 and over the course of the remainder of his life he would give and bequeath over thirty-five million dollars to the University. Additionally he helped fund hospitals, dental clinics, and technical institutes.\(^2\)

Like Peabody Conservatory, he wished to see Rochester become a center for art and music through education and entertainment that was inviting to the uninitiated.

I should like to see Rochester become a great musical center, known throughout the world. There is no reason to prevent this city from getting the sort of fame which comes from the possession of institutions which are foremost in developing gifted musicians and which are distinguished in the stimulation of the musical appreciation of the great body of citizens.\(^3\)


\(^3\)Lenti, 95. See also 2 and 26.
He himself had no musical training but on Thursday evenings and Sunday afternoons held a series of chamber music concerts at his home. “I love to listen to music and in listening I’ve come to think of it as a necessary part of life.”

To accomplish his civic aim Eastman sought to provide the University with a music school for both professional training and instruction for the amateur and to provide for the community a large concert and motion picture hall that would be on the same site as the school, the Eastman Theatre. He believed that one way the public might come to enjoy and appreciate good music was through motion pictures, with a small orchestral ensemble accompanying these silent films—rather visionary, when one considers the importance of orchestral scores throughout the history of film and efforts today to build audiences with concerts that ‘cross over’ boundaries of popular culture and art music. The Theatre devoted six days a week to motion pictures reserving Wednesday evenings for concerts. With the advent of sound films his motion picture enterprise came to a close. By 1928, however, in addition to motion pictures, Rochester audiences had been exposed to organ and voice recitals, opera, and beginning in 1923, the Eastman Theatre Ballet and the newly inaugurated Rochester Philharmonic Orchestra, which had been the Eastman Theatre Orchestra (ensemble) now augmented to full size.

George Eastman remained actively involved in the workings of the school throughout his life, making decisions about construction and about administration. He served on the Board of Managers for the School and retained the right to select members of the Board with the approval of the University’s Trustees. He played a major role in the

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{4}} \text{From the caption of the portrait of George Eastman in Eastman School Hall.} \]

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{5}} \text{Lenti, 85.} \]

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{6}} \text{Charles Riker, } \textit{The Eastman School of Music: Its First Quarter Century} \text{ (Rochester, NY: The University of Rochester, 1948), 16; also Lenti, 92-93.} \]
selection of directors for the School and for the Rochester Philharmonic, and played a major role in the operation of Eastman Theatre.  

In the final years of his life, he suffered from a debilitating spinal illness that impaired his walking and in 1932, after thoughtfully attending to his business and financial matters, he committed suicide. In addition to the main building and the Theatre, Eastman provided the School with two annexes for practice rooms, orchestral and opera rehearsal studios and classrooms, and three dormitories for women. Though George Eastman did not have the privilege of formal education or musical training, he possessed a keen vision and an extraordinary mind, which allowed him to see this vision through from planning to implementation—a business acumen combined with a genuine love of music.

Its History and Administrators

Eastman embodies some of the characteristics of its nineteenth-century predecessors. It shared with Oberlin the context of a strong academic foundation for its music course. Unlike Oberlin, however, it was from the outset a school of music within a university system. The academic strength of its curriculum remained a part of its ideology throughout its history as did its strength in performance, affirmed by its many performance graduates. It shared with Peabody a philanthropic commitment to enrich a community by building cultural and educational opportunities for the citizenry as well as for students. And it shared with New England Conservatory its early roots and connection, albeit somewhat indirect, to an already existing community music school. The particularity of the School was determined by the coming together of three extraordinary men—its founder, George Eastman, the president of the University of Rochester, Rush Rhees, and its second director, Howard Hanson. Each was very different
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7Lenti, 226.
from the other, but each had the same intensity of focus to make Eastman a great music school.

In the fall of 1921, one hundred four students entered as the first Eastman School of Music class. The journey to this point was somewhat circuitous. The thought of a music school for the University had been suggested by Rush Rhees as far back as 1904, four years after his appointment as President, when he mentioned to the architects for the University the possibility of a music school sometime in the distant future. Although Eastman knew him at that time, it was not until 1918 that he suggested to Rhees the establishment of a music school within the University. By now Eastman had funded other University enterprises. Not a major urban center, Rochester, like other cities, had nevertheless enjoyed the concerts of many traveling artists in the nineteenth century and also like other cities, had its share of music schools. The first to open in 1906 was the Rochester School of Music and one year later the Rochester Conservatory, which bought out the former. Among the faculty of the Conservatory was a fine pianist and teacher of Norwegian origin, Alf Klingenberg, who had come to Rochester in 1912. But within a year he left the Conservatory and with the founder and conductor of the Rochester Orchestra, established another music school in 1913 “to impart instruction and conduct examinations in all branches of music and of history, the languages and elocution, in so far as it may be necessary ... to impart instruction.” The school was located adjacent to the University campus and across from Sibley Hall, which housed the Sibley Musical Library. Within a year a third partner joined forces and the school was renamed the D. K. G. Institute of Musical Art. In 1916 it joined with the Rochester Conservatory and a

---

8Lenti, 25.
9Lenti, 15.
10The collection was a gift of Hiram W. Sibley, who was of a prominent Rochester family. It became an important and significant musical collection and was later housed as part of the school complex.
year later Alf Klingenberg became its director and sole owner, the Conservatory losing its identity to the Institute. Thus, all of the earlier Rochester music schools were absorbed in some way into this one institution.

The Institute offered three programs of study—a preparatory school for younger students, a four-year course leading to a diploma, and a public school course. Although it provided a fine education, its finances faltered. It is thought that Eastman provided financial help to sustain the Institute but this is not well documented.\textsuperscript{11} What does seem clear is that Klingenberg, his wife, and Hermann Dossenbach, the conductor of the Rochester Orchestra and the “D” in the name D. K. G. Institute of Musical Art, had suggested to Eastman a school of music connected to the University. Dossenbach had arranged the chamber music concerts at Eastman’s home as far back as 1905. These had become an important social event in Rochester, which Rush Rhees often attended. In 1918 Eastman purchased the Institute. Its 1918/19 Catalogue announced arrangements being made to enable “students who have met the college entrance requirements ... to work for a bachelor’s degree from the University by adding to the regular Four Year course of the Institute the necessary academic studies.”\textsuperscript{12} The University charter, however, did not allow for ‘professional’ education. It was not until the beginning of 1919 that the University was granted approval by the State Board of Regents for “the establishment ... of undergraduate and graduate college departments, professional, technical, vocational, and other departments.”\textsuperscript{13}

In that year the University acquired the Institute from Eastman, placing it under control of the University, and began designing plans for the construction of a complex to include the school and the theatre on a new site. The school would remain under the

\textsuperscript{11}Lenti, 21, 28.

\textsuperscript{12}Lenti, 33-34.

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid.
directorship of Alf Klingenberg and would include two departments—the collegiate department and the community division serving younger students and adult amateurs. The collegiate department awarded either the Eastman Certificate or a Bachelor of Music degree, which would be officially registered two years later in 1923. In any case, far more students enrolled in the certificate program. Following commencement in June of 1923, Klingenberg was asked to resign. His earlier Institute had been successful enough to gain Eastman’s support and interest so the reasons for this decision were somewhat unclear. However, in a letter to the English conductor Albert Coates Eastman pointed to a larger vision for the new school: “Mr. Klingenberg has many admirable qualities but he was not big enough to swing the job. What we want is a young man and our Trustees think he must be an American.”

Rush Rhees had been appointed President of the University of Rochester in 1900. At that time it was not yet in fact a university but a small regional college with a faculty of seventeen, a student body of 159, and four buildings in downtown Rochester. During his tenure the University acquired the Memorial Art Gallery in Rochester, established a School of Medicine and Dentistry, the Strong Memorial Hospital, and the School of Music. In addition, he oversaw the construction of the River Campus, the current site of the University’s academic buildings, and was a supporter of Susan B. Anthony and the suffragist movement. Rhees was more specific in stating his qualifications for the new director: He should be an American with an interest in using the resources of the school to further American music; he should be an outstanding musician, practically and academically, embracing a broad musical view rather than one narrowly focused; he

14Ibid., 101.

15The University of Rochester was founded as a Baptist school in 1850 but was non-sectarian in its administration. It grew to incorporate the College of Arts and Science, a College for Women, the School of Medicine and Dentistry, and the Eastman School of Music.

16From the caption of the portrait of Rush Rhees in Eastman School hall.
should have an excellent general education; and he should have administrative experience.\(^{17}\)

Among those considered was the young American composer Howard Hanson. His recollections years later of his interview with Rhees and Eastman were both telling and foretelling as their questions revealed what they envisioned for the school.

Did I think that it was possible to build a first-rate professional music school under the ‘umbrella’ of a university? Could the worlds of the artist, the performer, and the scholar co-exist in administrative as well as tonal harmony? What part should general education play in the training of the musician? As a graduate of both schools, did I prefer the administrative organization of the Institute of Musical Art—now the Juilliard School of Music—or the School of Music at Northwestern University? What was my impression of the famous foreign conservatories I had visited? What was my reaction to the music departments of America’s “ivy league” universities, for example, Harvard?\(^{18}\)

Clearly both Eastman and Rhees were sensitive to the philosophic and practical tensions between professional and liberal education that require resolution in order to coexist. And these questions so pertinent to this cause proved to guide the very foundation of Eastman’s ‘environment.’ In a letter to Rush Rhees, Hanson responded in a discreet manner: “The position of Director is one of great importance ... he should be an American in full sympathy with American ideals and possessing a full understanding of and love for the American student.” He described the task as “a spiritual one ... [breathing] fire into a great machine and [endowing] it with his own enthusiasm for a great cause. Rochester is not a music center and for it to become a music center a great thought would have to be born there ... “\(^{19}\)

Hanson was appointed director in 1924. He was born in Wahoo, Nebraska, in 1896, and attended Luther College Conservatory, where he received a diploma in 1911. In 1915

\(^{17}\)Lenti, 113.

\(^{18}\)Ibid., 115.

\(^{19}\)Ibid., 115,116.
he received a diploma from New York’s Institute of Musical Art, where he was a student of Percy Geotschius, an American music theorist, composer, and writer on music, and in 1916 a Bachelor of Music degree at Northwestern University. He described himself as being “low on academic credits” so he studied English, French, German, math, and physics.\(^\text{20}\) In addition to serving his academic limitations, liberal education played a significant role in the music education at Northwestern. The Dean of the School of Music was a prominent music educator, Peter Lutkin, whose views on the importance of a liberal education influenced those who studied under him. At Northwestern he had instituted courses in aesthetics, music criticism, pedagogy, diction, and in general questioned the awarding of a degree for applied music.\(^\text{21}\) In turn, Hanson’s broad educational background would be imprinted on the spirit of the Eastman School. Following his graduation he served on the faculty and was dean of the conservatory of the College of the Pacific in California. In 1921 he received the *Prix de Rome*, which afforded him three years in Italy that would influence his compositional style and develop his interest in Italian art. Throughout his forty-year tenure at Eastman, Hanson maintained an active career as conductor, composer, and music educator. He held positions in the Music Teachers National Association and the Music Educators National Conference. Perhaps most important, he chaired the curriculum committee of the newly formed National Association of Schools of Music, one purpose of which was to establish standards for the Bachelor of Music degree.\(^\text{22}\) In addition to several honorary doctorate degrees, he received a Pulitzer Prize, a Peabody Award, was elected to the National

\(^{20}\)Howard Hanson, *Autobiography*. Eastman School of Music Archives.  

\(^{21}\)Miller, 41-42.  

\(^{22}\)The Eastman School was one of its founding members, along with the Institute of Musical Art.
Institute of Arts and Letters, and in 1938 was named a Fellow at the Swedish Royal Academy.

The School developed rapidly. In 1922, when the school orchestra was formed there were twenty-eight players with faculty sometimes filling in; two years later there were 100 players with no necessity for outside support. By 1931 the reputation of the school orchestra secured its position for a weekly coast-to-coast broadcast over NBC. The 1920s saw the beginnings of an opera department, a school chorus, a class in orchestral conducting, the American Composers’ Concerts, and a composition department that offered undergraduate and graduate curricula leading to a Master of Arts or Master of Music degree. Although ensemble groups had been formed in the intervening years, in 1941 an instructor in chamber music was appointed bringing more specialized training to ensemble playing.23 With a large number of students and some faculty enlisting in the armed services for World War II, the balance between male and female students shifted in favor of the latter. Otherwise enrollment in the collegiate division was not affected, which was not the case for the preparatory division.

Under Hanson’s leadership, the growth of Eastman, its programs and its prominence attested to the “great thought born there.” The School was and remains fully a part of the University in its financial management, its commencement, and its degrees, and all students are given the opportunity of taking courses at either place. Yet, in spite of this administrative connection, it assumed a separate entity physically and in some way administratively, the University allowing Hanson a broad freedom to direct the course of Eastman’s curriculum and faculty, and thus to leave a pronounced legacy of attitude, spirit, and environment. Consequently, the School would become as much Hanson’s as Eastman’s.

23String, woodwind, brass, and vocal ensemble groups had been formed since the early years of the school, and ensemble was a course in the piano program, in 1941 an appointment for an instructor in chamber music was filled. Riker, 31.
The Curriculum: 1921-1945

With Eastman’s initial purchase of the Institute of Musical Art there were no changes to faculty or curriculum between 1918 and the opening of the school in 1921. The first Eastman catalogue of 1921 named Rush Rhees as President of the University and Alf Klingenberg as Director of the Eastman School of Music. There were thirteen members of the piano faculty, all Americans with the exception of Alf Klingenberg and Pierre Augieras, who was of French background and training. Among those listed was Raymond Wilson, a former student of Ernest Hutcheson at Peabody. Hutcheson, an Australian by birth, was trained in Germany and would later serve as Dean of the Juilliard School of Music. Of the thirteen, these three and Arthur See were full-time, perhaps serving as the faculty for piano majors. Courses were offered in theory and composition, piano, voice culture, organ, violin, viola, cello, harp, history and literature of music, and public school methods.

“In its expansion Eastman School of Music has a place of importance because of it’s cultural potential, both for the home community and the nation.”24 The announcement of the new site placed the School in a position of leadership. Courses were designed to be professional in character, and the Bachelor of Music degree was fundamentally similar for all areas of specialization. Students could enroll either for a degree or a certificate, which omitted academic requirements, all musical requirements remaining the same for both. Students were accepted for a term of no fewer than ten weeks for either the degree or certificate.

Admissions requirements for both the degree and the certificate programs specified a four-year high school course of fifteen units, three of which had to be in English, at least three in a foreign language, two in math, three in music, and four in electives. A unit represented work covering five high school periods a week. The music requirements were

241921/22 Catalogue, 9. Eastman School of Music Archives, and for all catalogue citations in this section.
accepted by exam only since courses in theory and harmony (no more advanced than
major and minor keys and tonic and dominant chords) were generally not available in
high schools. Students either took exams or submitted documents of certification as
evidence of having completed their academic requirements. Exempt from these exams
were only those students from schools whose college preparatory study was known by
the Admissions Office to be satisfactory.

For the piano major, performance requirements were of the intermediate level but
nevertheless addressed stylistic differences between the music of Bach and Mozart, and
technical competency through studies. The Inventions by Bach represented basic
contrapuntal playing of two simultaneous voice parts while the Mozart Sonata showed
clarity in passage work and control of melody over accompaniment. In addition, the
teacher and student presented a work of their choice, thereby allowing the student to
display his particular strengths. The Catalogue listed the following audition program:

- Two-part Inventions by Bach (Nos. 1, 4, 8)
- Sonata in G Major by Mozart
- Selected studies, for example by Czerny
- A work selected by the teacher

Although admission requirements for the pianist seem slight by today’s standards, each
requirement displayed competency in a different area, singling out stylistic elements of
the Baroque and Classic periods with appropriate technical attention and drill found in
Czerny studies. The individual work chosen by the teacher enabled the student to address
his interpretative strengths and leanings. All together the audition showed the applicant’s
musical maturity, his potential, and the quality of his previous training. Though a modest
level of achievement was expected when a student was admitted, these materials set the
foundation for advanced study. The Two-part Inventions by Bach, for example, paved the
way for the complex Preludes and Fugues of the Well-Tempered Clavier written in three,
four, and five simultaneous voice parts. The sonata by Mozart served as a departure for
the classic period and the larger sonatas by Beethoven, while the Czerny provided a beginning for the virtuosic studies/etudes by such composers as Cramer, Clementi, and those more demanding by Chopin, and Liszt.

The Bachelor of Music degree required four years of course work with a total of not fewer than one hundred thirty-six credit hours. The catalogue specified that one-quarter of these credit hours would be devoted to liberal arts courses taken at the College of Arts and Science and the remaining three-quarters to music. Thus thirty-four hours over eight semesters were assigned to university academics. These courses included rhetoric I, two full years of language and literature and of psychology and education, and one full year of history, economics, or philosophy. The music courses taken at Eastman were devoted to the applied major (48 credit hours over four years), theory and composition (24), music history (8), voice class required for the piano major (6), ensemble playing (6), accompanying (4), and chorus (4). Two credit hours equaled one hour of lesson time per week per term with the major applied teacher, and one credit hour equaled one hour of meeting time per week for lectures. Certificates in composition, piano, organ, and stringed instruments were given on the completion of the music subjects of the degree course but with academics omitted.

**Piano** repertory for each year of study was not outlined. Pianists were required to take class work in voice production, choral singing, and in ensemble playing and accompaniment as determined by the director.

**Theory**, along with applied study, formed the core of the music curriculum. All students except theory majors were required to take four years of theory, three hours each week. Though ear training—the ability to identify harmonic and melodic material by ear and the ability to write what was being heard—was considered very important, it was offered only during the first year. Course work progressed logically from basic material

---

25Two credit hours equaled three periods of meeting time.
through analysis of complex musical forms. Its distribution over four years was as follows: 26

First year. Harmony (chord tones and non-chord tones, modulations, enharmonic relationships, “thus completing the subject of harmony and its application in one year”), ear training (recognizing by ear and being able to notate rhythmic patterns, melodic units, and chord progressions), sight singing.

Second year. Analysis of smaller musical forms (hymn, folk, dance, aria, minuet, dance forms with trio) and of corresponding works by Romantic composers, and composition in each of these forms throughout the year.

Third year. Analysis of the Well-Tempered Clavier and other contrapuntal forms of Bach, Handel, and other composers. It was in this year that all non-theory majors began a separate track of study from theory majors.

Fourth year. Analysis of higher musical forms, the sonata during the first term, and instrumentation and analysis of symphonic music during the second term.

History and Literature of music was both comprehensive and interdisciplinary in nature. It met once each week over four years. Students would write essays utilizing the collection at the Sibley Music Library and would be expected to attend recitals and concerts. The purpose of the course was “to give students a comprehensive survey of the elements of the cultural value in the science, art, and language of music, together with relations these bear to universal culture and civilization.” In spite of the comprehensiveness of the course, students received only one credit per term and met for only one hour each week. The course began with the study of primitive music and moved chronologically and slowly into the twentieth century: 27

261921/22 Catalogue.

271921/22 Catalogue, 21 and 23.
First year. Ethnology; music of the American Indians, West Indians, Polynesians, Africans, Australians; archaeology, architecture, sculpture, and painting of Chaldea, Babylonia, Assyria, Egypt, Palestine, Greece, and Rome.

Second year. Medieval History, the art and history of music of the Christian Church to the Reformation and Palestrina.

Third year. First term, the beginnings of opera, oratorio, orchestra, classicism, with composers from Scarlatti and Bach to Mozart and Beethoven, et al.; second term, Romantic music.

Fourth year. Modern movements of Neo-Classicism, Neo-Romanticism, Nationalism, late nineteenth-century composers, including American composers. In addition, aesthetics, history of music, music appreciation, and criticism were discussed in this course.

Graduation exams were given twice a year. Those who displayed excellent competency in their applied area would be graduated with special honors as soloists and would be permitted to give a public recital. The final exam in piano prescribed three Preludes and Fugues from the Well-Tempered Clavier, a representative work of Beethoven or a later sonata of Schumann, a ballade or scherzo by Chopin, and a work selected by the teacher.28

This, Eastman’s first catalogue, showed a school in its infancy with regard to resources—available courses and faculty—yet one clearly defined with regard to its particular environment, one that would remain ideologically intact through revisions and changes to curriculum, administration, and faculty. As with Oberlin, Peabody, and New England Conservatory in the nineteenth century, the theory program occupied a center

28The Well-Tempered (well tuned) Clavier is a compendium in two volumes, each of twenty-four Preludes and Fugues in all of the major and minor keys, composed by J. S. Bach and written for keyboard. Historically it marks an early exploration of equal temperament tuning, which became the standard tuning system. It was known and studied by musicians and composers extending as far back to Beethoven.
role in the curriculum, along with study of the major applied subject—a carry over from the European tradition of essential knowledge for sound musicianship. The four-year course in theory was organized according to musical form. The first year provided a foundation in tonality and harmony for the analysis of formal genres covered over the next three years, progressing from smaller compositions, through more complex contrapuntal materials, to sonata and symphonic forms studied in the senior year. Though fewer credits were allotted to the history of music, its purpose seems to have been highly regarded as evidenced by its comprehensiveness and its presence in each of the four years. The importance of academic/liberal arts was implied both by the nature of this course and by the number of credit hours devoted to those courses taken at the College of Arts and Science. Required academics were specified and integral to the degree even though the primary concentration was music. They consumed a large segment of the degree program, perhaps too large, as most students enrolled in the certificate program for voice or piano, where more time could be devoted to practice in the applied field. This strong academic component would remain an earmark of Eastman education even after academics assumed a more modest role. Nonetheless, the School from these early years never lost sight of its fundamental commitment to the performing musician, evidenced by its special recognition at graduation of their outstanding student soloists.

During the next four years, from 1922 to 1926, course offerings and number of faculty increased significantly, and to the staff was added a school psychologist. Although admission requirements remained essentially the same, all entering students were required to take a psychological test for music known as Seashore Tests. In 1912 the psychologist Carl Seashore had developed a series of tests, *Measures of Musical Talent*, that were designed to give some indication of ability in musical study and of the potential for musical development. A Swede by birth and educated at Yale, Seashore devised a sensory methodology for determining musical ability. Such tests, popular in their day, were thought to measure the fundamental capacity to progress and “to identify marked
talent so that it may be stimulated and fostered.” After a four-year period of experimentation beginning in 1922, during which Eastman administered these tests but did not use them, they became a part of the official admissions application. Believing in the efficacy of these tests, Eastman would continue using them for another forty or so years in an effort to weed out those students who would not be able to meet the musical demands of their study.

Overall, degree requirements changed little while programs of study became more clearly defined. Credits for theory, for example, remained the same but some specific skills, such as keyboard harmony for both the first and second year student, became a separate course. Orchestration was added in the third year, and modern harmony in the fourth. Dictation as an independent course was offered as an elective in the third and fourth years. History of music underwent significant revision, being reduced to six units taken only in the freshman year, compared to its first version in which students were not introduced to the composers they were actually studying until their junior year. Musical form, offered in the sophomore year for four credits, may have served as an extension of historical survey as well as a course for musical analysis. In point of fact, the eight units of history extending over four years in 1921 were now compressed into two years. Academics were reduced to forty units taken in rhetoric, English, two years of a language, and psychology, for which another subject could be substituted. By 1926 all

29Howard Hanson, “A Discussion of the Curricula of Schools of Music,” in Papers and Proceedings of the Music Teachers National Association, 22nd Series, 1928, 58; Lenti, 37. Carl Seashore was Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Iowa. It will be recalled from Chapter III that at Peabody Conservatory Otto Ortmann was concurrently developing an aptitude test for musical ability. His work influenced Carl Seashore.

30In later years students were admitted before these tests were administered, so they were not a determinant factor of who would or would not be admitted. Although both Hanson and Eastman were impressed with the results of these tests, Hanson and the school psychologist conflicted over a student who had passed his audition but had not fared well with the Seashore tests. The student was admitted as Hanson felt he should at least be given a chance. Hanson, Autobiography. Provided by Vincent Lenti, e-mail correspondence, May 24, 2011.
academic requirements were offered at Eastman School, initially by University faculty, gradually replaced by newly hired Eastman faculty. The two required years of physical education, three hours each term for one unit, in the form of hygiene, gymnasium, folk dancing, or basketball fulfilled a State educational mandate enacted in 1916.

Six units per term for applied music remained consistent. However, the course of study for the pianist now prescribed specific materials for each grade level. The first six levels designated preparatory study and brought students to a level of playing to fulfill collegiate admission requirements. The grade levels continued into the four-year college program, each grade/year showing increased complexity with regard to technique and interpretation:


Grade 8: Gradus ad Parnassum by Clementi; Sonatas by Beethoven equivalent to Op. 2, No. 3, or the Piano Concerto in C Minor, or the Piano Concerto in G Minor by Mendelssohn; romantic and modern pieces.

Grade 9: Etudes by Chopin; Sonatas by Beethoven equivalent to those of Op. 31, or a classic or modern concerto; the Well-Tempered Clavier (with fugues for three, four, and five voices); romantic and modern pieces.

Grade 10: work of the preceding grade intensively continued, with added material, such as Etudes by Liszt, one of the later Sonatas by Beethoven (such as Op. 109 or Op. 110), a larger work by Bach.

For either the certificate or degree the piano major was expected to complete grade 10 literature to graduate. Though four years were set aside to accomplish this, the actual length of time might be extended depending on the needs and abilities of each individual student. The exam given in the last semester of study called for a recital program of serious content and difficulty, including music from the classic to the modern
period. In addition, the examiners assigned a piece to be prepared within two weeks by the student alone, without the help of a teacher. The difference in maturity between those pieces for admission and those for graduation make apparent a significant advancement in playing during these student years and suggest that the rigor of practice and study were of a very high standard. Once again, whatever the importance of culture and academics, the School did not lose sight of its primary purpose—to turn out competent musicians.

The number of available scholarships grew significantly. Notably, Eastman’s 1923/24 Catalogue announced a Fellowship of $1,200 given by the Juilliard Musical Foundation for advanced music study of the highest level awarded to a graduate student showing capacity for such study.\(^{31}\) Eastman nominated its candidate for the Fellowship and examiners appointed by the Foundation heard the candidate for the final granting of the award. To this was added in the following year a Scholarship of $1,000, also from the Foundation, available to an Eastman student in residence for at least two years, who was recommended by the Eastman faculty. However, no further mention of either the Fellowship or Scholarship is found in later catalogues. One may infer that these monies were redirected to the interests of the new Juilliard Graduate School, which opened in 1924.

By 1925, four programs of study that reached a broad age group and area of musical application—preparatory, certificate, degree, and special study of music “as a purely cultural subject”—were offered at the School.\(^{32}\) Within the collegiate division, theory and composition, piano, voice culture, organ, violin, cello, viola, harp, brass and woodwinds, history of literature of music, opera training, French, German, and English diction, and public school music methods were among those courses listed in the catalogue.

\(^{31}\)1923/24 Catalogue.

\(^{32}\)1925/26 Catalogue, 28.
A year later, the piano faculty had grown to approximately twenty-eight, including those of the school’s pre-college division, and were mostly American trained. The ‘conservatory’ faculty numbered far fewer, and their connection to Europe was strong, either directly by birth and training or indirectly through training alone. The faculty included the American Raymond Wilson, who had studied at Peabody with Rudolph Ganz and with Ernest Hutcheson, the French pianist Pierre Augieras, and Edgar Rose (among whose teachers was Josef Lhévinne, the Russian virtuoso who, like Hutcheson, would find his way to Juilliard within the next decade). In addition were Max Landow and the Hungarian Sandor Vas. Landow had been trained both in France and in Germany, where two of his teachers were students of Franz Liszt. His teacher in France, Eduard Risler, was said to have performed during the course of his career all thirty-two of the Beethoven Sonatas, all forty-eight of the Prelude and Fugues of the WTC by Bach, and all of the works of Chopin—an astonishing achievement even by today’s standards.33 Prior to Eastman, Landow had taught at Peabody Conservatory. Vas enjoyed an outstanding career in Europe concertizing and teaching, and was also a ‘descendant’ of Liszt through one of his teachers.

Cécile Staub Genhart also joined the piano faculty in 1926. Trained in Zurich by her father and by Emil Frey, and later in Berlin by the remarkable pianist Edwin Fischer, she was among the esteemed female piano teachers during this era.34 For some she was “the teacher,” a commanding presence in the piano department for the more than forty years of her teaching career at Eastman. In 1924 she married a student of her father’s,

33Lenti, 98, 24.

34Swiss born Edwin Fischer (1886-1960) was a celebrated interpreter, especially of the piano works of Bach and Beethoven, as well as a celebrated teacher. Pianist Emil Frey (1889-1946) was also Swiss born and had been a student of Louis Diémer, one of the great French pedagogues. Lyle, 95, 99.
Hermann Genhart, who became director of the Eastman Chorus. Piano majors knew him well, as two and, in some years, three years of chorus were required.35

The basic program of study for the piano major, that is, required courses and electives for the Bachelor of Music degree, had taken shape by 1926. The changes that followed leaned toward more flexibility of selection, reorganization of course distribution, and the relation of hours of meeting time per week to its equivalent units, now listed in the catalogue. Over the next twenty years the total number of units for the degree would decrease from one hundred thirty-six (in 1926) to one hundred thirty (in 1927), to one hundred twenty-six (in 1940), six more than the minimum suggested by NASM. Separate courses in keyboard harmony and dictation were eliminated by 1930, simply listing Theory I and II for the first two years, and Counterpoint I and Composition I for the last two. This latter course became Theory of Composition and in 1940 was replaced with a theory elective instead.36 The total units for music history were increased to fourteen in 1926.

The course History and Appreciation was taken in freshman year (6), Musical Form in sophomore year (4), and History of Fine Arts as related to music (4) in the senior year. This group of history courses perhaps suggests the difficulty in leaving behind an ideology grounded in a thorough and broad academic knowledge. By 1934, however, they had been absorbed into a single freshman course, History of Music and Form, for six units. Later it would simply be called Historical Survey.

35The absence of chorus from the 1940 Catalogue was replaced by two years of sight-reading that year.

36David Coppen, archivist of the Sibley Music Library, offered the following information regarding a probable theory text in use at Eastman during these years under consideration. Several copies of Manual of Harmonic Technic: Based on the Practice of J. S. Bach by Donald Tweedy (Boston: Oliver Ditson Company, 1928) are on library shelves at the University and at the School. The book contains a forward by Howard Hanson, dated August 30, 1928. Tweedy was hired to teach theory in 1924. In addition to his studies at Harvard, he, as Hanson, had studied under Percy Goetschius at the Institute of Musical Art.
To the piano program were added courses in piano pedagogy and methods, and in ensemble. Ensemble I classes began with music for four-, six-, and eight-hands, one piano and two pianos, and advanced to Ensemble II for piano with strings. Both methods and ensemble extended over two years. Although all piano majors were simply admitted as piano majors, from its beginning the School distinguished between its performance students from those intending to teach. Permission to present a public recital was initially granted to those student performers who played an outstanding final exam. Later, adjustments were made to the curriculum in the last semester of the senior year specific to each interest. Students graduating as performers took one course in piano pedagogy in their junior year, and one in methods, first semester senior year. However, an additional course in piano methods second semester meant for teachers was replaced by a senior recital for the performer. In addition, the performing graduate appeared as a soloist with orchestra. By 1940 the course of study for the applied pianist listed only one semester of piano methods and, four years later, a theory methods course for a full year as well. These methods classes were geared to teaching elementary and intermediate level students.37 Now two citations were awarded for outstanding solo achievement:

Students majoring in applied music, who are recommended by the examining committee of their instrument, may become candidates for the Performer’s Certificate. [This] may be awarded at the close of the Senior year, but usually an additional year is necessary. Candidates for this certificate are required to present a recital and to appear as soloist with the Rochester Civic Orchestra.

Out of this group, those whose performance warranted further recognition were granted the honor of performing with the more prestigious Rochester Philharmonic. “Graduates of outstanding ability who have received the Performer’s Certificate from the Eastman School of Music may, upon recommendation of the faculty, become candidates for the Artist’s Diploma. Candidates for this diploma are required to perform a concerto with the

37 Lenti, e-mail correspondence, March 8, 2011.
Rochester Philharmonic Orchestra.” It should be noted, however, that from its very first year, 1921, students of outstanding performance achievement were recognized with honors and allowed to present a public recital.

By 1944, the two-year English requirement was reduced to one year and all other requirements for academics became simply college or academic electives, six units in the junior year and three for seniors. All entering students now enrolled in a degree program, the certificate course of study having been gradually phased out by 1930.

These first twenty-five years of the Eastman School of Music show the evolution of an educational program grounded in two traditions, the liberal arts of American colleges and the music course of European conservatories, moving toward moderation between the discipline of liberal education and the discipline of professional practice. The university setting and a society still adjusting to the place of vocational/professional, non-classic education in the university in all likelihood influenced the strong academic component of the Bachelor of Music degree during Eastman’s initial years. However, in acknowledging the responsibility George Eastman had entrusted to the School—to serve aspiring young musicians and the community—the administration reshaped its curriculum to accommodate these purposes. Howard Hanson described that responsibility to the music student as: first, to provide an intensive professional training in the area of his interest; second, to provide a thorough musical foundation for work in that area; and third, to provide sufficient general education to enable him to function effectively in society. To achieve a high standard of musicianship, the School sought to develop in each of its students an “informed and inquiring mind, well equipped to handle the fundamental problems of his art. For this reason certain technical courses [were] required of all students. Beyond this ... the School [endeavored] to discover the individual talents of

---

38 1940/41 Catalogue, 40.
39 1921/22 Catalogue,
each student and to develop [those] talents along the lines which [would] contribute to his greatest usefulness as a musician in society."\textsuperscript{40}

In setting its standards for professional training, the School and administration began first and foremost with its entrance requirements. Only high school graduates who were sufficiently gifted and adequately trained on their instrument should be admitted to its professional courses. Thus, “the matter of the evaluation of the student’s abilities [was] of the greatest importance,” and among the resources for that evaluation were the Seashore musical aptitude tests.\textsuperscript{41}

The significant role of theoretical subjects in the curriculum that included harmony, counterpoint, composition, and orchestration was evident in the number of credits over four years allotted to these subjects. Theory was vital to every department, with intense drill in sight-singing, melodic dictation, rhythmic dictation, and harmonic dictation correlated to the written aspects of the study. Initially these skills were addressed as separate entities with separate units of credit. By the mid-nineteen thirties, they were taken as all one study and covered under the broad heading of Theory, for which units of credit were increased. Students were divided into sections and grouped on the basis of native talent. A comprehensive music history survey in freshman year enabled a student to draw upon this historical knowledge throughout his college years. These courses in theory and history gave insight into how music was constructed, the elements of musical language, and how the style of each period was reflected in this language. A theoretical-historical foundation provided the intellectual basis for an emotional response to music—but not a substitute—and with this dual understanding, a means of “[handling] the fundamental problems of his art.”\textsuperscript{42} Other courses particularly related to the pianist—

\textsuperscript{40}Howard Hanson, \textit{Two Decades of Progress} (1941). Cited in Riker, 52.

\textsuperscript{41}Riker, 53.

\textsuperscript{42}Riker, 53.
keyboard harmony, ensemble, methods and pedagogy—addressed skills that would open up avenues of work in music beyond solo performance. Choral singing, a form of group music, was for the pianist the direct process of making musical sound, unlike the piano, where wood, felt, and metal of the instrument come between the fingers of the pianist and the sound. Vocal production provided a means of being closer to the naturalness of musical language.

Although the applied faculty had had performing careers, Hanson wanted artists committed to teaching and committed to the School. What cannot be known fully is all that was learned from the studio teacher and exactly how that was communicated. Applied teachers transmitted a performance ethic and a work ethic based on their own backgrounds through the music they taught and their suggestions for practice in developing technique, critical listening, and interpretative judgment. Their own musicianship and artistry formed the point of departure of their pedagogical method. In addition to shaping a professional view, the applied teacher had the opportunity to affect a student’s world view because of the nature of one-on-one teaching. During these twenty or so years the primary applied teachers were products of European tradition and moved with the School toward the Americanization of conservatory training.

And here is Eastman’s educational achievement—designing an American conservatory curriculum that gave academic study credibility and theoretical study logical ordering, while sustaining a rigorous performing standard. The early academic requirements pointed to the tension in and struggle with making a degree the citation for a completed course of study designed to meet the practical needs of the musician. It was understood that the liberal arts were essential to being an educated person, which a degree implied. Incorporating these into a program concentrated on the ‘practicing’ of music necessitated some compromise of ideology. Applied music presents unique problems to a course of study because the development and maintenance of the mechanical skill of playing an instrument cannot be interrupted. In the early years of the
School, students took liberal arts at the College of Arts and Science of the University. Over time, faculty from the University came to Eastman to teach academics until Eastman began hiring its own academic faculty. Such subjects as aesthetics, acoustics, fine arts, languages, literature, and psychology became an integral part of Eastman’s curriculum, but “the teaching of the so-called academic subjects to music students ... demanded a different pedagogic technic from that used in the same subjects at a liberal arts college.” And here is part of the compromise: “When it ... seemed wise, the materials for study [were] changed. Otherwise, the quality of instruction in the academic department ... adhered to the high standards maintained by the College of Arts and Science.” The other part of the compromise was to offer at Eastman those subjects that seemed compatible with an interest in music.

Eastman offered the Bachelor of Music degree from its inception while at the same time its course offerings underwent revision. Academics were distilled, theory was filled out, and applied study grew more demanding. Graduate degrees were awarded beginning in the 1920s in a variety of majors but not in applied music. By 1934/35 these included the Master of Arts and Master of Music degree in composition, musicology, music theory, and music education. The following year the Doctor of Philosophy degree in musicology, composition, and music theory was introduced. The Masters degree in applied music appeared in the 1940s but was offered as a major in performance and literature, suggesting a reluctance to have applied music stand alone. Rather it acquired viability with the integration of a somewhat academic component—music literature.

Dr. Hanson fostered a theory of education that maintained one area of interest is complemented by inquiry into other areas.

I find myself approaching steadily in the direction of what we might call a centripetal theory of education where the major interest and talent of the student in one field draws to its center an interest in other fields on its

__________________________

43Riker, 57.
periphery, the radius of the circle being directly proportional to the depth and strength of interest existing at that center.

An interest in the superficialities of an art may indeed cut one off from the world, but a deep immersion in the art cannot leave one satisfied until he has explored it in its entirety....

Changes to the curriculum in Piano, Theory, History of Music, and Academics and other subjects between 1921 and 1944 can be seen in Appendix B (Charts A, B, C, D, respectively).

The Juilliard School

Founders, Administrators, History

The story of the Juilliard School is that of two schools gradually coming together to form an undergraduate and graduate division. In its earliest history the Graduate School was not so in the traditional sense but in conceit, an idea that evolved over the course of its eighty-seven year history to become a professional school for the arts that now includes music, dance, and drama. Without the bequest of the philanthropist, Augustus D. Juilliard, who died in 1919, and without the already well-established Institute of Musical Art, the story would be quite a different one. In addition to Augustus Juilliard, the prime movers included a foundation and four men, each with his distinct commitment to music and music education.

Augustus Juilliard died the same summer as Andrew Carnegie. His will stated that the bequest of $20 million for the furtherance of music was to be governed by a corporation of three named trustees and two additional trustees chosen by the three.

The

44 Cited in Riker, 55: Howard Hanson, Convocation Address, September 1946.

45 In 1946 the Institute of Musical Art and the Juilliard Graduate School merged completely, becoming The Juilliard School of Music. In 1969, its name was changed to The Juilliard School to reflect its additional programs of study in theater and dance.

year following his death the Juilliard Musical Foundation was formed. According to the stipulations of the will, the Foundation funds were intended

a) to aid worthy students of music in securing a complete and adequate musical education, either at appropriate institutions now in existence or hereafter created, or from appropriate instructors in this country or abroad; b) to arrange for and to give without profit to it musical entertainments, concerts and recitals of a character appropriate for the education and instruction of the general public in the musical arts; and c) ... to aid by gift or part of such income at such times and to the extent in such amounts as the Trustees of said Foundation may in their discretion deem proper, the Metropolitan Opera of the City of New York, ... in the production of opera ... provided that ... such gifts shall in no wise inure to its monetary profit.47

Direct control over the disbursement of funds was left to the Foundation, as the amount for each endeavor was not specified.

Juilliard made his fortune in textiles. His was a French Huguenot family whose parents settled in Canton, Ohio, in 1836 and worked in dry goods. Having made occasional business trips to New York City, Juilliard moved there in 1866, eventually establishing a successful business in the distribution of textiles. “Textile merchants became rich because they provided the engine power—sails—for the great clipper ships.”48 Not a musician himself, he was especially fond of opera, however, serving on the board of the Metropolitan. His interests spread further: he served on the boards of the American Museum of Natural History, the American Geographical Society, the American Fine Arts Society, and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. His will also included bequests to several hospitals, to the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, and to St. John’s Guild of the City of New York. As the largest bequest for music up to that time, his generosity offered much optimism for the musical opportunities it might provide.

47Olmstead, 62.

48Ibid., 60-61.
y the testor’s will, the Foundation is required to retain a detached attitude and an open mind. It is thus, or it should be, the most powerful of all factors favoring artistic freedom and progress. A young singer who cannot command an adequate education, a musician or composer who cannot command a hearing, should find it predisposed toward every novel and truly vigorous artistic personality.... Organic institutions tend, by their very nature, to become hidebound. The spirit of such a foundation should be not that of a professor or master, but that of a friend—the enlightened lover of musical art.”

In 1923, the Foundation began awarding scholarships to students, usually of one thousand dollars for one year’s musical study, and fellowships to graduates for advanced study. Scholarships were either awarded directly by the Foundation upon application or given to schools to award to students of their choice. These were not endowed funds and the awards to schools appear to have been discontinued within a year or so. Fellowships were granted upon examination by the Foundation.

To conduct its business, the Foundation purchased the old Vanderbilt guest house on East 52nd Street, and announced in 1924 that at that location it would provide advanced music instruction in piano, violin, cello, voice, and composition for one hundred students of American birth, sixteen to thirty years of age. The purpose of the School would be to prepare students for public performance and to help them secure such opportunities. Fellowship awards were now designated for the newly created Juilliard Graduate School. Students were accepted by examination for one year, the only other entrance requirement being that of high school equivalency. The first examining committee consisted of an author, two critics, two conductors, a composer, and a pianist from the faculty of the Institute of Musical Art in New York City. Those awarded a fellowship received free tuition. The School had no core curriculum except that of


50 By 1930 a fee of $500 was charged for tuition with fellowships provided in whole or in part for students who could not meet this charge. 1930/31 Catalogue, 6. The Juilliard School Archives, and for all catalogue citations following in this section.
private instruction, for which a certificate was granted after three years’ study. Thus, the name Graduate School perhaps spoke more accurately of what was to come within two years than of its initial program—advanced applied study for the exceptionally gifted with a world-renowned artist faculty. The faculty of thirteen included three Americans by birth. The Australian, Ernest Hutcheson, the Russian, Josef Lhevinne, and the American, Olga Samaroff, comprised the faculty in piano. Ernest von Dohnányi, also appointed in piano, was unable to teach at the School because of illness. Standards were very high and a significant number of students were dropped after one year. Two years following its opening, the Juilliard Graduate School merged with the highly reputable Institute of Musical Art founded in 1905, and at this point the full story of the Juilliard School begins.

It is a happy association when the philanthropy of one finds its outlet in the passion of another. The other in this case was Frank Damrosch. The godson of Franz Liszt, after whom he was named, Frank Damrosch was born in 1859 in Breslau, Germany, into a musical family that would continue its musical interests and influence after immigrating to America in 1871. Frank, the eldest son, had studied piano with Rafael Joseffy, a Hungarian, who was a student of Liszt and editor of nearly all the piano works of Chopin. Both Damrosch parents were prominent musicians, his father a conductor and his mother a singer. Once here, Frank was appointed Supervisor of Music for the public schools in Denver, Colorado, before moving to New York in 1885 to become chorus master and assistant conductor of the Metropolitan Opera. In 1891 he was named Director of Music for the public schools in Manhattan and the Bronx, and in 1897, Supervisor of Music, a position newly created by the New York City Board of Education. As an educator and musician, he believed strongly in the positive benefits of sight-singing and dictation. For

51 Olmstead, 76.

52 Ibid., 11.
three years he had trained a four-year old in these skills before introducing her to the piano and had seen the positive effects of this training in his work. Influenced by the Felix Adler Society of Ethical Culture, Damrosch instituted the People’s Singing Classes, through which music was taught to the poor, and organized a series of symphony concerts for young people in order to provide knowledge of serious classical music that seemed so lacking in this country. He donated his services to these efforts, although the youth concerts were funded in part by Andrew Carnegie, with the result that he somewhat single-handedly enriched the musical life of the City. Unlike his parents and siblings, his strength and dedication lay in education. His vision encompassed the development of native talent not only as concert performers but also as well-trained teachers who would act as missionaries spreading the appreciation of music among a wide public.53

For over a decade Frank Damrosch had wanted to establish a music school but not until an accidental meeting in 1903 (on a steamer between Atlantic City and New York) with a former acquaintance, James Loeb, did his idea take shape into a reality. An endowment of five hundred thousand dollars raised through nine subscriptions would provide the funds needed for the school. However, to avoid delaying the project, Loeb decided to provide the total sum in honor of his mother, Betty Loeb. In all, he and his family would contribute over $1.5 million to the Institute of Musical Art, enabling the school to expand its facility and scholarships and to retain its exceptional faculty.54

Although James Loeb was a humanist by temperament and interest—a scholar, a gifted musician, and a student of fine arts—his career was defined by his father, who “insisted” that he carry on the family business in banking. He had studied at Harvard under the American composer John Knowles Paine, and the art historian Charles Norton; and he played both piano and cello especially well. His mother had been trained as a
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pianist. Loeb and Damrosch first met at a concert of the Musical Art Society, an early music organization of *a capella* singers founded by Damrosch in 1893. The similarities in background and the differences in personality were not as important as their sense of "duty and idealism ... their concern for the poor," and their love of music.\(^{55}\) Although a fragile temperament, Loeb was a part of the philanthropic culture that included such men as Carnegie and Peabody. In addition to the Institute, he funded the music building at Harvard, established the Loeb Classical Library, making available translations of ancient Greek and Latin authors, and funded a neurological and psychiatric research center in Munich, Germany. He spent most of his later years in Munich, where he died in 1933. Throughout Damrosch’s association with ‘his’ Institute of Musical Art, Loeb would remain an abiding friend and benefactor. Of him Damrosch wrote, “James Loeb, although intended for a career as banker, had the nature of an artist [and] a highly trained intellect, a love of beauty, a fine character, and a sympathy with any work that tended towards ideal conditions in the development of higher culture.”\(^{56}\)

The Betty Loeb Endowment Fund stipulated that the principal would be invested and only interest income would be used for expenses. The Institute would accept students of both sexes with no discrimination as to race, color, or creed. Finally, the funds would be returned if the Institute ceased to exist or if there were any breach of contract.\(^{57}\) The opening announcement of the Institute described the undertaking as one

\[\textit{devoted to ... the highest and most unselfish artistic purposes to advance the art of music by providing for students the highest class of musical instruction in all its branches—practical, theoretical, aesthetic; [and] to encourage}\]

\(^{55}\)Olmstead, 16.

\(^{56}\)As quoted in Olmstead, 13.

\(^{57}\)Olmstead, 16.
endeavor, to reward excellence, and generally to promote the knowledge and appreciation of the arts in the community.”

Like New England Conservatory’s Eben Tourjée a half a century earlier, Damrosch visited several European conservatories to study methods of teaching and their administrative organization, and to review their origins and development. What he found was “a lack of eclectic individualism in the instruction of pupils, together with the almost complete absence of a unified pedagogic scheme.” Although these conservatories achieved excellent results in some cases, for the most part their eminent and well-qualified teachers were concerned only with their specialty and were not informed or interested in the rest of a student’s musical education. “The result [was] a highly specialized self-centered egotistical virtuoso but not the really great artist whose mastery of the technique of his art is joined to a most thorough musicianship, artistic perception, and general culture and to whom virtuosity is but a means to a higher end.” Even more problematic was the uneven development of students, who were not required to follow a coherent and intelligently and comprehensively constructed course of study. Catalogues listed several appropriate courses, but there existed no administrative organization to oversee a plan of study or to record what was taken. In assessing what America then

---

58 Damrosch, 35.

59 Conservatories began during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in Naples and Venice as well-endowed hospitals and schools that took in mostly children of poor parentage or orphans. A musician who provided music for the chapel was usually included among the schoolteachers. As patronage moved from church to court for its military bands, these schools expanded to include training in instrumental music. Out of these developed some of the important eighteenth- and nineteenth-century conservatories in Europe. Thus, the term conservatory refers to the conserving of music by tradition and performance and also to the conserving of the spirit by nurturing the young and providing training for a profession. Frank Damrosch, “The American Conservatory, Its Aims and Possibilities,” Papers and Proceedings of the Music Teachers National Association at its Twenty-eighth Annual Meeting, 1906, 13.

offered, Damrosch believed that conservatories, colleges, and university music departments were usually organized by people “whose commercial instincts were stronger than [their] musical conscience.”

The Institute would address these considerations, prescribing instead a viable plan of study, logically organized and carefully supervised, intended to elevate artistic standards. To accomplish this it would provide a musical education to all who wished to pursue serious study—not only to those entering the profession of music, but also to the serious amateur. The practical musician, after all, depended on the musical knowledge of the public at large to find a venue for his profession. That collective body was the audience. Damrosch outlined four elements essential to a successful school: 1) The faculty must be outstanding in its individual specialty yet well grounded in pedagogy; 2) every student was to pursue “a course of study intelligently designed and adapted to his needs”; 3) founders, administrators, and faculty must be concerned first with the development of musicianship, not monetary considerations; and finally, 4) the “environment of the school must be such as to afford contact with high manifestations of the art, so that ambition may be stimulated, judgment directed and steadied, good taste cultivated, and industry and zeal inspired and rewarded.”

For its first twenty-one years, Damrosch oversaw the direction of ‘his’ school in an “authoritarian and paternal” manner as to courses, dress, behavior, use of free time, and outside reading. He assigned students to teachers, remained informed of their progress, and of his faculty expected no less than loyalty and ethical conduct. The Institute opened in October 1905 in the Lenox Mansion at the corner of Fifth Avenue and Twelfth Street with a student enrollment of two hundred eighty-one, far more than the expected one.

61Ibid., 15.
62Damrosch, Institute, 36.
63Martin, 228.
hundred fifty. Within the year the numbers reached four hundred sixty-seven. As a consequence, in 1910 the Institute moved to a larger newly constructed building on Claremont Avenue and 122nd Street, where it, and later the Graduate School, would remain until relocating in the 1960s to Lincoln Center. At the opening ceremonies, Woodrow Wilson, then president of Princeton, described the concern of Damrosch “not so much to teach a man expression as to give him something to express.”\(^6\) But in recognizing the value of a broad education, Damrosch also understood the particular demands of the musician. “It [is] not so much the nature of the curriculum that, in my opinion, retards the student of music [with regard to academic study], but rather the demands it makes on his time and strength.”\(^6\) A student aspiring to a career in performance must devote four to five hours daily to practice along with two hours to theoretical study. To obtain the control of the instrument this career demands, study must begin early in life, from eight to eighteen years of age, and these years are followed by studies in advanced solo and ensemble literature. Such rigor limits the time for in-depth study of other subjects. Furthermore, such training is best accomplished in a music school: “The academic atmosphere which of necessity reigns in an academic institution rarely permits the creation of the artistic atmosphere required for the generation and cultivation of the imagination without which no work of art, no matter how correctly performed, can be properly interpreted.”\(^6\) Although European universities granted degrees in music history, musicology, and aesthetics, no degrees were granted for applied


\(^6\) Frank Damrosch, “A College Degree in the Education of the Musician,” *Proceedings of the Music Teachers’ National Association*, 1926, 82. This view was similarly held by John Erskine.

\(^6\) Ibid., 82.
music because “the training of a musician does not belong in an academic institution” but rather in a “special school with its own atmosphere, ideals, and methods of measuring quality and quantity.”

The Institute was equipped with a complete and comprehensive library of standard musical compositions for all areas of study as well as a large collection of books treating all aspects of musical subjects. In addition, the Institute purchased the Circulating Library of the music publisher G. Schirmer. Its most important equipment, though, was its core of teachers. In addition to being successful independent teachers and artists in their own right, the faculty must be able to teach with pedagogical logic and willing to correlate its work with a total plan of education. It required, to some degree, a compromise of individuality and independence to the larger aims of the school, and of the director an innate sense as to who would accommodate these larger goals. The Institute’s first faculty included the American theorist Percy Goetschius, the four members of the Kneisel Quartette, all of whom had played in the Boston Symphony, and the Polish pianist Sigismond Stojowski to head the piano department. Goetschius had achieved international fame as a teacher of theory and composition, was the author of nine theory texts, and prior to 1905 had been on the faculty of the New England Conservatory. Stojowski had been a pupil of Paderewski and at the Paris Conservatory had studied

67Ibid., 83. Damrosch’s disapproval of European conservatories excepted the Royal College of Music in England. Because of the need to train church musicians to an assured level of competency, candidates for the Bachelor of Music or the Doctorate of Music were examined by university faculty although trained in regular schools of music.

68F. Damrosch, “Music in the College,” Baton (1928), Vol. VI. No. 3, 9. The Juilliard School Archives. An artistic atmosphere comes into being by the dignified environment of artists’ and students’ recitals, by illustrated lectures, and by opportunities of coming into contact with outstanding visiting artists. It also includes a spirit of ‘loyal cooperation’ in the purpose of the school. 1930/31 IMA Catalogue, 15. The Juilliard School Archives.
under Léo Delibes. He remained at the Institute until 1911, established a successful private teaching studio in New York City for several years, and during the summer of 1932, taught at the Graduate School.

During the years prior to 1926, the Institute developed a program in public school music through its association with Teachers College, a program for opera through its association with the Metropolitan Opera, and a group of preparatory training centers throughout the City. These centers offered instrumental lessons during the week with classes in ear-training, elementary theory, Dalcroze eurhythmics, and orchestra at the Institute on Saturday mornings. In 1920, classes in chamber music for strings under violinist Franz Kneisel and violist Louis Svencenski and for piano and strings under pianist James Friskin were begun. An article in the Spring 1906 issue of The Etude magazine predicted that the generosity of James Loeb would set in motion a wave of philanthropy (as well, a standard) for music schools in other cities. The Institute of Musical Art “will have an influence more far-reaching than it is safe to predict.”

It did—and the possibilities it might afford the Graduate School were carefully weighed by the Juilliard Musical Foundation. On January 25, 1926, the Trustees of the Foundation announced their plans

---

69 Pianist Ignace Paderewski, born in Poland in 1860, was an overnight success and referred to by some as a “genius who also plays the piano.” By today’s standards his technique was formed on bad habits, although his playing is said to show many “masterful assets.” For a time he served as Prime Minister of Poland. Lyle, 210-211. Composer Léo Delibes was born in Paris in 1836.

70 Eurhythmics is an introduction to music incorporating rhythmic movement, aural training, and improvisation developed by the Swiss educator, Émile Jaques-Dalcroze.

71 Svencenski was a member of the Kneisel Quartette. The English pianist James Friskin had taught at the Royal College for the Blind before joining the faculty of the Institute of Musical Art.

72 Olmstead, 29.
for the establishment and maintenance of a comprehensive institution for
musical education to be located in New York City. This institution [would] be supported by the Juilliard Foundation and [would] be in charge of a board of nine men carefully chosen for their experience and special fitness, corresponding to a board of trustees of a college or university.... Instead of creating a new institution with departments of different grades it was deemed wise to incorporate several existing schools into one general plan, and to this end the Institute of Musical Art was [to] become a component part of the educational work of the Juilliard Musical Foundation.  

The original five-hundred-thousand-dollar endowment for the Institute was put into the Betty Loeb fund, in honor of the founder’s mother, with its income after provisions for pensions to be used for scholarships. The Juilliard School would be governed by the Trustees of the Foundation, serving as the finance committee, and a Board of Directors of the School, serving as the executive committee. Each institution was to remain a separate entity—with its own faculty, student body, and later even its own entrance, when in 1931 the Graduate School would be annexed to the Institute at Claremont Avenue. The Institute would continue as a conservatory for both elementary and advanced students who, for the most part, paid tuition; and the Graduate School would continue for the training of highly advanced students admitted by competitive examination with tuition covered by fellowship.

Frank Damrosch was named Dean of the Institute, a position he would hold until illness intervened in 1932. From a business perspective, the decision was wise, since without another substantial infusion of funds, the Institute could not hope to compete for teachers with the newly established Eastman School of Music in Rochester and The Curtis Institute in Philadelphia. The Graduate School would benefit as well: Though doing good work, it was not utilizing its resources fully because of its inability to integrate the “larger interests of society” into its educational plan.  

Nevertheless, the acceptance of the merge by the Institute’s original board meant, in effect, that control of

---
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the Institute would shift from Damrosch to a new governing body. Ernest Hutcheson, from the piano faculty of the Graduate School (and formerly at Peabody and the Institute of Musical Art), was named Dean of the Graduate School in 1927, and in 1928 the distinguished scholar John Erskine was appointed President of the combined institutions. The schools were intended to complement each other, and to this purpose the 1924 title ‘graduate school’ was prescient. Initially this was a graduate school in the sense that, in terms appropriate to the profession, it provided the most advanced training in an environment of uncompromising standards for the performance major guided by a faculty of international artistic recognition. Now merged, the Institute provided undergraduate study giving viability to the term graduate school.

The new dean, Ernest Hutcheson, was born in 1871 in Carlton, Australia, a suburb of Melbourne, and was the eldest of five children. After his early education with the “best musician” in Australia, Rev. George William Torrance, and Max Vogrich, he went to Leipzig in 1886 where he studied piano with Bruno Zwintscher and Carl Reinecke, and theory and counterpoint with Salomon Jadassohn. Jadassohn was a highly influential theorist and through his manuals on theory codified traditional views on harmony, counterpoint, and form. Hutcheson graduated at the age of nineteen. In his Memoirs he described the Leipzig Conservatory as being “excessively conservative and the vocal department in particular [as being] incredibly poor, [with] no recall of having heard one good singer there.” Following his graduation, he traveled to Weimar to continue piano studies with Bernhard Stavenhagen, a pupil of Liszt. There he met Irmgart Senffit, also an

75Gottlieb, 22. Erskine had already served on the Foundation Board for two years and later would be named President of the Board.

76Hutcheson Papers, Box 15. The Juilliard School Archives. Torrance was both clergyman and composer having studied music in Leipzig. Vogrich had also studied in Leipzig with Carl Reinecke.
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exceptional pianist, and after their marriage in 1897 moved to Berlin the following year. In Europe he enjoyed success as a composer, pianist, conductor, and teacher. His associations included both musicians and other intellectuals, among them, Nietzsche. He and Irmgart immigrated to America in 1900 where he became head of the piano faculty at Peabody Conservatory in Baltimore, a position he held until 1912. The prior year he had been appointed chair of the piano department at the Chautauqua Institute, and he remained in that position until 1944.

In 1917 Hutcheson joined the faculty of the Institute of Musical Art, and in 1924 was appointed to the piano faculty of the Juilliard Graduate School. A facile pianist, he possessed an enormous repertoire with twenty recital programs and eleven concertos at his ready disposal. Of his playing, the composer and critic Virgil Thompson wrote, “If he possessed more fire and intimacy he would be one of the greats.” Truly a man of letters, he was self-taught and an avid reader of philosophy, art, and science. His writings included the Ring by Wagner, Electra, a manual on piano technique, and a text on the literature of the piano, but as a composer he decided for himself that he would never achieve greatness. At Carnegie Hall he presented a series of concerts covering the history of the piano from the sixteenth century to the modern day, a companion series to his book on piano literature. With the advent of radio as a means of disseminating an awareness of art music, Hutcheson appeared on weekly broadcasts for which he said he practiced four hours. During his student years in Europe he noted his thoughts regarding study and talent: “Sometimes there is a dull period when nothing goes well. If I were to formulate an artistic creed the first article might well be, ‘I believe in the need of initial talent and in

---

78 Olmstead, 97. Chautauqua was founded in 1874 by two Methodists. It brought together a gathering of distinguished people who gave classes on literature and music, lectures on a wide variety of topics, and recitals. John Erskine, My Life in Music, 30.

the efficacy of work.’’ One of his teachers, Bruno Zwintscher, had passed on to him the words of Mendelssohn: “To practice more than four hours a day is to practice your time away.” Hutcheson continued, “It is regularity of work that counts most, I found, and I maintain this in spite of many, especially teachers of the older Russian school, who have advised seven or eight hours’ daily drill.”

Hutcheson kept meticulous notes on his practice, his repertory and when he studied each work, his students, on pieces presented in his piano classes, and on his earnings. Among his listed activities in 1896, for example, he noted over four hundred lessons taught, thirty-five public performances given, twenty new pieces learned, over one hundred books mostly of a serious kind read, a lecture on Wagner’s *Ring*, and the composition of a Scherzo and Capriccio for piano, and six songs. He adhered to a very high ethical standard and as a much sought after teacher, heard no student without the consent of the student’s teacher if that student were currently studying. As Dean he encouraged the Juilliard faculty to develop a Code of Ethics. Often asked why schools such as Juilliard, Eastman, and Curtis continued to train young musicians for a career for which there was no demand, Hutcheson’s position was that the growing interest in music presented many opportunities, especially outside of urban centers. Many students were in fact already “gainfully employed” as musicians, and for the pianist in particular there was work as teachers, accompanists, and occasionally as concert performers. He was committed to protecting the interests of the American composer and in developing an artistic sense in the American people. He believed that few studies stimulate the mental process as music does.

80 Hutcheson Papers, Box 15, The Juilliard School Archives.

81 Hutcheson Papers, Box 18, The Juilliard School Archives.

82 Hutcheson Papers, “Outlook for Music in America” (Reprint of an address for radio, March 17, 1934), handwritten pamphlet, Box 18. The Juilliard School Archives.
It has often struck me that if we could educate our hands, our eyes, our

tongue, and our thoughts and feelings properly to fulfill their functions, the
choice of subjects in our curricula would become a matter of minor
importance. Such training, I believe, would undoubtedly fit us for our
vocations in life, would make intelligent and civilized human beings of us,
would direct us to good manners and good morals. The practice of music
would certainly fit into this scheme of education. You train the hand by
playing an instrument, the tongue by singing, along with the eye and ear and
most of all thought and feeling.  

He taught many who went on to well established careers, among them Olga
Samaroff, who served on the faculties of both Juilliard and Curtis, and John Erskine, who
was both friend and colleague. As a teacher and administrator, Hutcheson heard all
entering and final piano exams. It was said that there are over one thousand students
whose genealogy can be traced to him. Of his students, Hutcheson kept meticulous
records, numbering each, recording pieces studied, and in notebooks notating the
progress of each lesson. Of teaching, Hutcheson wrote,

To be a good teacher, one must have wide experience, keen intuition, and a
[lively] impatience. Yes, impatience; impatience to get ahead, to keep
moving, to create and develop creativity.... My few talented pupils are
difficult to teach. The gifted student in coming to Juilliard will bear the
routine of hardship and experience to [learn that] playing is a problem.  

After a hiatus of more than twenty years, John Erskine resumed his piano study
under Ernest Hutcheson in 1924, the year of the opening of the Juilliard Graduate School.
Born in New York in 1880, Erskine was surrounded by music in his youth, especially
through his father, who was a member of Leopold Damrosch’s New York Oratorio
Society. He studied piano with Carl Walter, organist at St. Bartholomew’s in New York
City, but the strongest musical influence of his youth was that of the American composer
Edward MacDowell, with whom he studied piano and composition during his

83 Address at a concert in Riverdale, May 1931, Hutcheson Papers, Box 18.

Archives.

85 Independent folder, Box 18.
undergraduate years at Columbia. When Erskine asked MacDowell if he had any special talent, his mentor replied, “No ... but enough to make a good craftsman if you work hard ... [and to become a] foundation for great talents....” To Erskine that translated into “paving stones ... which [he] preferred not to be.”

Receiving his Ph.D. also at Columbia, Erskine moved into an academic and literary career. During his first teaching years at Amherst he heard both Olga Samaroff and Josef Hofmann, with whom he would become colleagues later in life. He returned to Columbia as Professor of English in 1908, remaining until 1927. Over the course of his career he authored several successful novels, librettos for operas, and books and articles on music. In the fall of 1916 Erskine was sent to France to found the American University at Beaune. Among his most significant academic achievements was his creation of the Great Books course—one book assigned each week for discussion. The program was adopted at many schools, for example St. John’s College in Annapolis, where it became the backbone of its curriculum, and the University of Chicago. Although he believed in the value of learning different artistic mediums, ultimately “for every temperament there is one language in which expression may become complete and satisfying.”

The summer prior to his work in France Erskine agreed to offer three weeks of literature classes at the Chautauqua Institute. It was on this occasion that he met the Hutchesons, a meeting that began a long association of friendship and professional comradeship. He found Hutcheson to be of “remarkable character.” Seven years later

86Erskine, My Life in Music, 4.
87Samaroff was a member of the initial Graduate School faculty; Hofmann was director of The Curtis Institute during part of Erskine’s presidency.
88John Erskine, My Life as a Teacher, 233.
89Erskine, My Life in Music, 31.
Erskine resumed his piano study under Hutcheson’s guidance. His first assignment was a summer devoted to Czerny Studies and Bach. With the reorganization of the Graduate School 1926, Erskine was invited to become a member of the new Board of Directors, most likely with a supportive recommendation by Hutcheson. Erskine would remain director of the Juilliard School Board, as well as a trustee of the Juilliard Foundation and chairman of the Metropolitan Opera Board, until his death in 1951. In 1928 Erskine was appointed President of the combined schools, a tenure that would last for nine years until his resignation for reasons of health. His views on music embraced popular taste and recognized the power of public will:

Theoretically music rests on popular impulse ... popular we call it, not vulgar. To retain its hold on the mass of humanity it must continue to express, in however refined a form, all sides of that basic impulse. If it doesn’t, the popular impulse will take its revenge—humanity will express itself somehow ... In music the popular impulse is all for rhythm, then melody, and finally harmony.... Jazz seems to me normal and healthy.\(^90\)

Throughout his tenure as President, Erskine received many offers to perform, and did so not always with critical success, but this was not a deterrent. It would be unfair to draw a comparison to his mentor, Ernest Hutcheson, or to pianist Josef Hofmann, his colleague at Curtis. Perhaps Erskine was a representative of the highly competent amateur-borderline professional, an example where “all art begins in the amateur spirit.”\(^91\) Yet Erskine’s love of literature, music, and teaching was sincere and generous. And his outstanding ability as an administrator proved itself by the esteem to which he brought the school, in spite of his tendency toward pretentiousness, self-advertising, and the “very naïve belief that the attention paid him was owing to personal achievements rather than to the money he controlled.”\(^92\)


\(^91\)Hutcheson Papers, Box 18.

\(^92\)Martin, 302.
The history of Juilliard during the years of the Erskine Presidency, from 1928 to 1937, saw the creation of a string orchestra and opera school under the outstanding direction of the American conductor Albert Stoessel, the continued growth of an acclaimed artist faculty, and the development of a more structured curriculum and administrative organization. In 1929 the Institute was approved for the granting of a Bachelor of Music Education degree, “enough to give [the school] a place in the school system, and beyond that, degrees are a nuisance.”93 In 1931 the Graduate School relocated to the site of the Institute on 122nd Street with a new annex providing an adequate hall for the performance of opera.94 Erskine disproved of a downtown site for the School because the atmosphere encouraged “somewhat exclusively” the career of a virtuoso rather than a school primarily for instruction.95

Although innovative opera productions had been ongoing, an opera school in conjunction with the Graduate School was formalized in 1935. It was open to students and graduates of both the Institute and the Graduate School. A significant outreach program offered through the Extension Department of the Graduate School began in 1929. Students were sent to centers throughout the country to develop and foster community music programs and educational activities. Initially Juilliard funded these programs, gradually decreasing funds as the programs took hold. With such efforts the

93Erskine to Hutcheson, letter of July 30, 1929; Box 2, Folder 7. The Juilliard School Archives. Erskine also remained removed from membership in the National Association of Schools of Music. In a letter to the then president of NASM, Harold Butler, he wrote, “With the faculty which we are fortunate enough to have in the Graduate School and in the Institute of Musical Art, I should personally be unwilling to see our program influenced by considerations which may very well be valid in other parts of the country or in schools less fortunately equipped, but which will be of no advantage to us.” October 16, 1929. Box 2, Folder 21. The Juilliard Archives.

94His son Graham worked for the architects Shreve, Lamb, and Harmon, and had a hand in designing the building. Letter of Helen Worden Erskine to William M. Moore, January 2, 1958. Columbia University Rare Books and Manuscripts Collection.

95Letter of December 21, 1929; Box 2, Folder 5. The Juilliard School Archives.
school encouraged its graduates to look beyond big centers in which to establish their careers and instead to bring their talent to communities where it would be needed and used. A student advisory committee recommended students as soloists or teachers in general for outside employment.\textsuperscript{96} In support of American music, from the 1930s to 1945 the Graduate School conducted an annual competition to publish a new work by an American composer.\textsuperscript{97}

Upon the retirement of Frank Damrosch in 1933, Ernest Hutcheson was appointed dean of the combined schools and in 1937 was named president. Not an administrator by temperament, he oversaw the School throughout the war years with steadiness and an enlightened direction. These were critical years. Although student enrollment seems to have held, the number of male students decreased markedly, replaced by females, and the faculty was repeatedly reminded not to express a negative attitude to those drafted because of the loss of valuable time away from their study.

The Juilliard School flourished, bringing an extraordinary faculty together to train some of this country’s most outstanding artists. Juilliard would define one very high standard in its striving for perfection in music education for the professional musician. The commitment was a very large one: “Musical performance differs from any other recitation now encouraged in our classrooms in that it must be good as a whole as well as in detail and the student can expect no lucky break in the [attention] he draws from the instructor.”\textsuperscript{98} To develop standards of taste, judgment, and refinement that finds a basis with a secure foundation in ear training, theory, and history was assumed an ongoing commitment. “A true musician must be able to develop his music out of himself, by

\textsuperscript{96}1932/33 Catalogue. The Juilliard School Archives, and for all subsequent catalogues in this section.

\textsuperscript{97}Gottlieb, 19.

himself ... [and only from this foundation can] the interpretation of music through one’s performance be fully recognized.”

The Institute of Musical Art

The Curriculum: 1905-1945

The original Prospectus of the Institute of Musical Art announced a faculty to teach all stringed instruments, piano, organ, voice, and harp, winds and brass, French, Italian, and German, pedagogy, chorus, and theory, composition, ear training, and sight-singing. Five instructors were named under the course entitled Lectures—topics of an academic nature generally relating to history and aesthetics of music, literature, and methods of study. The piano faculty numbered fifteen, with Sigismund Stojowski as department head. A second heading entitled “Subjects to be Taught” included acoustics, the elements of music, sight-singing and sight-playing, dictation, the history and aesthetics of music, piano, counterpoint, harmony, composition, musical form, ensemble playing, pedagogy in all its branches, voice, conducting, interpretation, languages, oratorio, song and opera singing, stage deportment and dramatic action, stringed and wind instruments, organ, choir and the training of boys’ voices, plainsong, playing from old clefs, and church services—Catholic, Protestant, Hebrew. One year later analysis, score reading, and public school music were added. Students could enroll either as special students, taking any course of interest, or as regular students, following a prescribed course of study. “Courses [were] planned upon liberal lines, with a view of improving everything

99 Damrosch, Institute, 327.

100 Pianist and composer Sigismund Stojowski was born in Poland and studied at the Paris Conservatory and later with Ignace Paderewski. He was regarded both as a brilliant pedagogue and a warm and sympathetic human being. David Dubal, The Art of the Piano (Pompton Plains, NJ: Amadeus Press, 2004), 345.
essential to students’ needs for all-around progress.” Another word for liberal might have been flexible, as a program was designed for each student according to his needs and determined by the director. Thus, one area of study may have been advanced while another elementary or another omitted all together if sufficiently mastered. The regular course consisted of three years of study and in applied piano included the following areas:

- The piano – technique, touch, phrasing, interpretation;
- Ear training, sight-singing, music dictation, choral practice;
- Elements of music – notation, intervals, rhythm;
- Theory of music – melody writing, harmony, form, analysis, counterpoint;
- Sight-playing – ensemble with two pianos and with strings;
- Attendance at lectures, recitals, rehearsals, concerts.

The distribution of classes generally adhered to the plan outlined below. The presence of ear training and dictation each year supported Damrosch’s belief in the unquestioned benefits of these skills.

The first year

The piano

Ear training – dictation – sight-singing

Elements of music – notation.

The second year

The piano

Dictation

Sight-singing

Harmony

101 Prospectus of The Institute of Musical Art of the City of New York, New York, 4. Juilliard School Archives.
Attendance at lectures, etc.

The third year

The piano

Dictation

Sight-playing

Ensemble playing

Counterpoint, musical form, analysis

Attendance at lectures, etc.

Having successfully completed this program, a student could move into a post-graduate artists’ course of advanced study in piano, theory, and ensemble playing—in chamber music and with orchestra. Attendance at lectures was also an integral part of this program, becoming a requirement the following year for both students in the regular course and those in the artists’ course.\(^{102}\) Having passed exams satisfactorily, regular students would receive a diploma, and post-graduate students either the artist’s diploma for performance or the teacher’s diploma.

By 1910 the Catalogue described the Institute as an advanced school of music providing “regularity and discipline lacking in private teaching ... [and] cultivating mental powers and will-control in the students of art frequently charged with over stimulating the emotional state.”\(^{103}\) Specific categories for repertory for the final exam in piano listed a Prelude and Fugue from the Well-Tempered Clavier by Bach, a sonata by Beethoven up to the middle-period works of Opus 31, and a representative romantic piece not involving virtuoso technique. These requirements, Bach, Beethoven, and a romantic work, remain fundamental to exam requirements in piano to the present day.

\(^{102}\)1907/08 IMA Catalogue, 14. The Juilliard School Archives, and for all subsequent catalogues in this section.

\(^{103}\)1910/1911 IMA Catalogue, 5.
the baroque, classic, and romantic musical styles, these categories embrace a wide interpretative understanding and demand a discipline of study that shows the development of pianism and musicianship. With this foundation in place, a student could then find an avenue of expression for his individual personality, talent, and ability within the large repertory of piano works. As significant was the unspoken conviction that Bach and Beethoven are the great masters to learn and to learn from. The romantic repertory brings pianism to another technical and emotional level with much opportunity for a varied and wide interpretative palette and brilliant and dazzling playing. The omission of virtuosity, in the case of the Institute, may have indicated a commitment to Damrosch’s insistence on musicianship: What musicianship is apparent in cantabile playing, bringing a natural singing style to a melody conceived on the piano, without the distraction of impressive technique? Or it may have been a reaction to the empty virtuosity that began to overrun piano performance and composition in the late nineteenth century as instruments improved. In either case, it was through the study of these styles that the pianist mastered ‘The piano’ as described in the catalogue—technique, touch, phrasing, interpretation.

Over the next four years the course of study developed into a program of five to seven hours of class work and lessons each week. Giving more clarification to the two courses of study, a ‘diploma’ was awarded to the graduate of the regular course and a ‘certificate’ to the post-graduate, a distinction between teachers and artists-performers now put in place. Diploma graduates would be called associates; certificate graduates, alumni or alumnae. The regular course remained a three-year program but length of study for the post-graduate was either one or two years, depending on artistic and technical maturity. The exam for the regular course added sight-reading. A further addition, it was understood that the candidate would have thoroughly completed three compositions in each category listed above and that the Beethoven sonata selected for the exam could not be Opus 2, No. 1, or 10, No. 1, or 14, No. 1—these considered more student works. The
performer was required not only to maintain “high grades of scholarship,” but also to have given a public recital before “musicians of standing not connected with the Institute.”

High school graduation remained the only requirement for admission. By 1920 the applicant in piano had to meet a level of playing comparable to studies by Czerny or etudes by Heller, all together still a very modest requirement. Each week the student pianist met for two half-hour lessons, along with two hours of ear training, one in theory, one or more for lectures, and perhaps a course in ensemble playing ranging from one piano four hands to two pianos eight hands to more advanced chamber music with strings. Lectures included such topics as technique of study—an outgrowth of concern that students with so few hours in class each week did not know how to use the rest of their time effectively in preparation for lessons and classes. (A description of the curriculum for theory, ear training, and keyboard harmony as it appeared in the 1920 Catalogue is presented in Appendix B (Chart E). A comparison can be made to the listings in the 1935 and 1940 catalogues, where a fuller account of the work covered for each subject each year is given.)

Tests in ear training and theory, placement tests in effect, became standard procedure for applicants by 1935. In addition applicants had to show ‘aptitude and talent.’ Students were enrolled for the entire year and were liable for tuition for the entire year. The minimum piano requirement for admission added more composers to the list—a study by Czerny, an etude by Heller, a Two-part Invention by Bach, a sonatina by Clementi or a sonata by Haydn or Mozart, and a work by Mendelssohn, Chopin, or Schumann—although the level was not considerably more advanced. Within the program itself, there was little change: one hour more meeting time each week was added to

104 1914/15 IMA Catalogue, 18.
theory; ensemble and keyboard harmony became requirements for the pianist, while lectures and chorus became optional. Basic courses were

- Piano – two half-hour lessons
- Ear training – two hours
- Theory – two hours
- Keyboard harmony and ensemble – not specified

Members of the faculty, alumni, and visiting artists presented weekly lectures, and students were able to attend the ten lectures at the Graduate School given by President Erskine. Candidates for the certificate (performers) had to be approved by their applied teacher and the dean and had to complete the “IIIrd” level in theory, ear training, keyboard harmony, and ensemble. They also had to be in residence for study for one year, which could be satisfied in a variety of ways.105 The Preludes and Fugues of the Well-Tempered Clavier and the sonatas of Beethoven remained on the exam program, to which was added the choice of a sonata by Schubert in place of Beethoven, along with a romantic work specifically by Chopin, Schumann, or Brahms. The final exam program, to be played from memory, was assigned in February for the May exam. A week prior to the exam a work of moderate difficulty selected by the faculty to be learned without assistance was also assigned.

No time limit was set for the post-graduate candidates, although a two-year limit was usual. These certificate candidates were required to complete advanced theory classes—theory IVA, dictation V, and keyboard harmony V. The requirements for their piano exam were more demanding and included:

1) one of the larger compositions by Bach (a Partita, Toccata, etc.);
2) a sonata by Beethoven later than Op. 22 and omitting Opp. 49, 106, 109, 110, and 111 (leaving the selection mainly among middle-period works);

3) a nocturne, ballade, scherzo or the F Minor Fantasy by Chopin;
4) two pieces from the Fantasy Pieces or Novelettes or Kreisleriana by Schumann;
5) a rhapsody, transcription, or etude by Liszt;
6) a work by MacDowell, Debussy, Ravel, Rachmaninoff, Scriabin, or any other modern composer.

One piece from this list was to be prepared without any assistance or ‘criticism.’ What remained consistent in the exam program were Bach, Beethoven, and a major romantic work. The new additions were a large-scale composition by Liszt displaying virtuosity, and a twentieth-century composition, both categories expanding the spectrum of interpretation and technique while limiting the number of candidates, because of the difficult level of playing required, and thus limiting the number of certificates awarded.

In 1924 the Institute began an affiliation with Teachers College to offer a four-year Bachelor of Music degree in Music Education. Music courses were taken at the Institute and all academics at Teachers College. Eight years later the New York State Department of Education began a revision of degrees conferred by its educational institutions in order to simplify and clarify the variety of degrees offered. At the Institute the degree was changed to a Bachelor of Science with a major in education, and by 1940 the degree program included a major in applied music. Degrees demand their own set of controls. In this case a high school average grade of eighty percent and a total of sixteen high school units—four in English, two in foreign languages, one each in math, science, and history, one-half in civics, with six and one-half in electives—were required for admission. The degree candidate had one more year to complete all academics in addition to all of the regular music courses, totaling four years. Schedules were planned so that a student was
at school four days a week and had four hours each day for practice.\textsuperscript{106} (How courses were distributed is shown in Appendix B, Chart F.)

In summary, the applied major received the greatest amount of units (points), followed by theory and related subjects, and finally academics, which included psychology, history of music, foreign language, and ethics. In addition there were courses in pedagogy for piano and for theory, and a one-year requirement for chorus and for physical education. Repertory for the performance exam followed that for the certificate course of study (post-graduate), offered concurrently with the degree program. Performance exam requirements were unaltered for all candidates, degree or non-degree. The following year, however, the exam also included a ‘substantial’ piece prepared without any assistance assigned two weeks before the final exam. This was the same criterion as that for the post-graduate but at a greater level of difficulty and with an additional week for preparation.

A revised listing for courses gave a new numbering system indicating level of advancement by term and applicable to either degree or diploma candidates. The regular course of three years’ study was approximately a commitment half that for the degree, and was tabulated by hours per week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1\textsuperscript{st} Year</th>
<th>2\textsuperscript{nd} Year</th>
<th>3\textsuperscript{rd} Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano (1 hr.)</td>
<td>Piano (1)</td>
<td>Piano (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear training 11-12 (2)</td>
<td>Ear training 21-22 (2)</td>
<td>Ear training 31-32 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBHarm.11-12 (1)</td>
<td>KBHarm. 21-22 (1)</td>
<td>KBHarm. 31-32 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble (1)</td>
<td>Ensemble (1)</td>
<td>Ensemble (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture (1)</td>
<td>Music history (1)</td>
<td>Lecture (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorus (1)</td>
<td>Chorus (1)</td>
<td>Chorus (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{106}Juilliard Archives, Faculty Minutes, October 25, 1938, 1.
The post-graduate took advanced (104) level courses in theory, analysis, dictation, and keyboard harmony, along with classes in methods and general psychology. In an effort to coordinate piano and theory more closely, the theory department provided an outline of work for each level and a detailed analysis of one or two compositions as a guide for theoretical application to performance study.

Many among the piano faculty enjoyed long careers at the Institute. Helena Augustin was appointed the year the Institute opened, as was Gaston Dethier, who also taught organ, and both were still listed in the 1940 Catalogue. The close of the first decade of the Institute saw the appointments of James Friskin and Carl Friedberg, and shortly later Gordon Stanley. Although both the Institute and the Graduate School remained separate entities, faculty and students of the Institute benefited from joint faculty meetings with the Graduate School that began in the 1930s, following the appointment of Ernest Hutcheson as dean, and were ongoing until the complete merge of the two schools in 1946.

Considering these first years, the factor that most gives the Institute its distinct character is a steadiness of purpose born out in its curriculum and in the standards it sought to set. Unlike its nineteenth-century counterparts, its original vision remained in focus. First and foremost, it was a ‘conservatory’ of music. Courses were added to the catalogue and expanded upon, but the diploma/certificate program of study remained intact, never veering from its original format. The influence of the European conservatory was apparent—academics were present through lectures, yet no conflict with the aim of acquiring sound musicianship ensued. Unlike Europe, a course of study and level of achievement was prescribed—with supervision. This was one aspect of its American dimension. The rigor of study was reserved for developing strong aural recognition and sight-reading skills, handed down from the educational principles of its first director, Frank Damrosch, and a secure knowledge of theoretical material—harmony,
counterpoint, form and analysis. The focus of applied study was centered on pinpointing the skills that are necessary for competent playing and constructing a means of assessing those skills. A three-year student in the regular course had to demonstrate in exams basic technical competencies, in addition to an interpretative awareness of and ability with diverse musical styles. Students were expected to synthesize their overall theoretical and musical knowledge, and were tested by having assigned a work to learn within a limited time frame without the guidance of a teacher. The advanced artist program required of its candidates a performance that would be found convincing to a musically-informed audience outside the school. This was in effect a graduate program conceived for diploma and certificate students free of degree constrictions. It represented concentrated musical study and remained in place even as a degree program took hold.

A second aspect of its American dimension was the inclusion of degree study. Damrosch was an educator, educating the public at large, student musicians who would bring music to this public, and younger students who would become that public audience. He recognized and accepted the importance of the degree for public school music without compromising a performance standard or essential theoretical skills. The degree in applied music that followed sixteen years later was established on this musical foundation. Initially diploma students outnumbered degree students. That would shift but gradually over the years. Behind an administrative vision was the support of a competent faculty dedicated not only to training its students but also to improving standards by incrementally demanding more of its students. Consequently, the Institute held forth not as a shadow of the Graduate School but as a school in its own right, yet philosophically in step with its close neighbor in the annex.

A typical course of study for a student in the Regular course continuing on to the Post-graduate course is shown in Appendix B (Chart G). It shows academic year, instructors, subjects and grade level, comments or grade, and total number of classes attended and number of absences.
The Juilliard Graduate School

The Curriculum: 1924-1945

When the Graduate School first opened in 1924 it offered instruction in piano, violin, cello, voice, and composition for one hundred students of American birth, sixteen to twenty-five years of age. The purpose of the School was to prepare students for public performance and to help them secure such opportunities. Students were accepted by examination, provisionally for one year, and were awarded a fellowship for the year’s study. The only other entrance requirements were graduation from high school, American or Canadian citizenship, and parameters of age. By 1941 admission was open to all students of the Western Hemisphere, to applicants who showed marked talent, adequate preparation in their major and minor studies to do graduate work, and to those who had the “endorsement” of their private teachers or music school.107

The original faculty of thirteen included only three Americans by birth. Appointed in piano were Ernest Hutcheson, from the faculty of the Institute of Musical Art, the American Olga Samaroff, who also taught at Curtis Institute, Josef Lhévinne, James Friskin, and Carl Friedberg. Hutcheson joined the piano faculty of the Institute in 1917 upon the recommendation of Carl Friedberg, who had then resigned for political reasons (believing that his German background placed too much pressure on Damrosch). Samaroff was the first woman admitted to the Paris Conservatory and had also studied with Hutcheson. Lhévinne was a product of the Moscow Conservatory under Anton Rubinstein, and was a fellow student of Sergei Rachmaninoff. Both he and his pianist wife, Rosina Lhévinne, had left Russia and were residing and teaching in Germany. In 1919 they immigrated to the United States. “During the 1920s when the Soviets allowed none of their artists to go to the West, Josef Lhévinne became one of the treasured links

107 Faculty Minutes, Graduate School, May 16, 1941. The Juilliard School Archives, and for all Faculty Minutes in this section.
to the Russian grand manner of playing.”

James Friskin and Carl Friedberg served on the faculties of the Institute and of the Graduate School simultaneously. Friskin was regarded as a fine scholar and as an outstanding interpreter of Bach. Friedberg was a student of Clara Schumann in Frankfurt, and for the music of Brahms, studied with the great composer himself. This was a faculty of the highest order whose lineage was extraordinary and whose legacy would be unsurpassed.

No specific course of study was outlined but “each student [was] encouraged to develop his resources not only in his major study, but in every way possible that [would] contribute toward making him a well-rounded musician.” Upon recommendation, students were able to renew their fellowships, generally for an additional two years, and in special cases permitted to return for “advice”—consultation lessons with their major teacher. Although the early catalogues suggest no particular selection of courses for the Graduate School, a transcript issued for each student admitted to the School was attached to the application/enrollment form. Initially the application contained general background information on the applicant, both musical and academic, along with the results of his entrance exam. This included a grade in ear training and one in sight-reading and succinct comments on the applicant’s playing by each member of the applied major faculty. It noted date of admission and date of graduation, or if the student had resigned or had been dropped, and the reason. A second sheet showed subjects taken during each year of study, amount of meeting time per week, the instructor, and the grade for the class. The printed

108 Dubal, 217.

109 Ibid., 219.

110 Clara was an extraordinary nineteenth-century musician and pianist. She edited all the piano music of her composer-husband, Robert Schumann, and was a close friend to Johannes Brahms, who regarded her musical opinions highly.

111 Institute of Musical Art (and Juilliard Graduate School) 1935/36 Catalogue, 8. The Juilliard School Archives and for all following catalogues in this section.
subject headings were Major; Theory, under which might be entered harmony, ear
training, score reading, orchestration, counterpoint, fugue; Class composition; French;
German; Italian; Diction; Opera; Ensemble; Orchestra; Conducting; Secondary Piano;
Literature; Miscellaneous, which might include a secondary instrument, radio technique,
lieder, form and analysis, normal class, and/or lecture class. The entry for Attendance
separated major from secondary subjects.

Whereas the transcripts are a testimony to a finished product—decisions made—
the faculty minutes show a major institution evolving from a rudimentary institutional
position to one of judicious construct. An array of topics important to the administration
of a school, to developing some common vocabulary among colleagues whose
personalities and opinions were strong, to creating a principled environment for a student
body where tensions and sensitivities were easily confronted, to requirements and course
offerings, were reviewed in frequent meetings of the faculty.

Attendance was among the issues considered important. Teachers were not
accustomed to keeping records, and students were inclined to answer the demands of or
to take opportunities regarding their applied instrument at the expense of secondary
studies, which was anything other than the applied instrument. Erskine recommended that
the attendance system used at Columbia be adopted at Juilliard. Mid-term attendance
reports were sent to the dean, a warning sent to those students who incurred several
absences, and students would be dropped if attendance was not taken seriously.\textsuperscript{112} The
faculty was shown how to keep records on a new attendance sheet and encouraged to be
very firm with delinquent students particularly regarding secondary study.\textsuperscript{113} Where there
were conflicts with performances and the academic calendar, students were expected to

\textsuperscript{112}Letter of J. Erskine to E. Hutcheson, May 12, 1932. General Administrative Records,
Office of the President, Box 2, Folder 7. The Juilliard Archives.

\textsuperscript{113}Faculty Minutes, 1929, 10.
change engagements rather than to begin the term late or leave early. For this mostly European faculty, such procedural accounting was very different from the European conservatory system, where a student was free to come and go as he wished so long as he passed his exams.

Students were admitted provisionally for one year and, depending on the quality of their work, and those of exceptional talent were allowed to extend their study three or four additional years. Performance requirements for both scholarship students at the Institute and fellowship students at the Graduate School were the same: From memory the applicant in piano presented 1) a Prelude and Fugue or a Partita or a Suite by Bach; 2) any sonata of Beethoven (early, middle, and late periods works) except Op. 14, 49, 79—considered ‘student’ works; 3) a nocturne, ballade, scherzo, or the F Minor Fantasy or Barcarolle of Chopin; 4) and a piece of the applicant’s choice. Applicants were also required to pass tests in sight-reading, ear training, and harmony; and fundamentals of technique were examined informally.

Re-appointments after one year’s work were based on progress shown in periodic exams and by teachers’ records. All students were expected to begin performing as soon as they entered the school, and all took exams, mid-year and end-of-year in their applied major, except those heard in recital or those having made their debut. Upon graduation many students were permitted to return to their teacher for advisory lessons—for concert tours, for example. Some students received half or partial fellowships for lessons every other week or every month, again depending on need. Both Josef Lhévinne and James Friskin called for some document to indicate completion of work, and it was agreed to provide a certificate-record at graduation. The faculty recognized that a request for a teacher in any area of specialization usually meant a request for an all-round musician,

---


115 Faculty Minutes, February 1935, 38.
not a specialist, and that a pianist, for example, would be expected to teach theory or some other music-related subject in addition to piano.\textsuperscript{116}

That theory requirements sometimes interfered with the acceptance of a student who showed much promise was cause for discussion, especially among the voice faculty. Hutcheson was not inclined to compromise standards for this one area because that would create “havoc” in other programs. Unlike a private teacher, a school has the responsibility to observe requirements. There were some great talents in each department, but also a group that did not belong in a graduate school. However, to accommodate, it was agreed that failure in an entrance test would not prevent an applicant from receiving a fellowship if the overall application were strong and the talent exceptional. The new era demanded learned theoretical skills in addition to intuitive ability, so standards for these skills should be maintained. Special cases would be treated individually.\textsuperscript{117} Eventually the catalogue would spell out the requirements in theory for all students:\textsuperscript{118}

- Harmonization of a melody, a figured bass, and an unfigured bass.
- Modulation.
- Counterpoint – adding two voices in strict counterpoint to a given \textit{cantus firmus}, each voice in a different species; and an example in a species given by the examiner.

In his first year as dean (1927), Hutcheson spoke to the need of more ‘cultural’ studies among course offerings. As dean he had direct control over the School’s educational program. Erskine offered a series of lectures on a variety of academic topics such as epic and romantic poetry, and mythology. His sister, Rhoda Erskine, had begun a small class in literature that had become so popular that another two were offered. In

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{116}Faculty Minutes of April 28, 1928; April 16, 1928; January, 1933, 27.
  \item \textsuperscript{117}Faculty Minutes, October 1934, 37.
  \item \textsuperscript{118}1940/41 Catalogue, 57.
\end{itemize}
addition, Dean Hutcheson recommended a course in pedagogy, which would provide a useful list of teaching materials as part of its curriculum. And Josef Lhévinne regarded chamber music important enough to be taken in the first year. Teachers had complete freedom in the use of text books. A representative course of study for the pianist, then, might include theory, ensemble, normal class (teaching methods), special subjects when required, and electives. The matter of changing teachers and a Code of Ethics in general received attention. A teacher change was permitted only at the end of the semester.

The difficulty in grading a performance was discussed in depth. In attempting to develop some common vocabulary for the intangible factors inherent in performance, a group of questions were posed to the faculty: Is my judgment objective? How broad-minded am I in my musical judgments? Am I still capable of appreciating the student’s problems as a performer? What are the standards of the school? What do the symbols A – B – C mean? Out of this emerged a kind of glossary to serve as a guide. The recommendations were to grade according to the actual performance, not potential. The evaluation should focus on musicianship and the technique necessary to interpret effectively, not on showmanship. The exam grade reflected talent, intelligence, and industry, and the final grade would also take into consideration the teacher’s report. That report would indicate if the grade accurately represented the student’s progress and ability and if there were a need for or a benefit from more detailed criticism, especially in the case of technique. The knowledge of technique can be misleading when a piece is played well, especially if the student has a very natural technical gift. The following definitions were decided upon for letter grades:

---

119 Faculty Minutes, November 21, 1927.

120 Faculty Minutes, May 1, 1939.

121 Faculty Minutes, January 10-13, 1939, 15.
A – Musical, mental, and physical equipment of high order. Poise, vitality, imagination; grasp of form and style. Such a performance can be found in music of any degree of difficulty.

B – Good performance, well prepared, limited imagination, or minor slips of memory, technique or pedaling. Lacking special individuality. Serious talented student with little performance ability.


The age of the student, length of study, and all repertory covered was entered on exam slips to better inform the faculty in their evaluations.

In attempting to develop a specific curriculum for individual approaches to piano playing, the faculty defined elements that comprise a sound technique, “the essentials of piano equipment.” Among these, correct muscular habits; correct fingering patterns through scales and arpeggios; legato playing of single and double notes; a sense of tonality; and a variety of tools to deal with technical passages. Endurance and reserve were also relevant factors. To be sure technique was appropriately accounted for in study, it would be a part of the major exam.\textsuperscript{122} The purpose of technique was to serve the elusive nature of interpretation. In a later discussion Hutcheson noted the importance of distinguishing between personal taste and matters of fact in interpreting periods of musical style. For example, he asked the faculty to decide upon such factors as use of pedal in Bach, choice of tempo, use of the metronome, and manner of ornamentation so that there might be some broad agreement on matters of musical details, consequently providing a more tangible basis for grading.\textsuperscript{123} 

\textsuperscript{122} Faculty Minutes, December 7, 1938, 7.

\textsuperscript{123} Faculty Minutes, April 14, 1943, 23.
Four transcripts of students who studied at the Graduate School between 1927 and 1942 indicate the flexibility allowed in choosing classes and by summation the amount of time the student may have had to devote to practice. We surmise that the demands related to the applied major were rigorous, emanating as much from the student’s self-criticism as from the standard set by the teacher.¹²⁴

Example I
Admitted October 1927; graduated with ‘advice’ May 1931; teacher, Mr. Lhévinne.

Ear training, *good*; sight reading, *very good*.

This student did not appear for an entrance exam in piano, implying, though not determining, that he was accepted upon Mr. Lhévinne’s recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1927-28</td>
<td>Aural Harmony</td>
<td>1 hr. per week A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmony I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928-1929</td>
<td>Harmony II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers’ Class</td>
<td>an attendance record of 55% No Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929-1930</td>
<td>Counterpoint</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-1940</td>
<td>Fugue</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“advice”

¹²⁴These examples are from the Juilliard School Archives and were kindly made available by Jane Gottlieb, librarian, and Jeni Dahmus, archivist. Names of students were removed.
Example II
Admitted October 1932; graduated 1936; teacher, Mr. Friedberg

Ear training *A+ (absolutely)*; sight reading *C*.

The transcript outlines in detail prior study. This applicant was a graduate of the Institute and received both a Diploma for the Regular Course in Piano and the Certificate of Maturity for the Post-graduate Course in Piano. She enrolled in the Institute in December 1924 at the age of sixteen, having completed Grammar School and having studied piano with a private instructor. She continued her study at the Institute through May of 1930, with an additional year for Post-graduate work. Mr. Damrosch noted from her entrance exam, “good talent – musical – promise.” (Her transcript from the Institute of Musical Art is shown in Appendix B, Chart G.) All of her piano study at the Institute from 1924 to 1931 was with the same teacher, Martinus Sieveking.  

No grade in piano was given but rather an evaluative comment—excellent, excellent musical talent, very good mind, etc. Evaluative comments instead of grades were also given for theory, ear training, keyboard harmony, and pedagogy. An average percentage grade, however, was entered for each of the lectures attended. Attendance in all classes was recorded with total number of classes attended and number of absences. The grade entered for a piano exam heard by the piano faculty in May of 1927, at the end of two and a half years’ study at the Institute, was 87%. She was granted a Diploma in the Regular Course and given a general average grade of 88%. In April of 1931, she was awarded the Certificate of Maturity in piano with a grade of 88%. In 1932 she applied to the Graduate School. The piano evaluation on the Entrance Application noted the following:

• J. Lhévinne – there is something that could not show to her advantage.

---

125 Born in Holland, Sieveking began his career as an accompanist in Paris. He immigrated to the United States in the 1990s and became highly reputed as a teacher. Among his several published works, his piano method, he claimed, guaranteed virtuosity in two years.
• Friskin – playing very badly controlled but I feel there is musical talent there, which might be saved.
• Friedberg – undoubtedly musical, good sense of tone, if she would control herself she could learn much.
• Samaroff – Chopin showed rare feeling, some talent.
• R. Lhévinne – Chopin quite nice, talented.
• Hutcheson – distinct talent; it’s a big talent gone wrong but not indiscriminately so.

The student was admitted into the Graduate School and remained in the program for three and a half years under the instruction of Carl Friedberg. Being exempt from theoretical subjects because of her excellent record at the Institute, she elected to enroll for academic subjects, German, Russian Literature with John Erskine, English Novel also with Erskine, Plato, English Diction, and Appreciation Class with Samaroff.

1932-1933
Class Composition attended twice – excused
English Novel B
Russian Literature C
Literature (Samaroff) No Grade

Piano: “Talent above average, technique developing . . . more mechanical. Diligent, progress, good musically, technically.”

1933-1934
German I 1 hr./wk. C
Plato 1 B+
[Appreciation] 1 No Grade

Piano: “Average talent, hands small, some technique. Good mind, very diligent, general improvement, works past [ability] . . . imagination and initiative . . . physical handicap.”
1934-1935

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Diction</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and Reading</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1935-1936 (Half Time)

Piano: “Very limited pianistically yet not without charm. Small hands ... musical ability. Quality of touch has improved. Works hard.”

Example III

Admitted October 1934; graduated with ‘advice,’ May 1939; teacher, Mr. Siloti

Ear training, B+; sight reading, C+.

This applicant was a high school graduate and had studied harmony with a private teacher for one year and in high school for two years. The transcript also indicates that the student studied harmony and theory for one summer. At the beginning of the typed graded report—there is also a handwritten copy—Ear training and Harmony I and II are listed under “J.S.M by exam, 10/14,” and the notations for each of one hour weekly meetings, twenty-eight term meetings, no grade given.

The following comments from the piano evaluation were entered on the Application:

- Friedberg – Performance shows character, musical sense, promising student, very fine talent, etc.
- Samaroff – Talent vital and individual; tone good—lacks depth in cantabile playing.
- R. Lhévinne – Good material, adequate technique, good intelligence.
- J. Lhévinne – Musical, good fingers and intelligence and rhythm; accurate playing.
• Friskin – Very good material on the whole; melodic playing not always well listened to, etc.

• Hutcheson – All very decent. Nothing very bad; nothing distinguished. The others found much more in her that I did.

• Siloti – no comments.

The program of study combined both theoretical and academic subjects with emphasis on Chamber Music.

1934-35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Hours/Week</th>
<th>Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28 wks./term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterpoint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Drama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1935-1936

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Hours/Week</th>
<th>Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Music (Trio)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1936-1937

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Hours/Week</th>
<th>Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Music (Trio)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Music (with Strings)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1937-1938

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Music (Trio)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1938-1939 (Half time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano (half time)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Music (Trio)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The asterisk for the grade in piano indicated that “credit [was] based on a satisfactory performance examination before a jury of the faculty at the end of each school year,” as noted on the transcript. In addition, the student served as an accompanist for the academic years from 1937 to 1940. The transcript concludes with a summary of studies:

**Suggested Evaluation:** By examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterpoint and Fugue</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Music</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestration</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Reading</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 1939 the application form attended to more detailed information regarding background and experience. It requested names of schools and/or teachers, dates of study, references, performing and teaching experience. It also outlined the requirements for admission:
1) marked and unusual talent with adequate preparation for advanced work; 2) American or Canadian citizenship; 3) general education equivalent to four years of high school; 4) applicants must be over sixteen and under twenty-five years of age, with the following exceptions which should be carefully noted: men singers, all applicants in Composition, in Conducting, and in Flute must be over sixteen years and under thirty years of age.

In addition, a question asked if the student could devote his entire time to study because “the School [could not] assume any responsibility for ... living expenses.” Even more pointedly, it continued, “Please do not return this blank unless you are able to meet these expenses without depending on earning them while studying. The school work required is too heavy to permit such a combination.”

**Example IV**

Admitted October 1939; graduated with ‘advice’ May 1943; teacher, Mr. Hutcheson.

Ear training, A; sight reading, B; theory C+ to grade 2.

This applicant had graduated from high school in 1937, had spent three months from the following December to March at a Berlitz School of Languages, and two summer months at Northwestern University. In addition the student had been enrolled in piano at the American Conservatory of Music from 1928 to 1939, also taking courses in harmony, counterpoint, ear training, and composition. He had also begun teaching harmony at the Conservatory in 1937.

The following comments were entered on the Application Form for his piano evaluation:

- Siloti – Yes.
- R. Lhévinne – Many faults but has possibilities
- Samaroff – Talent yes; technique too tense, but good possibilities; tone suffers from a tense hand and arm, needs weight.

---

126 This was noted on the transcript for Example IV.
• Friskin – Very well controlled playing, it could have more flexibility and more contrast; sometimes a lack of impulse.
• Friedberg – Great talent, stiff arm, pushes but has possibilities; tone and talent very musical; could be made into a real musician.
• J. Lhévinne – Good discipline; very musical; very good tone.
• Wagner – Good native talent; technique will do when not cramped; hears well; stiffness in the way.
• Hutcheson – Talent, but not very brilliant; adequate technique; everything a little heavy; intellectually heavy rather than physically.

The student chose a combination of theoretical and academic subjects for a course of study.

1939-1940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counterpoint</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1940-1941

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fugue</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Literature</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score reading</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1942-1943

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class composition</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian I</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieder</td>
<td>auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian II</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form and analysis</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hutcheson entered no grades for or comments on the student’s piano study.

We do not know the career patterns that these students followed, but we do see a graduate program of intense specialization that at the same time afforded the opportunity either to strengthen musical skills or to complement one’s education with academic interests. The applied subject aside, the overall course of study was tailored to meet the needs and interests of the individual student while the primary purpose focused on performance training. Students were responsible for meeting requirements of attendance in all subjects (evident from the transcripts) and for meeting an expectation of progress. For the major study, the number of students was kept in check since fellowships had to be renewed each year. Although the number grew to approximately one hundred seventy-five students, the initial goal was to maintain an enrollment of about one hundred students, out of which might develop twelve to fifteen ‘artists.’

The Graduate School was founded for the “benefit of music students with unusual talent who [were] adequately prepared for advanced work with artists teachers. It [sought] to aid young musicians whose formal studies [were] fairly complete to qualify as performers or teachers and endeavored to help them in their first steps of a professional career.” To accomplish this it strove to be the ‘best’ professional music school in the country by discreetly “americanizing” a European tradition. Tuition was free, programs of study individual, but there was accountability by a diverse and demanding faculty that pulled together to nurture its talent in a disciplined, structured, yet flexible environment. President Erskine “believed there could be room for only one first-rate school of music at the top of all the schools in the country, and he hoped the Juilliard Graduate School could be that one.” It may have had to share that position, but it was not surpassed.

127Faculty Minutes, March 18, 1929, 19 and 9.

128Faculty Minutes, October 1934, 37.
The Curtis Institute of Music

Founder, Administrators, History

The story of The Curtis Institute of Music is very much the story of Mary Louise Curtis Bok. Born in Boston in 1870, and an only child, her parents moved to Philadelphia when she was still an infant. Impressed with the city, her father, Cyrus Curtis, chose Philadelphia in which to establish his business venture in publishing, the Curtis Publishing Company. Among his publications was the *Tribune and Farmer* that included a supplement, *The Ladies’ Home Journal*, which proved to be popular and successful and for which her mother was editor. Curtis Publishing could also claim *The Saturday Evening Post* and *The New York Post* among its successes. Not musicians themselves, both parents nevertheless cultivated their love of and interest in music and in fact had met singing in a church choir. Mary Louise attended school in a small community outside of Philadelphia, in Abington, where she studied piano with Jean Paul Kürsteiner. Her study served her well, as she was a fine pianist with a musical acumen that would be called upon often in later years. In 1889 Mary Louise’s mother resigned her position at the *Journal* in order to travel with her daughter. Her replacement was the young editor Edward Bok. Born in 1863 in the Netherlands, Bok had settled in Brooklyn at a young age and had worked in various publishing firms before moving into the position at the *Journal*. Because of its provocative and timely articles, *The Ladies’ Home Journal* reached over one million copies in sales, the first magazine in America to do so, during

---

129 Burgwyn, 2.

130 Viles, 4. An unknown figure today, Kürsteiner was born in Catskill, NY, in 1864, to parents of French-Swiss and American background. After music study in New York, he traveled to Leipzig where he was a student both in piano and composition. Among his teachers was Salomon Jadassohn, also the teacher of Ernest Hutcheson. On his return to the US he began teaching at the Ogontz School for Girls in Philadelphia, the school that Mary Louise attended. He was a composer and author of a text on piano playing. Nicholas Slonimsky, ed. *Baker’s Biographical Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 5th edition (New York: Schirmer, 1950), 886-887.
his tenure. Among the books that he authored, his autobiography, *The Americanization of Edward Bok*, was awarded a Pulitzer Prize in 1920. He championed social causes, among them childcare and public sex education, funded many awards for social causes, and had an indirect influence on American architecture.\(^{131}\) In 1893 he and Mary Louise married.

In addition to her strong interests in music and literature was Mary Louise’s involvement with the settlement music school movement. In 1908 two women teaching at the College Settlement for immigrant children in South Philadelphia were allowed the use of several rooms in order to begin teaching music to the neighborhood children. When enrollment escalated beyond their expectations they recruited more teachers, among whom were two members of the Philadelphia Orchestra—Russian-born Samuel Belov and Dutch-born Johann Grolle, both violinists.\(^{132}\) The following year Grolle was appointed director of the new Settlement Music School. The Settlement became an important training ground for young music students, drawing some of its faculty from the esteemed Philadelphia Orchestra, and of such caliber as would move into the Curtis Institute. The Settlement was funded largely by the Ethical Culture Society and in part by tuition fees. Fees, however, were set according to what the student could afford, some receiving full scholarships, others partial, and others paying in full.\(^{133}\) In 1910 Mrs. Bok joined the Settlement as an administrator and continued there until 1924. These fourteen years were marked by a growing commitment to the success of the School and her efforts to support its financial stability. To that end she organized concerts at the Curtis

\(^{131}\)“Edward Bok,” *The Bok Tower Gardens National Historic Landmark* Web Site. Accessed July 30, 2011. Bok was also awarded a Gold Medal of the Academy of Political and Social Science for his autobiography.

\(^{132}\)Morality to Grolle was linked to the development of an aesthetics sense and the appreciation of art music as taught by the Settlements. Shannon Green, “Art for Life’s Sake: Music Schools and Activities in the U. S. Social Settlements, 1892-1942” (diss., University of Wisconsin at Madison, 1998, 38).

\(^{133}\)Viles, 8.
Publishing Company, often featuring outstanding artists, proceeds from which were directed to the running of the School. In addition, Mrs. Bok donated monies from her mother’s estate to the building of new quarters in order to accommodate the Settlement’s growing enrollment. Her philanthropic interests also extended to hospitals and welfare and relief organizations.

The original purpose of the Settlement was to enable its students to become better citizens through their study of music. At the same time many of its well-trained students showed much promise, suggesting a need to provide opportunity for more advanced study. In response, a conservatory branch for the Settlement School was created, again with funds from the estate of Mrs. Bok’s mother. For its first year both divisions were housed in the same building, Johann Grolle serving as director of both. But the time was right for an American music conservatory of extraordinary quality offering intense musical training to a few highly talented students. With new restrictions on immigration, fewer Europeans were available to fill the positions in important musical organizations in the country, especially those positions in winds, brass, and percussion. Furthermore, the confluence of excellent musicians, wealth, and an attitude of enabling social betterment made Philadelphia ripe for such a school. Encouraged by her close friends, the world-renowned pianist Josef Hofmann, and the conductor Leopold Stokowski, Mrs. Bok established the Curtis Foundation as a memorial to her mother and began the process of finding separate quarters for the conservatory.

---

134Burgwyn, 5.

1351925/26 Catalogue, 16. The Curtis Institute of Music Archives (online: www.archive.org/details/curtisinstituteofmusic.), and for the catalogues following in this section; Viles, 29.

136Viles, 28. As conductor of the Philadelphia Orchestra, Stokowski had brought the orchestra to an exceptionally high level of playing and had introduced its audience to what was then ‘modern’ music. Mrs. Bok served on its board.
With an initial gift of five hundred thousand dollars three elegant private homes adjacent to each other were purchased for the new conservatory. Because its location was near the City center, students would have access to the numerous cultural events Philadelphia offered. The Curtis Institute of Music received its charter from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the spring of 1924 and opened in October of that year. Its purpose was succinctly stated: “To train exceptionally gifted young musicians for careers as performing artists on the highest professional level." Among the members of its advisory council were Felix Adler of the Ethical Cultural Society, Cyrus Curtis, Mrs. Bok’s father, Edward Bok, and prominent musicians. Mrs. Bok was named president. The purpose of The Institute, to develop exceptional musical talent with no restrictions as to race, gender, nationality, or creed, under the guidance of an artist faculty, was spread by word-of-mouth among musicians and musicologists and an extensive and expensive publicity campaign. Financial status was of less consequence but the application process would be rigorous. The Institute was conceived as a small, highly selective school, housed in its wooden-paneled homes, and decorated with works of art; it has remained so today. For Mrs. Bok, the vision was clear:

It is my aim that earnest students shall acquire a thorough musical education not learning only to sing or play, but also the history of music, the laws of its making, languages, ear training and music appreciation. They shall learn to think and to express their thoughts against a background of quiet culture, with the stimulus of personal contact with artist teachers who represent the highest and finest in their art. The aim is for quality of the work rather than quick, showy results.

---

137 Burgwyn, 10.
138 Ibid.
139 Paintings included works of such artists as Childe Hassam, George Inness, and among the sculpture a bronze head of Beethoven by Bourdelle. 1930/31 Catalogue, 79.
140 1925/26 Catalogue, 4.
Johann Grolle assumed the directorship of The Institute during its first year, when it had both a preparatory division and the conservatory division. Curtis would enroll up to two hundred students, and tuition for those who could afford to pay was five hundred dollars. One month after the opening of The Institute a student orchestra was assembled, and all students of orchestral instruments were required to participate. The orchestra also included members of the Philadelphia Orchestra, and “a limited number of qualified players [from the community] not otherwise connected with the Institute.”

Leopold Stokowski, Thaddeus Rich, assistant conductor and concertmaster of the Philadelphia Orchestra, and violinist Michael Press, conducted rehearsals. The distinguished faculty was a gathering of legendary musicians—to name but a few, Marcella Sembrich in voice (also on the faculty of Juilliard), William Kincaid in flute, Carl Flesch in violin, Louis Bailly and Felix Salmond in cello, Marcel Tabuteau in oboe, Carlos Salzedo in harp, Rosario Scalero in composition, George Wedge in theory (who would soon move to Juilliard); and in piano the ‘big’ names of Josef Hofmann, David Saperton, George Boyle, Isabelle Vengerova, Wilhem Backhaus, and harpsichordist Wanda Landowska. Josef Hofmann chaired the piano department. Many of the faculty were solo players of the orchestra and some had been teachers at the Settlement. Full scholarships were awarded in voice, piano, harp, trombone, and one in an unspecified area of study. For the remainder, full or partial scholarships were available to students of exceptional talent who demonstrated need. The back page of its first catalogue read, “The endowment of The Curtis Institute of Music makes possible rare opportunities for students of talent.”

---

141 The first dean, Dr. Grace Spofford, had served as dean at Peabody Conservatory. 1925/26 Catalogue, 4.

142 Ibid., 15.
Grolle’s tenure as director lasted only one year, but he remained director of the Settlement until his retirement in 1956. He was followed with the two-year directorship of William E. Walter, a businessman, whose abilities and persistence with publicity served Curtis well. As an endowed institution and “thus fortunately removed from commercial considerations, [Curtis could look] to quality of its students rather than to quantity ... [confining] its enrollment to a number which it [could] adequately and thoroughly instruct,” instructing both those who aspired to a concert career and those to teaching. In 1926 the piano department saw the departure of Wilhelm Backhaus, whose performing career took precedence, and George Boyle, a pianist of English background who moved to Juilliard for a short time before returning to Philadelphia to open his own studio. Filling these positions were the Russian Benno Moiseïvitsch and the Pole Moriz Rosenthal.

In 1927 Mrs. Bok’s close friend, the pianist Josef Hofmann, was appointed director of Curtis, receiving an annual salary of $100,000. Hofmann had written a column on piano technique for *The Ladies’ Home Journal* from 1901 to 1914. The articles were very popular, evident from their long history, and served as a basis for his informative book, *Piano Playing*, which was reprinted several times. He had chaired the piano

---

143 Viles, 140. An ‘efficiency expert’ was consulted and his evaluation suggested that the timing for a music school was auspicious and favorable since the Immigration Act of 1924 limited immigration and consequently the number of musicians coming from Europe. The report also stated that Grolle was not the person for the position of director.

144 1926/27 Catalogue, 6.

145 Moiseïvitsch was a student of Theodore Leschetizky, a teacher of several great pianists. He settled in the UK and during World War II played over 100 concerts to aid Russia. Rosenthal was especially known for “his exquisitely turned Chopin.” He studied with Karl Mikuli, a pupil of Chopin, Rafael Joseffy, a student of Liszt and editor of nearly all of the piano works of Chopin, and Liszt himself, but of his teachers said, “I have learned all I know about piano playing from the music of Chopin.” Wilson Lyle, *A Dictionary of Pianists* (New York: Schirmer), 191.

146 Dubal, 166.
department and taught at Curtis since the opening of the school and would continue in those positions even as director during the next eleven years.

Hofmann was a phenomenal pianist, born in 1876 in Poland, a child prodigy, trained by his father, who himself was a remarkable musician—conductor, pianist, and composer. Already appearing with much success at the age of six for a charity concert, he made his first European tour at the age of nine, debuting with the Berlin Philharmonic under the conductor, Hans von Bülow.\footnote{Both as a pianist and conductor, von Bülow was among the great nineteenth-century musicians, demonstrating a profound knowledge and understanding of the works he performed. He was a champion of Wagner and Brahms, among the first conductors to memorize the orchestral score, and his writings are marked with brilliance and wit. He was born in 1830 in Germany and died in 1894. Slonimsky, ed., \textit{Baker's}, 226.} At eleven he appeared in New York. The highly respected music critic of \textit{The New York Times}, W. J. Henderson, wrote, “The tenderness of sentiment, the poetic insight ... not only arouse the intelligence but move the heart ... And these things cannot be taught ... More than that, he is an artist and we can listen to his music without taking into consideration the fact that he is a child.”\footnote{Dubal, 164.} His father, however, withdrew young Hofmann from the concert stage so that he could study and develop quietly, again with his father, then under the guidance of pianist-composer Moritz Moszkowski, and then with the great Russian pedagogue and pianist, Anton Rubinstein. At eighteen he resumed concertizing, often causing a sensation where he performed, and he sustained a long career that endured the rejection of his romantic nineteenth-century style of piano playing for the more direct, somewhat leaner interpretations that came into vogue at the beginning of the twentieth century. What sustained him was an individuality “fortified by one of the massive technical equipments...
of all time.” In appearance, however, Hofmann was businesslike in dress and sedate in manner both on stage and off, a hiker, a mountain climber, a good swimmer and rower, and a fine tennis player. In addition, he was a gifted inventor with more than sixty patents ranging from improvements to the piano mechanism to shock absorbers to—presumably—the windshield wiper, which idea came from the movement of the metronome; and he built his own car from scratch. In 1946 he withdrew from the stage, tired from his long career in performing, and somewhat depleted by the effects of alcohol. He died in Los Angeles in 1957 at the age of eighty-one.

Hofmann proved to be a successful administrator, committed in purpose and clear in his ideas about training for a concert career. Among them, he limited enrollment in order to allow enough time for the careful individual instruction of each student; another, he wanted instruments available, rent free, to students of need; another, he extended summer sojourns to advanced and exceptionally gifted students so that they could continue study wherever their teachers had traveled—in the United States or in Europe. Mrs. Bok responded by increasing her initial endowment of $500,000 to $12.5 million. (A foundation would be created in 1932 to administer these funds.) Curtis acquired a full range of orchestral instruments and several Steinway pianos, which were placed in the student’s place of residence for the academic year. And two years after its opening, all who were accepted now received full tuition. International in scope, students came from Europe, Canada, Mexico, Cuba, Australia, and Puerto Rico, in addition to the United States to study. Enrollment was held to a specific number and admission for each department depended on the number of students who were graduated or who left the

---

149 Dubal, 168. A pianist of a younger generation than Hofmann, Arthur Rubinstein, wrote of his “volcanic outbursts ... frightening the audience.... And yet he was a pianist of great stature because a musical personality emerged at every concert, which I cannot lightly dismiss.”

150 Dubal, 162.

151 Burgwyn, 22-23.
Institute. Both Mrs. Bok and Mr. Hofmann made decisions regarding faculty and students, and both heard all piano auditions.

A new addition to the 1928 Catalogue was the division of piano accompanying. Harry Kaufman, a former Hofmann student who had toured with several members of the Curtis faculty, was named division head. The catalogue read, “Accompanying is a field that has been much neglected yet it is remunerative and full of opportunity for those who make it their life work.” Also added were courses in chamber music, campanology, and professional criticism, although the latter two were offered only for a few years.

As with Eastman and Juilliard, radio broadcasts provided performing opportunities for Curtis students and faculty while promoting the Institute before the public. Curtis began its series of weekly broadcasts over CBS in 1929. In addition to opera productions at the Institute, Curtis affiliated with the Philadelphia Opera Company, also in 1929, an affiliation that lasted until 1932, then resuming in 1938 after a six-year hiatus. The most notable joint event was the first American performance of the opera *Wozzeck* by Alban Berg, in 1931 (a work of major importance in the modern opera repertory), with the Philadelphia Orchestra under the direction of Leopold Stokowski. Curtis students played in the orchestra and vocal students appeared in the cast. The Hofmann years also saw the formation of the Curtis String Quartet. Beginning as a student ensemble it would become one of the outstanding ensembles of the country, its career extending from 1928
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152 1928/29 Catalogue, 18.

153 1931/32 Catalogue, 64.

154 The Boks had built a bird sanctuary and singing tower with a set of seventy-one bells on their property at Mountain Lake, Florida. Qualified students traveled there for six weeks of carillon lessons, beginning their study on a practice clavier before using the keyboard for bells. 1929/30 Catalogue.

155 Burgwyn, 27.
to 1944. Also significant was the appointment in 1931 of Fritz Reiner as conductor of the Curtis Orchestra, a position he held for ten years. Among the great conductors in the country, Reiner and his student orchestra toured and were heard on radio. Although Hofmann was not in favor of a formal commencement, his sentiments were over-ridden by a stronger current in the country for academic recognition. Ten years after its opening Curtis held its first commencement. By this time The Institute had begun to award the Bachelor of Music degree in all areas of performance, in addition to its diploma. Thirty students of the class of 1934 were graduated and an additional forty from previous years were awarded diplomas. The 1935 Catalogue stated that students who qualify receive a diploma, or the degree Bachelor of Music, or the degree Master of Music, this, however, awarded only in composition.

The 1930s were very difficult ones for The Institute and for Mrs. Bok. Her husband, Edward, had died in January of 1930 and her father would follow in 1933. Financially it was a time of reserving resources, cutting back expenses, and a time of serious concern for the future of Curtis. (The 1932-1933 Catalogue was hand-typed and only three copies were available.) Some departments had to be reorganized, some were eliminated; student enrollment dropped, the school year was shortened and salaries reduced. In 1938 Josef Hofmann announced his resignation, but in the course of his tenure the Institute had established itself and its unique position among schools for advanced music study. It provided its students an education free of financial worry yet one intensely committed to artistic ideals; it provided opportunities for performance

156 It disbanded because one of its members was drafted. Viles, 154.

157 Burgwyn, 37. Reiner had been director of the Cincinnati Symphony. In addition to guest conducting many major orchestras, he later served as conductor of the Metropolitan Opera and of the Chicago Symphony.

158 1935/36 Catalogue, 10.

159 Burgwyn, 37.
through radio and concert engagements here and abroad; it provided financial backing as well as professional coaching to assist students at the beginning of their performing career. Its curriculum, while allowing enough flexibility for individual needs, also offered the structure of diploma study or degree study. In addition, the library, begun in 1925 with approximately five thousand volumes of books and music, had grown to some twenty-eight thousand volumes. Through these accomplishments, Hofmann had created his vision of the Curtis education—“To hand down through contemporary masters the great traditions of the past—to teach students to build on this heritage for the future.” This statement has since appeared in every Curtis catalogue.

Mrs. Bok served as acting director for one year until the appointment of the eminent American composer, Randall Thompson, in 1939. A graduate of Harvard University, Thompson had held a fellowship at the American Academy in Rome for three years. He was twice a Guggenheim recipient, and before coming to Curtis had taught at Wellesley College and at the University of California, Berkeley. Following his two-year tenure at Curtis he would go on to head the School of Fine Arts at the University of Virginia, to a professorship at Princeton, and in 1948 to a professorship at Harvard University. Between 1933-35 Thompson had conducted an investigation of music study in thirty colleges in the United States for the Association of American Colleges that appeared in book form as College Music. With a survey of several colleges, it reported on the teaching of music in higher education—music history, theory, and applied music.

Conservatories quite rightly give credit for Applied Music: it is an essential part of their program. The direction of a conservatory is frankly vocational. That of a Liberal Arts College is not. The aim of a Liberal Arts college is to produce integrated citizens. Everything in my experience leads me to condemn Applied Music as a subject for college credit; but nothing in this report is to be construed as hostile to the study of Applied Music or to the many admirable musicians engaged in teaching it.160

The Sponsoring Committee for the Thompson study included Howard Hanson, director of the Eastman School, Harold Butler, dean of the Crouse College of Fine Arts of Syracuse University, and Paul Weaver, music department head at Cornell, and it countered that “Music must be experienced in its completeness ... applied music [studied in conjunction] with historical, literary, and theoretical subjects.” Their statement received support from John Erskine and Ernest Hutcheson of the Juilliard Graduate School, who were also on the Sponsoring Committee. Although Thompson’s views toward conservatory study were sympathetic, his was a different voice in the Curtis setting (and among his colleagues at the companion schools formed at the same time as Curtis).

Convinced that a cultural background is essential for every music student’s best development, Thompson inaugurated compulsory weekly assemblies of lectures and recitals that presented an overview of music history. But he was faced with financial difficulties that continued to affect curriculum, salaries, and Curtis holdings. Some of the instruments were sold as well as one of the buildings, in addition to some of Mrs. Bok’s own property, for much needed funds for the Institute. Summer sojourns were eliminated as was funding for student career initiatives. Nevertheless, guest artists continued to appear. Rudolf Serkin, who would enjoy a long and distinguished career at Curtis, becoming its director in 1968, was appointed to the piano faculty, joining Saperton, Vengerova, and Kaufman, who had been on the faculty since the 1920s. Serkin was in his thirties and just beginning to establish an international career when he became a member of the Curtis faculty. Though many notable musicians stepped over the threshold of

\[\text{161} \quad \text{Thompson, 105 and 137.}\]

\[\text{162} \quad \text{Serkin studied in Vienna with Richard Robert and composition with Arnold Schoenberg. Born in Bohemia to Russian parents in 1903, he made his debut at the age of twelve with the Vienna Symphony Orchestra. Of his playing it has been said that he was not a natural pianist, at times doing “royal battle with the instrument.” But he excelled in the playing of Beethoven and Brahms. Dubal, 331-332.}\]
the Institute in the course of its history, perhaps that of Leonard Bernstein is somewhat a household name. He was a student in Dr. Thompson’s orchestration class.\footnote{Viles, 128.}

Thompson resigned his position in 1941 because of “differences of opinion between myself and the board of directors concerning fundamental issues in music education.”\footnote{Ibid., 134.} Taking on the mantel and assuming the fourth directorship in the history of The Institute was violinist Efrem Zimbalist. Zimbalist had joined the Curtis faculty in 1928, the same year that his teacher from Russia, Leopold Auer, was appointed. Upon Auer’s death in 1930 he became head of the violin department. Born in Russia in 1889, and trained at the St. Petersburg Conservatory under Auer, he made his European debut at the age of eighteen, and within a short time had become a well-known and highly regarded violinist throughout Europe. In 1911 he immigrated to the United States, continuing his acclaimed performing career. In 1943 he and Mrs. Bok married. He concertized until 1949, then left the concert stage for three years, resuming again in 1952, and finally retiring as a soloist in 1955. He served as director for twenty-seven years and died in 1984 at the age of ninety-four.

The Zimbalist directorship refocused the school on its original purpose, to train soloists. That focus and the retrenchment necessary during the war years caused the interest in and support of chamber music, orchestra, and opera to diminish, which consequently diminished the instrumental faculty as well. Orchestra and opera would be reorganized in the late 1940s, but some courses were eliminated—conducting and composition.\footnote{Ibid., 137.} Efforts to keep The Institute open proved successful; it survived these difficult years—to some degree even flourished—and Zimbalist would see its secure musical and financial footing restored. Gradually instrumental teachers returned to teach
and the turn-over in faculty, a faculty that had been a part of the Curtis community for several years, was replaced by a younger generation of extraordinary musicians. To those not within its immediate circle, Curtis retained its affluent well-being. “That false impression was abetted by the fact that it became increasingly cut off from the outside world.”166 However, its aims as expressed in its first catalogue remained intact: “It is discriminating in its acceptance of students, and is even more regardful of the manner in which its pupils are taught.... It offers freely, therefore, its distinctive features ... so that its influence may be of the widest range, in order that it may make a distinct contribution to the musical life of America.”167

The Curriculum: 1924-1945

A small body of students, carefully and thoroughly taught either for careers as soloists or as teachers, offering its education at modest fees so that its influence would be “of the widest range ... to this policy every instructor in The Curtis Institute [was] committed.”168 The Curtis vision of educating the musician—its stated purpose—was clearly expressed in its first catalogue:

The distinctive quality of The Curtis Institute of Music lies in the belief of the founder that while music may be taught in all its branches by masters of the art, the student who would have received only this instruction would be ill equipped to stand before the world as a well-grounded, thoroughly-trained musician. Following this conviction, the Institute offers ... an opportunity, in its Academic Courses, for its students to acquire a true conception of the history of the world in which they live, a study of the interrelationships of the allied arts, the principles of psychology, languages, diction, a course of reading of the great poets and writers of all ages, and a survey of the world’s history for its bearing on the development of the arts. For these courses it draws upon the Faculties of The University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, Bryn Mawr College, etc. The Institute offers, therefore, a
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166Burgwyn, 49.

1671925/26 Catalogue, 8.

distinctive academic course as forming a direct part of its musical instruction, so that a student may graduate from the Institute not only with a knowledge of the best in music but with a carefully taught cultural background. A Curtis Institute pupil leaves it, therefore, with something more than the acquisition of a technical musical knowledge.\textsuperscript{169}

The list of academic subjects was impressive (see Appendix B, Chart H). Whereas these academic courses were intended to provide a foundation for further study and to help shape one’s personality, they did not diminish the fundamental need of developing “true musicianship.” Rhythmic training affected muscular control and alertness; aesthetic expression influenced the imagination; and ear training stimulated melodic conception and memory. In addition students needed to know harmony and musical analysis and to be able to read music at sight on their instrument.\textsuperscript{170}

Talent was the sole criterion considered for admission—“a native musical gift, of quality worthy to be taught by ... the great masters in the world of music”\textsuperscript{171}—and a fine enough and sufficient previous training to qualify. In later years age limits were included under requirements, with preference for candidates between sixteen and twenty-four except in “unusual circumstances.”\textsuperscript{172} By the 1940s, twenty-one was given as the limit for pianists, and candidates were expected to show an ability in sight-reading and some knowledge of theory in their entrance audition. Further, if an applicant were studying at another school or with a private teacher, Curtis requested written permission from the school or teacher for the student to audition. (This was also true at Juilliard.)

The entrance audition for the piano applicant consisted of major and minor scales and arpeggios, selected studies from Finger Dexterity, Op. 740, by Czerny, a Three-Part Invention by Bach, and one movement from a sonata by Beethoven or a composition of

\textsuperscript{169}“The Purpose of the Institute,” Ibid., 6.

\textsuperscript{170}1925/26 Catalogue, 12.

\textsuperscript{171}1926/27 Catalogue, 6.

\textsuperscript{172}1939/40 Catalogue, 18.
comparable difficulty. (These requirements, though not advanced, were more so than those at Eastman or the Institute of Musical Art.) Teacher assignments were left to the discretion of the examiners, although student requests received consideration. These requirements gradually evolved into a more demanding audition program over the next twenty years. In 1938 a Prelude and Fugue from the Well Tempered Clavier by Bach was added to the audition exam, along with a complete Beethoven sonata, and two pieces, one slow and one brilliant, either by Chopin or Schumann. The following year the Prelude and Fugue was listed before the Three-part Invention, a suggestion perhaps that it was preferable, the Beethoven sonata remained, but the two additional pieces were specific to Chopin. These requirements had evolved in their specificity: Studies in technique were eliminated, the Bach and Beethoven works were larger in scope, and two pieces, both by Chopin, were to display melodic and virtuosic playing respectively. These three composers appearing on all audition programs confirmed the importance of their music to the pianist’s repertory and to the development of ‘pianism.’ In general the requirements had become significantly more substantial.173

A typical Plan of Study for the pianist during the early years of The Institute included weekly meetings in Piano, in Musicianship, in Academics, and specially scheduled Lectures. Out of the following list of courses individual programs were constructed.

Piano: one lesson weekly, but no length of time was specified. However, Teachers’ Records indicate one hour was allocated for the major.

Musicianship: one hour each week of theory, keyboard harmony, sight-singing, dictation, form and analysis, and two hours each week of ensemble, for a total of seven

173 This audition program also helped establish what has been spoken of as the ‘canon’ in the classical world of music—those composers and pieces basic to study and to programming and heard time and again. See Hays, “Music Department.”
hours. Dictation and keyboard harmony were coordinated with theory classes, and ensemble was considered under theoretical subjects.

Academic subjects: two elective courses subject to the approval of the dean and the chair of the academic department.

Lectures: History of music or music appreciation, one hour weekly.174

Comparative Arts: one hour each week.

Theory was distributed over seven grades ranging from the elements of music to orchestration.

I. Preparatory course: elements of music, scales, signatures, intervals, chords, melody writing.

II. Elementary harmony to the dominant seventh and inversions; simple modulations, melody writing and elementary counterpoint; study and analysis of form.

III. Advanced harmony and figuration; practical composition in smaller forms from the phrase to extended double-period; analysis.

IV. Completion of harmony and figuration; practical composition in smaller forms from double-period to song form and trio.

V. Counterpoint; study and writing of two- and three-voice preludes and inventions in the style of Bach.

VI. Advanced counterpoint; study and writing of fugue, single and double counterpoint; canon.

VII. Orchestration.

174 Harpsichordist Wanda Landowska offered a course entitled “Style and Interpretation of the Music following the Principles of the Great Masters of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,” demonstrating musical examples on the harpsichord, the clavichord, and the square piano. 1925/26 Catalogue, 13.
Dictation ranged from material covered in elementary theory to notating Bach chorales by ear.

Unless excused for ‘some valid reason,’ students were required to study at least two academic subjects each term and to attend designated lectures. Within three years this academic requirement would be reduced to one academic each year and ‘certain’ lectures. Some of the academic courses were open to the community for a fee. The purpose of the course in psychology was “to aid [the student] develop his methods of study and practice in such a fashion that his progress will not be impeded by unnecessary difficulties. Attention [was] directed to certain aspects of biological and psychological research which have been shown to possess great importance for the individual in the right ordering of his life and work.”

The demands of practice were acknowledged, and courses were arranged to allow students the maximum time for this daily regimen. Curtis recognized that it was impossible to provide a complete and thorough academic education in the context of its primary focus; nevertheless, it meant to provide a foundation for future study. The intentions guiding academic courses were “to give students under a minimum time schedule the collegiate background and understanding of cultural values essential to the true development of an artist.”

Considered the most relevant for the musician was the study of languages, literature, fine arts, history, and psychology. In addition, an understanding of the “fundamental unity of various art forms enables a deeper conception of art and life and suggests a higher ideal of personal ethics.”

The dean designed a course of study to meet the needs of the individual student. The preparatory division was discontinued after one year, although high-school-age
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175 1925/26 Catalogue, 27.

176 Ibid.

177 Ibid.
students attended the Institute. Understandably, the length of enrollment was not
designated; rather, the emphasis was on quality of achievement rather than length of time
given to a subject. Attendance and progress reports were submitted at the end of the
academic year. Students who failed to pass an exam satisfactorily were allowed to repeat
the course. All students were accepted on one year’s probation, and those whose work
was not adequate, either because of effort or ability, were not permitted to continue at
The Institute.

As head of the piano department—the first catalogue used the phrase ‘personal
direction and supervision’ instead of ‘head’—Josef Hofmann designated three levels of
piano study, Preparatory, Artist, and Post-supervision. Preparatory students were
groomed for the artist grade under a major teacher, then called master teacher. Master
teachers gave class lessons to preparatory students so that even at an early stage of
development teachers knew the strengths of a student’s talent, and students were exposed
to a ‘master’ foundation in approach to study. Post-supervision was available only to
former artist-level students and consisted of four lessons with their teacher, equally
spaced, for not more than two years.178 (Comparable was Juilliard’s ‘advisory’ category
but details of that arrangement with the teacher were not so specific.)

To the existing list of courses were added solfège, eurhythmics, and acoustics, still
totaling seven hours per week devoted to theoretical subjects. (Solfège, harmony,
acoustics, eurythmics, ensemble, ear training and dictation, keyboard harmony, and later
score reading were all considered theoretical subjects.)

1 hour or meeting time per week

Piano

3 hours per week

Solfège or Harmony

178 1926/27 Catalogue, 23.
1 hour per week

Ensemble

English

French, German, or Italian

History of Music, or Comparative Arts, or Psychology, or Comparative Literature, or World History

Eurhythmics

Acoustics

Theory retained its position as essential to understanding the organization of music, and it offered the opportunity to develop compositional skills for those students so gifted. (In addition to instrumental and voice lessons, composition and orchestration, as advanced theory classes, were privately instructed.)

A series of eight lectures on art were offered in 1928. Among some of the titles, Impersonal Elements: Symbolic and Magic Art (with experiments); Rhythm, Personal Expression (with experiments); Intuition, Religion and Art, and The Form of Speed. One can only wonder at the experiments. Also new to the curriculum were platform deportment, chamber music, chamber music score reading, and a major in accompanying.

Piano A and Piano B replaced the words solo (Piano A) and accompanying-supplementary (Piano B) under piano studies. A Plan of Study for piano now might include chamber music, introduction

179 The chair of the theory department, Reginald Morris, was an Englishman trained in England, where he had also taught. He authored theory texts, one of which was regarded as “demolishing the dry-as-dust rules” of the subject. One of his texts may have been used for theory class. His colleague, Rosario Scalero, was “the type of scholar only Italy could produce” in his perception of form, beauty, and orderliness. Solfège was taught by the French theorist, Renée Longy-Miquelle, daughter of the founder of the Longy School in Boston, George Longy, who was oboist with the Boston Symphony for twenty-seven years. 1926/27 Catalogue, 9-10.

180 “To succeed in this field one should plan on this career choice rather than to arrive at it by failure in solo work.... It is as much of an art as solo playing ... and requires a thorough musicianship, pianistic ability, singleness of purpose and faithfulness to [the] work.” 1930/31 Catalogue, 61.
to science (intended for students with insufficient high school background), platform deportment, and physical training, along with courses in theory\textsuperscript{181} (see Appendix B, Chart I). Chamber music would become a required supplementary subject for piano majors in 1935.

What is noticeably absent from all the catalogues under consideration was any mention of end-of-year exams in the major area, known as ‘juries’ in many music schools. There were, in fact, no ‘juries’ at Curtis until 1979, when Curtis became a member of NASM. Nor was there any mention of a document acknowledging completion of some amount of work until the 1935-1936 catalogue, which stated simply, “Curtis Institute graduates who qualify receive the diploma, the Bachelor of Music, and/or the Master of Music degree” (awarded only in composition). The policy to grant degrees was inaugurated in 1934, the year that Curtis held its first commencement. However, the degree was not accredited and recognized only at Juilliard and at Yale.”\textsuperscript{182} “The possession of sufficient musical talent, while other qualifications are to be met, is almost positive assurance in itself of acceptance.” Those students not having completed high school, and especially foreign students, were tutored in academics, but those who completed a high school education while at Curtis were the exception. “Consequently, students upon reaching graduate status musically may or may not have met the academic

\textsuperscript{181}Piano B was required for all students except those majoring in Piano. Accompanying and chamber music/piano students needed only Grade B skills to major in either of these areas, although the general outline for the course of study in solo piano, accompanying, and chamber music remained the same. The distinction between A and B indicates the intensity of the commitment for the solo major, who was assigned to a master teacher. That was not the case for the other majors. Many of the chamber works and accompaniments are very demanding both musically and technically, but the demands of the solo career exceed the others in its singular source of energy and intuitive gift to produce a compelling performance and to sustain a long career.

\textsuperscript{182}Curtis received accreditation from the Commissioner of Higher Education in 1992 and joined the National Association of Schools of Music in 1979. Information provided by Curtis librarian, Elizabeth Walker, 2 August 2011, by phone, and Robert Fitzpatrick, former dean, August 5, 2011, e-mail correspondence.
requirements of a degree.” In some instances students had already received degrees at other institutions before coming to Curtis for its intense and highly competitive musical training. (Such was the case with Leonard Bernstein, who had already graduated from Harvard before continuing his study at Curtis under Randall Thompson.) Except for the Plans of Study that show what courses may have been taken, it remained the judgment of the major teacher to determine when a student was ready for graduation, regardless of other course work. Thus, when playing reached a certain level, the student graduated. Examples of ‘graduation recitals’ of significant stature date from 1939 and give evidence in the choice of repertory of the high level of work achieved.

Not until the 1940s, however, did the typical description of minimum course requirements enter the catalogue. (Might this have been the influence of the academic background of Randall Thomson, the director at that time?) The diploma was awarded at the completion of three or more years of study in a major course, assuming a “high standard of excellence” was maintained in both major and supplementary courses. The pianist was required to complete one year each of solfège, counterpoint, harmony, and elements of music, and would be examined in these courses. Chamber music was required throughout the entire period of study. Students received credit for both public performances and for performances in Curtis’s Casimir Hall. Attendance at all recitals was required, as was permission by the director for outside professional engagements. But again, the major teacher determined when a student was ready to graduate.

183 Overtones, Vol. VI, 1 (May 1936).

184 Former dean of Curtis Robert Fitzpatrick provided the information regarding juries and graduation. Curtis librarian Elizabeth Walker concurred.

185 Elements of music included acoustics, theory of harmony, theory of rhythm, form, the Greek system, the modal system, constitution of polyphonic forms, the rise of opera and oratorio, the Flemish Schools, the Italian Schools, the German Schools. 1942/43 Catalogue, 7.
For admission to the degree program, students would have successfully completed sixteen high school units as outlined by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. The degree was awarded at the completion of no fewer than four years study in any major course and a minimum of one hundred twenty semester hours—sixty in applied music, thirty in theory, and thirty in academic work, according to the recommendation of NASM. Chamber music as a supplementary subject was required throughout the four years. Curtis granted credit for academic subjects taken at an accredited college or university before or during a student’s period of enrollment\(^{186}\) (see Appendix B, Chart J).

For academic subjects, teachers submitted a Record of Class Work. These are informative records. For example, a course in Comparative Literature scheduled over twenty-five weeks in 1925 listed Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Shakespeare Sonnets, Lecky (selected chapters on the History of England), Rousseau, Mill, and Shaw as required reading. It included an optional reading list of about another twenty or so books. A course in World History summarized its description with, “The limited amount of time and the musical programs of the students make this of necessity a very general course,” an academic compromise in deference to musical demands.\(^{187}\) Tutoring was offered to those students needing to complete high school equivalency: a representative example from the 1940-1941 academic year was a tutoring class of three to five students studying Latin, Algebra, History, English Composition, and English Literature taught by one instructor.\(^{188}\) Although most academic subjects met for one hour weekly, Tutoring was given over two, three, or five days each week, depending on the instructor.

\(^{186}\)1942/43 Catalogue, 6.


\(^{188}\)Classes in the Academic Department 1940-41, Report of the Dean, 1940-41, Box 3.
There was no indication in catalogues of courses for students interested in teaching, yet one Record of Classes lists three classes in ‘Normal’ for 1924-1925. It was taught by Angela Diller, known for her piano methods for young children. Thirty-two students were enrolled.\textsuperscript{189}

From a Record of Private Lessons for the same year, four major teachers of piano—Hofmann, Boyle, Saperton, and Vengerova—each taught one student per week. There is no mention of Wilhelm Backhaus who was said to have been on the faculty for that year. By 1940 the major teachers—Jorge Bolet (a former student of Saperton), Kaufman, Saperton, Serkin, and Vengerova—taught between four and eight students weekly, for a total of approximately thirty-four students.\textsuperscript{190} This suggests on the one hand the growth of the department during the intervening years and on the other hand the limited number of students admitted.

What characterized Curtis during these twenty years was a consistency of purpose that in turn dictated a consistency in its music curriculum. Changes were more in the details than in the basic course structure. The major teacher was the guiding force throughout one’s time of study at Curtis, and that teacher, appointed to the faculty because of his/her stature in the profession, determined the educational course of events for the student. It may be reasonable to assume that the admissions process was so rigorous and the standard to return for another year so demanding that the level of work in all musical courses remained high. But one cannot lose sight of the fact that playing and practicing the instrument dominated the life of the student.

Curtis began with a commitment to ‘cultural’ or academic courses that would help develop an artistic sensibility. Its elaborate offerings were geared to those subjects thought most to benefit the musician—languages, history, the arts, and psychology, the

\textsuperscript{189} Report of the Dean 1925-1926, Box 1, Folder 2.

\textsuperscript{190} Ibid.
latter to assist the individual in organizing his life-style. Initially four courses from these
categories in addition to lectures were required each year. Gradually this requirement
was reduced, although provisions were made for those students who entered without
having completed high school. In addition to tutoring courses, the academics listed in the
Dean’s Report of 1940-41 were three languages to advanced level (French, Italian,
German), addressing mainly the needs of student singers, and psychology. By 1945
academics and high school equivalency were required for degree students but not
required for the non-degree program, which remained the primary program of study for
its student body. Curtis accepted academic credits from other institutions and in many
cases students who had already been awarded a degree from another institution. When
time was needed for more private instruction that time was taken from other instrumental
work, namely ensemble classes, although academics were modified to accommodate the
intensity of instrumental study.

In an article for the school magazine, *Overtones*, Josef Hofmann wrote on the
concert artist as teacher: “It used to be that concert artists dreaded teaching as a
comparatively colorless occupation that clipped the wings, devitalized art, and stultified
performance ... in spite of the examples of Liszt and Rubinstein, the two great artist-
teachers of the past, and later Busoni, all of whom, alternately concertizing and teaching,
were living refutations of this theory.”¹⁹¹ For Hofmann teaching was a means of
preserving the theories and principles that had evolved over time and a responsibility to
pass these on to newer generations so as to assure an “eternal life for [the] art.” But to
inspire teachers, students must be “good,” which is why the artist-teacher accepts only
gifted students—selfish perhaps, yet justified. “A vessel cannot be expected to receive

¹⁹¹*Overtones* (May 1936): 5-6.
more than its capacity and a great artist has much to give.”¹⁹² Being “good” takes time. Curtis understood this well—making that possibility in fact paramount—and preserved the flexibility with its curriculum to allow students to achieve that “good.”

¹⁹²Ibid., Jorge Bolet, who was a student under Saperton at Curtis during the Hofmann years took the position that there are not great teachers. “There are only great students . . . Some of the great pedagogues … prime examples in this country are Lhevinne, Genhart … had the good luck because of their name … to attract the very greatest talents.” Risenhoover and Blackburn, 42.
Chapter V
SUMMARY

How much do we practice in order to become a performing musician, in this case a pianist? Perhaps a more fundamental question might be “What does the ‘practice’ of the performing musician encompass?” Eastman, Juilliard, and Curtis addressed these questions in their own way. First, in their purpose they defined their overarching mission and also defined the quality of talent that could aspire to this end. Second, their curricula defined a level of musicianship to serve as the foundation for interpretation. And third, the personal profiles of those who were significant in the design of the schools’ programs and of those who taught in these schools defined to some degree the musician’s way of life—the ‘practice’ of the musician. Students’ lives were channeled by the particular ‘environment’ each of these schools cultivated, beginning with its original purpose, translated into a body of knowledge, to be passed on and conserved from one generation to the next. What is taught and what is learned is always being evaluated, concepts of curriculum are many, and curriculum adjusts as a school grows and change occurs both within its walls and without. Further, intellectual validity or professional specialty may be more the result of how we are taught and how we study rather than the study of a given subject.
Minimally, education should provide those tools that enable an individual to adapt to ongoing changes in society and to find a meaningful place in that social spectrum. America accomplished this for its music students by taking from Europe a standard of performance along, with a music education based on theoretical and analytical knowledge, while drawing upon its own history to integrate an academic component into the music curriculum in some format. It was a process of distilling what was essential—musical training, and allowing flexibility with what was deemed important—academic study. How these schools brought together European and American ideals to prepare their students for a performing career in music contributes a significant chapter to the history of American higher education. The degree to which this enterprise was successful provides opportunity for judicious review. With regard to the study of music subjects themselves, it brings into focus another dimension in the distinction between liberal and professional: If analytical thinking suggests a process that influences quality of thought, then is this process not similar across many areas of study, both those considered liberal and those professional? And if so, how valid is the divide?

In accepting vocational/professional training as part of its offerings, the nineteenth-century American university bestowed on music ‘academic’ credibility by granting degrees in music and by creating professorships in this field of study. Yet tensions between music and academics persisted as the importance of the degree as a credential gradually became a social determinate as well as a necessary document for teaching within the university. The curriculum for the applied music student had to consider, sooner or later, the significance of the degree and how its academic requirements might be met. Putting the degree aside, there was also the question of providing a general
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education (academic, liberal arts) for the musician. For the applied music student whose
talent made possible a concert career, an environment that encouraged time for reflective
practice and created a safe zone for developing one’s individual voice and stimulated that
individuality was desirable if not critical. This framework also had to promote the
practical tools that underlie musicianship and had to foster a humanistic sensibility that
would find its expression in interpretation. Taken all together, training and educating the
musician culminated in disciplining the muscles, disciplining the emotions, and
disciplining the mind.

With equal rigor Eastman, Juilliard, and Curtis all aimed to do this, each in its own
way, depending on the primary interests each sought to serve. Defining its purpose,
Eastman and the Institute of Musical Art addressed a wide population through their
preparatory and community extension divisions, in addition to their collegiate-level
programs. Both schools offered a variety of music majors, one of which was a strong
program in advanced performance study. The Juilliard Graduate School and Curtis
directed their efforts solely to performance study and its close associate, composition.
With these as their starting points, each school developed its individual curricula with
subjects that were common to all and with some that were unique to each. Broadly
speaking, those categories of study were theory, skills, professional studies, academics,
and the applied major.

Theory: This group of subjects included music fundamentals, harmony,
counterpoint, analysis, and orchestration. Although all of these schools had a strong
theory curriculum, there was no one basic text in use nor one prevalent format for
presenting material. At least one theorist on each faculty had written a text on the subject.
For example, several copies of Manual of Harmonic Technic: Based on the Practice of

2German universities were relegated to research and the conservatory to musical studies,
the major drawback for universities being the “number of dissertations” often “produced on
unimportant subjects.” Edward J. Dent as quoted in Thompson, 216.
J.S. Bach by Donald Tweedy are at the libraries at Eastman and at the University of Rochester. It may be assumed that that text was used for a period of time. It was published ‘for’ the Eastman School and Howard Hanson wrote the forward. Tweedy dedicated his theory book to Percy Goetschius, the highly respected and well-known American theorist. Goetschius was on the faculty at the Institute of Musical Art and also authored theory texts, as did George Wedge, who taught at Juilliard beginning in the 1920s after serving on the faculty at Curtis. The same was true of Reginald Morris, the English theorist at Curtis. What is evident is that the American music school was no longer dependent on European texts and that there was no one American method of teaching theory. Nevertheless, theory and all that it encompassed provided the tools of analysis that opened the path to understanding how a musical composition is constructed.

Skills: Associated with theory but more accurately ancillary subjects, keyboard harmony, ear training/dictation, sight-reading, and solfège received different emphasis in the curricula among these schools. By 1934 keyboard harmony and dictation do not appear as independent classes in the Eastman catalogue. They seem to have been absorbed into the course in theory since credit hours for theory during sophomore year were increased, suggesting the inclusion of these ancillary subjects at that point in the curriculum. At the Institute of Musical Art these classes met for two hours weekly for three years in both the three-year diploma course and the four-year degree program. Curtis required two or three years of solfège in its degree program, along with two years of form and orchestration. Solfège as such was not offered at Eastman and was removed from the Juilliard curriculum because it was felt to serve a limited purpose. All schools regarded the development of ear-training and keyboard skills as very important. The

---

3David Coppen, archivist, Sibley Music Library, e-mail correspondence, May, 2011.

4 Solfège included ear training, chord formation and progression, rhythm, sight-reading, transposition, and score reading. Often it simply refers to vocal sight-singing with do-re-mi syllables. 1944/45 Catalogue, 16.
Institute of Musical Art and Curtis were consistent, though, in keeping these separate courses for three years—the standard length of time for diploma study.

**Professional studies and activities:** These related directly to the working musician. Piano and theory methods were required for degree study at the Institute of Musical Art and at Eastman and were taken as an elective at the Juilliard Graduate School. Even though there is no mention of methods in the Curtis catalogues, it is listed in an administrative accounting of subjects offered. All schools, therefore, acknowledged teaching as a career path for the performer, although Eastman substituted practice for the performer’s recital in place of its fourth-year-second-semester methods class. Each school required ensemble, Eastman for one year, the Institute for two, and Curtis for each year of study there. Only Curtis required one year of accompanying, in place of *solfège* in its diploma course, and only Curtis offered a course in stage deportment. Performance opportunities included school and community recitals and radio broadcasts, and students heard performances by mentors and visiting artists. Along with providing professional experience, George Eastman, Frank Damrosch, and Mary Curtis Bok imprinted ‘their’ cultural standard on society at large in some sense by the example of ‘their’ school’s activities and the audiences they reached.

**Academics:** These subjects developed students’ awareness of historical perspective and a view of the world beyond themselves, enlarging their understanding of human experience. From its first year the Bachelor of Music degree could be taken at Eastman. Its initial academic requirements of university courses, however, were pared down to what would become more typical for the music student—English, languages, psychology, music history. For several years lectures on a wide variety of topics mostly related to the arts provided the cultural and academic background considered important for a well-rounded education at the Institute of Musical Art and at Curtis. In the case of Curtis, its early catalogues listed an impressive array of subjects, but by the 1940s only languages and a class titled Elements of Music remained in its catalogue. Keeping in mind that the
Institute of Musical Art was founded in 1905, nearly thirty years passed before a degree in applied music was offered. For Curtis it was ten years—initiated the same time as the Institute—but its degree was not universally recognized. Once the degree was in place, high school graduation became a requirement for admission. Lectures at the Institute were complemented by the series at the Graduate School given by John Erskine, one such series named Materials of Poetry. When the Bachelor of Science degree entered the curriculum at the Institute of Musical Art in the 1930s, courses such as English literature, languages, history, ethics, psychology, and acoustics were available for study. Eastman may have enjoyed the reputation of a more academic school, but in fact the offerings at the Institute were as prominent. (Additionally, one Graduate School student transcript shows a course in radio technology; literature had been offered at the Graduate School since the early 1930s.)

One means of enabling music students to manage academic classes was to absorb academic faculty into the music school by engaging that faculty to join its ranks. These teachers tended to be sympathetic to and to understand the demands and pressures of performance study. The commitment was to turning out performing musicians, which meant that academic expectations needed to remain sufficiently flexible to allow music students to achieve that end. On the other hand, the minimal academic offerings at Curtis in the 1940s seem to suggest that a change had taken place from its earlier years and that those students now enrolling for such classes did so at nearby academic institutions.

**Applied music:** As music education in America improved and as the number of competent applicants increased, these schools demanded a higher level of playing for admission. Once accepted, study was intense, especially so for candidates for the performer’s and artist’s certificates at the Institute of Musical Art and at Eastman. Few made the mark. The intensity of study is further evident at the Graduate School and at

5Miscellaneous booklet, The Juilliard Graduate School Faculty, 1932-1933.
Curtis, where students were admitted “on probation,” for only one year at a time, depending on the quality of their work. To give some perspective of how the Graduate School assessed its student population, it accepted approximately one hundred students, out of which twelve or fifteen might develop into artists. Length of study for performance students at each of these schools was flexible.

Requirements notwithstanding, performance standard at the Juilliard Graduate School and at Curtis directed the course of events. At Curtis teachers had autonomy to determine when students would graduate. If curriculum is seen as a kind of ‘power struggle’ among faculty, then here the artist teacher reigned. Curtis students were not examined in their applied area. Juilliard, on the other hand, sought to integrate itself with the trends that dominated educational practice, those of exams and requirements. When confronted by faculty about the difficulty of theory requirements, Dean Hutcheson countered that the day a musician could survive simply on performance ability was past. Leniency with theoretical subjects could not be encouraged, although each case would be reviewed. “A school has to maintain discipline and requirements in study. The private teacher can do exactly as he pleases, but in a school there is a real difference.”

The piano faculties at all of these schools during these early years were predominately European—mostly of Russian, German, and French background. In some cases language was a problem, and in some cases also the severity of teaching styles and temperaments in general. But the importance of the stature of the artist faculty and what they might bring to the student community outweighed these issues for most students, who, over a period of time, more often than not came to appreciate and value their

---

6 Faculty Minutes, 1929, 19. The Juilliard Archives.

7 Faculty Minutes, October 1934, 35. The Juilliard School Archives.

8 Laila Storch, Marcel Tabuteau: How Do You Expect to Play the Oboe If You Can’t Peel a Mushroom? (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008), 184.
teaching. (Appendix A briefly describes the personalities and teaching styles of four teachers from these schools.)

The administrators of both the Juilliard Graduate School and of Curtis were examples of the products they hoped to produce. With the exception of four years between 1924 and 1945, the directors at Curtis, Josef Hofmann and Efrem Zimbalist, were consummate artists and active in their careers. In addition they taught a limited number of students. (Concert artists have filled all directorships at Curtis since.)

Juilliard’s Ernest Hutcheson had a distinguished and very long career as a teacher—at Peabody, Chautauqua, the Institute of Musical Art, and at Juilliard—and taught a “legion of first-class players.”

Perhaps not regarded in the same league as Hofmann (among the handful of great pianists of that period), he nevertheless was highly respected as a pianist and remained active performing during his tenure as dean and president. Both Hanson and Damrosch held strong views on music education—Hanson, the prominent composer with a background in academics as well as in music, and Damrosch, the prominent educator with a conservatory background. They too exemplified the products they wished to produce, leaning toward a wider perspective than performance alone, one where adaptability was encouraged and held as necessary, while not diminishing a high standard for performance.

With the example of these schools and the guidance of the National Association of Schools of Music, the core curriculum in 1945 had become typical for applied music study. It would remain in place at Eastman and Curtis for another thirty or so years. At Juilliard, however, the curriculum underwent a major revision with the appointment of its new president in 1945 and its complete merge with the Institute of Musical Art in 1946.

---

9 Dubal, 184.

Also moving ahead, each school would alter its offerings to equip students with the theoretical tools for the new tonalities and formal structures of twentieth-century composition, and each would broaden its curriculum to enable its graduates to remain competitive as resources and opportunities became limited. To this point, however, these schools had established an environment unique to itself as it filtered and refined its programs of study over the course of their initial twenty to twenty-five years. Among many musicians, music educators, and potential applicants, Eastman’s program has been regarded as the most ‘academic’ in comparison to that of Juilliard and Curtis, and perhaps more broadly focused, while Juilliard and Curtis have retained their reputation for ‘intense’ performance study. This is at best a short-hand description. However, the degree of truth in this perception, assuming truth to lie there, may be substantiated by this study of their early histories. By the twenty-first century, Juilliard had expanded its educational domain to include theater and dance, in addition to music. By comparison, Curtis has remained small in size with its singular focus on music, but not without recognition of the challenges of the twenty-first century for musicians.

The success of these schools resulted from at least five known factors. First, each school began with a clear vision of purpose and what it desired for an end result, and each stayed the course. Second, each school maintained a very high and uncompromising standard for the training and education of its students. Third, their financial backing made possible not only the reality of a vision but also the means to hold to an original purpose and to maintain a desired standard. Fourth, their artist faculties, carefully selected, were willing to compromise some degree of independence for the larger school-community ideology. Finally, these schools assessed and reviewed their curricula and adjusted as times and social currents necessitated change and as the level of students improved, demanding of themselves the same level of improvement as of their students. They serve, consequently, as outstanding models of professional education.
Currently, what makes it great? has become a popular topic for pre-concert talks to engage audience receptivity. The curricula these schools designed for study in applied music was intended to guide the student to answer that question for himself as a way of validating his interpretation of a musical composition and of “solving the problems of his art.” It encompassed an understanding of music as a means of human expression from the composer through the performer, of music as a reflection of a historical time period, and of music as an organized sound structure. No curriculum is a guarantee of an end result. Yet by supporting an intellectual foundation that brought together theory, cultural exposure to other disciplines, and musical talent these schools offered a definition of musicianship as the basis for music performance. It was a professional curriculum founded on artistic integrity.

In a slightly different context Howard Hanson cogently expressed this ideal of the profession that is the musician’s ‘practice’:

Applied music is by no means confined to the development of virtuosity. It is only a ‘tool’ to be used in the study of music; it, in a very real sense, is music to the vast majority for it is the closest approach to the creation of music that anyone can make who is not himself a composer. The performing of music may not be creation but is, in its ideal form, a very real act of re-creation. It involves an intense concentration by the student on the problems of an interpretation—a translation—of the printed page in terms of actual sound. The printed page is merely a complex symbolization of the thoughts of the composer. It becomes music only after this symbolization has been adequately translated into sound by a scholarly and sensitive mind and by trained ears. It is difficult to understand why the studying about music should be considered work justifying college credit while the adequate interpretation of the music itself in performance should be considered unworthy.11

The challenge may be to accept sound as a substitute for words and interpretation as a substitute for the written document, and for the musician to bring to his interpretation the intellectual, emotional, and physical capacity to grasp and communicate the musical
composition in all its intricacies. The process, then, is no less compelling than a
penetrating analysis of a literary masterwork, and presents no less stimulating an
intellectual discourse as different interpretations and analyses are weighed, argued about,
and enjoyed for their creative insights.

11Howard Hanson, as quoted in Thompson, 101.
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Appendix A

THE ARTIST AS TEACHER

“It is impossible, of course, to capture completely the personal touch of a great teacher.”1 Passing on a tradition, nurturing talent, influencing—such a process, elusive and complex, occurs as much by what is unsaid as by what is said, often affecting the personal as well as the musical life of the receiver. By and large the world of the applied music student revolved around that weekly lesson with his major teacher—respect, reverence, fear, anxiety, elation, anger—all of these emotions taking hold at one time or another as the musician within the student evolved. Other responsibilities were attended to, yet the ‘major’ teacher was the ‘major’ force of his student career, and beyond. What is unique to the applied musician is that the weekly lesson was a kind of evaluation of his emotional construct of the music. This ‘critique,’ specific to the individual, was, of course, a factor he would face repeatedly in a performing career—published criticism of his performances. What objectivity here, sometimes complicated by large and egotistical personalities?2

Because of the importance of the private lesson in the student’s total curriculum, the following examples provide a glimpse into the private teaching studio of four teachers from the schools reviewed. In describing the context of communicating ideology, these examples address an aspect of professional education. The discussion, while brief, allows some sense of particular teaching styles and personalities: Cecile Genhart of the Eastman School, Ernest Hutcheson of the Juilliard Graduate School, Isabelle Vengerova of Curtis,


and Olga Samaroff, of Juilliard and Curtis. All were renown in ‘their’ day, highly regarded for their musical knowledge and for the pianists they turned out, and today remain historically significant as teachers of piano. Each brought a sharp personality to his/her teaching, along with an individual ‘methodology.’ Their backgrounds by birth and training were different. They were first, second, and third generation products of the great teacher-pianists of the nineteenth century, following, among others, Franz Liszt, Ferruccio Busoni, Theodore Leschetizky, and Anton Rubinstein.3

Cecile Genhart was Swiss-born. After her first lessons with her father, a pianist and teacher of repute, she studied with Busoni in Berlin. Upon her return to Switzerland she resumed study with Emil Frey and Edwin Fischer. Additionally, the English pedagogue Tobias Matthay, whose studio she visited in 1929 after she had been appointed at Eastman, greatly influenced her teaching.4

Genhart was a teacher of great detail, hearing the same work repeatedly to be sure the student understood well her points. Her teaching was known to enable even those students with modest ability to play very well. The application of harmony, counterpoint, and musical form in designing an interpretation was basic to her approach. She also expected students to develop keyboard fluency with transposition, modulation, and improvisation, so as to have not only what was on the printed page in the hand but a basic facility of ‘pianism’ as well.5

Although her demeanor was firm, it was not without a guarded awareness of the delicate relationship between teacher and student. “Establishing the initial relationship with a student is always an exhausting process. One has to overextend oneself in order to

3 Liszt taught in Weimar, Busoni in Berlin, Leschetizky in St. Petersburg and Vienna, and Rubinstein in St. Petersburg. As well Liszt and Busoni are regarded as historically great pianists.

4 The English pedagogue Tobbias Matthay (1858-1945) authored several books on piano playing, his method based on the concept of free arm weight. Lyle, 183.

5 Gordon, 113.
create a bond with the new student, yet one has to begin correcting immediately. The corrections must be exacting, and yet the rigors of new, high standards must not be so great that the student is destroyed. Even during the most stormy sessions, those in which a student’s inadequacies begin to dawn upon him, a certain amount of his dignity must remain. Thus it is easy to see why I do not believe in ever being sarcastic in teaching.”

The quality of sound and concentrated listening to oneself formed a fundamental premise in her teaching. “Never believe until you hear.... Technique should always be judged in terms of sound. A good technique is not something that one sees. It is the quality one hears...” and requires the sacred time of daily practice.

Genhart believed she as the teacher influenced the entire personality of the student. “If a student is to reach the goal both of us want for him, that of becoming a combination of both artist and top-notch teacher, then he must realize that every aspect of his life and his personality must be evaluated in those terms.”

Ernest Hutcheson was Australian by birth. For advanced study he traveled to Leipzig, where he was a student of Carl Reinecke, and then to Weimar to study with Bernhard Stavenhagen, one of Liszt’s last pupils. Hutcheson kept meticulous notes, both on his daily practice—what he practiced and how long—and on what his students played, and, in fact, was known for his teaching ‘notebooks.’ Several years before his tenure at Juilliard, he had published a collection of technical studies entitled, *The Elements of Piano Technique*, a compilation of exercises synthesizing the essentials of technique for


7 Mandarin Cheung, “Pilgrimage of An Artist Teacher: Cecile Staub Genhart as Remembered by Her Students” (D.M.A. diss., Arizona State University, 1999), 54-55.

8 Gordon, 111.

9 Stavenhagen was born in Germany in 1862 and was known as a brilliant virtuoso specializing in the work of Liszt. George Bernard Shaw regarded him among the finest of pianists. (Lyle, 271.)
the student to work on independently. As a teacher at Peabody, Chautauqua, the Institute of Musical Art, and Juilliard, Hutcheson taught more than one thousand students in his career, one of whom was John Erskine, whose account of Hutcheson’s teaching follows:

I learned quickly to recognize his pre-eminence as a teacher.... From some points of view as good a teacher as I ever met in any subject. His special skill was in developing the pupil’s personality and in avoiding any encouragement to imitation of insincerity. He wanted the pupils ... to express themselves and at the same time to show that they understood what the composer was saying.

The pupil sat at one piano, Mr. Hutcheson beside him at another, but ... Mr. Hutcheson would not touch his piano until his pupil had played the piece to the end. He would then suggest that what the pupil had been trying to say could be made clearer by a different approach. With a surprising clearness he would suggest that different approach, still without specific illustration at the keyboard. The object of the discussions was to arouse the pupil’s imagination and to stimulate self-criticism. When the pupil began to understand what he himself wanted to say in the performance of a given piece, Mr. Hutcheson would often remark that the purpose now began to be clear, but it could be achieved by much simpler methods.

At this point he would permit himself to illustrate on the keyboard. At the end of the lesson his most characteristic comment might be something like this: “I would not play that passage the way you do, but I think your way of playing it is right for you, and I advise you not to change the interpretation.”

The chances would be that your curiosity was at once aroused to hear how he would play the passage, and if you asked him to do so he would demonstrate the contrast and explain the two interpretations, always managing somehow to rouse your appreciation not only of your own interpretation but of his.

As enlightening is his Address to Students (page 214), a sensitive statement of inspiration, encouragement, and advice gleaned, it seems, from personal understanding and experience. His may be considered a give-and-take approach, non-dogmatic and clear in arriving at a convincing interpretation.

---


Isabelle Vengerova, born in Lithuania, studied at the Vienna Conservatory under Leschetizky and was later appointed professor at the St. Petersburg Conservatory. Records of her teaching suggest an authoritarian manner between teacher and student. Every piece was memorized for the first lesson, not necessarily unusual, and then gradually each nuance of the music was analyzed according to the harmonic and contrapuntal foundation of the composition. The ear was the final arbiter in the design of the interpretation. Quality of sound was important, and her technical approach helped students cultivate her sense of sound. She also encouraged students to acquaint themselves with the cultural and historical background of the composer of the music they studied: “When you play a Beethoven sonata, you must also form an idea of all other Beethoven sonatas. While playing a work of a certain composer, you must become familiar with the historical era of his time, his biography, his ideas and the musicians who influenced his creative imagination. You must also study scholarly and literary works devoted to this composer.”

Vengerova’s studio was one of fear, with no exchange of ideas, and total control over students’ musical lives. Playing for another teacher, even informally, was not tolerated—the student was dismissed from her studio—nor performing without her permission. The outbursts of temper, at times ripping and stamping on sheets of music, at times throwing objects, must have made for colorful ... and difficult ... sessions.

Olga Samaroff was among the first Americans to hold a significant teaching position at a major American school. She was also the first American female to win a scholarship to the Paris Conservatory, where she encountered a patrician attitude toward

---


her musical pursuits: “Americans are not meant to be musicians.” Following her studies in Paris and having not been accepted into Anton Rubinstein’s class in St. Petersburg, she traveled to Berlin for lessons, one of her teachers there being Ernest Hutcheson.¹⁴

As a teacher she avoided illustrating and coaching. Rather she encouraged students to think through what they already knew and to apply this to their study and analysis of the score. In part, her approach was learned from the conductor Leopold Stokowski, to whom she was married for a time, and how he studied his scores. She provided students with lists of processes in studying music—Ten commandments for the Study of Music, for example. Among these, play the right note, study the music away from the piano before playing or practicing it, realize that all knowledge is barren without feeling, your playing can only be important if all the things that matter in music are important to you.¹⁵ Students were to work out these things as they related to their study of a piece of music on their own and to decide what they needed help with. Apparently these tenets were later revised and became Fourteen Points of Piano Practice. Some to consider—

Form the musical, imaginative, and interpretive concept of the goal toward which you will work.

In order to save time instead of reading through, take the first 8 to 12 measures, examine carefully for phrasing, type of touch, dynamics, accents, fingering, division of hands, and pedaling.

Repeat this section at least 25 times with all these things included, plus complete mental concentration.

Remember that the object and inevitable result of practice is the establishment of the habit of playing a certain thing in a certain way.

Do not establish the wrong habit.


¹⁵McGillan, 111.
Her time with most students was minimal—often thirty minutes every other week, not allowing much time for detailed work. She provided broad concepts for study, and details were the responsibility of the student. With some students, however, she was more than generous, giving extra lessons and of her personal time to the point of inviting some students to live with her during the Depression.\textsuperscript{16} She believed that being an artist “is a question of who a person is and she occupied herself with her students’ human development.”\textsuperscript{17}

Samaroff described her lessons with Ernest Hutcheson as “an unforgettable experience.”\textsuperscript{18} In his Address to Students Hutcheson summarized a personal-professional ideology that guided him, we infer.

\textbf{Transcribed Address: Ernest Hutcheson to Students (no date)}

Dear Students,

If you have talent, ambition, industry and perseverance, and wish to adopt music as a profession, let me by all means encourage you in your purpose, for the reward of success is great, the penalty of failure small, and the joy of work, irrespective of success or failure, keen and absorbing. You are choosing a pursuit full of beauty and intellectual interest, one which will bring you into intimate contact with life and offer you unusual personal freedom. Nor is the field overcrowded as is often said; every musician worth his salt can at best make a decent living.

If you are a pianist, you can hardly begin your studies too early. Spend some years in preparation, at least two or three more in a good Conservatory, and finally place

\textsuperscript{16}McGillan, 202.

\textsuperscript{17}Olmstead, 117.

\textsuperscript{18}McGillan, 14.
yourself under some artist of repute, abroad or at home. Choose your teachers carefully, and do not change them frequently or frivolously. Practice steadily, not spasmodically or extensively. Work at Harmony and Ear-training from the outset: later on study theory and composition, for (because) nowadays, to be a good pianist, you must be a good musician too. Further, as you must tap rich sources of human sympathy before you can express anything of value, give yourself a wide cultural education; read much, forming broad and catholic tastes, and learn one or two languages besides your own. Prolong your years of study to the utmost of your ability, for art is long. Do not be in a hurry to make money, and if you are forced to support yourself before you arrive at measurable artistic maturity, see to it that your progress is not arrested. Your studies will never end. Be not easily discouraged when things go badly, but actively seek a remedy. Seize every opportunity of playing before an audience. Learn from your fellow-students as well as from your teachers. Hear all the good music and all the great artists you can. Cultivate personality, not eccentricity. Listen, think, feel. Above all, guard well your health, both of mind and body.

With all good wishes for your success

Cordially yours

Ernest Hutcheson
Appendix B

SUPPLEMENTAL CHARTS
**EASTMAN CURRICULUM**

**Piano, Piano Methods, and Ensemble**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1925</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1934</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1944</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freshman</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF I (6)</td>
<td>PF 7 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 7 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 7 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 7 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 7 (1/6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(mtg. per wk./units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students who show a high degree of excellence will graduate with honors &amp; will be qualified to give a public recital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sophomore</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF II (6)</td>
<td>PF 8 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 8 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 8 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 8 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 8 (1/6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF III (6)</td>
<td>PF 9 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 9 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 9 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 9 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 9 (1/6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF PED (2)</td>
<td>PF METH A (1/1)</td>
<td>PF METH (1/1)</td>
<td>PF METH (1/1)</td>
<td>PF METH (1/1)</td>
<td>PF METH (1/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENS I (4)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF IV (6)</td>
<td>PF 10 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 10 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 10 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 10 (1/6)</td>
<td>PF 10 (1/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENS II with strings (1)</td>
<td>PF METH (elec) (1/1)</td>
<td>METH B (elec; 1/1)</td>
<td>METH 1-2 (1/1)</td>
<td>METH 101-102</td>
<td>METH 101-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEN REC (2)</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd sem. Only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENS 2 (1/½)</td>
<td>ENS II (1/½)</td>
<td>ENS II (1/½)</td>
<td>ENS II (1/½)</td>
<td>ENS II (1/½)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PF 10 (1/6)</td>
<td>METH (elec; 1/1)</td>
<td>METH 1-2 (1/1)</td>
<td>METH 101-102</td>
<td>METH 101-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEN REC (2)</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd sem. Only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEN REC (2)</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd sem. Only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEN REC (2)</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd sem. Only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEN REC (2)</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd sem. Only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEN REC (2)</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd sem. Only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEN REC (2)</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd sem. Only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
<td>CHOR (2/½)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEN REC (2)</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
<td>SEN REC (2) –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd sem. Only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
<td>2nd sem. only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Students who were candidates for graduation as performers were not required to take Piano Methods C or 103-104. Instead they were required to give a senior recital and to prepare a concerto with orchestra. On the other hand, students who wished to graduate as teachers were required to complete the first three-year course in piano (by 1944 designated as the course for the performer’s certificate) and did not need to give a public recital. They then would take Piano Methods C or 103-104 and had to show “a definite aptitude for teaching.” The same distinction between performer and teacher applied to other instruments as well. (Numbers in parenthesis refer to number of meeting hours per week followed by unit allowance. Abbreviations: PF – Piano; PEDagogy; ENSemble; METHods; CHORus; SENior.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>TH I (6)</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>SONATA FORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KEYBD H (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MODN H (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**DICT III (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>TH I (6)</td>
<td>TH II (4)</td>
<td>CPT (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KEYBD H (1)</td>
<td>KEYBD H (1)</td>
<td>ORCH (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**DICT IV (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>TH I (5/3)</td>
<td>TH 2 (4/4)</td>
<td>CPT 1 (2/2)</td>
<td>COMP 1 (2/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[*HIST M &amp; F (3/3)]</td>
<td>KEYBD H (1)</td>
<td>DICT 3 (elec - 1)</td>
<td>DICT 4 (elec - 1/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>TH I (5/3)</td>
<td>TH 2 (6/6)</td>
<td>CPT 1 (3/3)</td>
<td>TH COMP (2/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[*HIST M &amp; F (3/3)]</td>
<td></td>
<td>CTP (3/3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>TH 1-2 (5/3)</td>
<td>TH 3-4 (6/4)</td>
<td>CTP 101-102 (3/3)</td>
<td>TH ELEC (2/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TH 1-2 (5/3)</td>
<td>TH 3-4 (5/4)</td>
<td>TH METH (1/1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This was the only music history course listed in the 1930/31 and 1934/35 Catalogues and may be considered as the requirement for music history.

**Electives.

Abbreviations: Theory; KEYBoarD Harmony; MUSical ForM; CounterPoinT; DICTation; ORCHestration; MODeRN Harmony; COMPosition; METHods; ELECtive; HISTory of Music & Form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1925</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1934</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1944</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freshman</strong></td>
<td>HIST &amp; LIT</td>
<td>HIST M 1</td>
<td>HIST M &amp; F (3/3)</td>
<td>HIST M &amp; F (3/3)</td>
<td>HIST SUR 1-2 (3/3)</td>
<td>HIST SUR 1-2 (3/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ETHNO</td>
<td>(1926-27 = Hist &amp; Apprec)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sophomore</strong></td>
<td>MEDIEVAL – PALESTRINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior</strong></td>
<td>Beginning of OPERA to EARLY ROM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior</strong></td>
<td>LATE ROM MVT, 20\textsuperscript{th} C &amp; AMER COMP</td>
<td>(1926-28 = Hist of Fine Arts as related to music)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: HISTory & LITerature; ETHNOlogy; ROMantic; MoVemenT; AMERican COMPosers; Music; Form; HISTorical SURveY.
### CHART D

**EASTMAN CURRICULUM**  
Academic and Physical Education Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>RHET (3)</td>
<td>ENG 1 (3)</td>
<td>LANG I (3)</td>
<td>LANG II (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHYS EDU (3/1)</td>
<td>PHYS EDU (3/1)</td>
<td>PSYC I (3) or APPROV ELEC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>RHET (3/3)</td>
<td>ENG 1 (3/3)</td>
<td>LANG 1 (3/3)</td>
<td>LANG 2 (3/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHYS EDU 1 (3/1)</td>
<td>PHYS EDU 2 (3/1)</td>
<td>COLL ELEC (3/3)</td>
<td>COLL ELEC (6/6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>ENG 1-2 (3/3)</td>
<td>ENG 11&amp;12 (3/3)</td>
<td>COLL ELEC (6/6)</td>
<td>ACAD ELEC (3/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHYS EDU 1-2 (3/1)</td>
<td>PHYS EDU 11-12 (3/1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>ENG 1&amp;2 (3/3)</td>
<td>ENG 11&amp;12 (3/3)</td>
<td>ACAD ELEC (6/6)</td>
<td>ACAD ELEC (6/6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHYS EDU 1&amp;2 (3/1)</td>
<td>PHYS EDU 1-2 (3/1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>ENG 1&amp;2 (3/3)</td>
<td>ACAD ELEC (3/3)</td>
<td>ACAD ELEC (3/3)</td>
<td>ACAD ELEC (3/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHYS EDU 1&amp;2 (3/1)</td>
<td>PHYS EDU 1-2 (3/1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>ENG 1&amp;2 (3/3)</td>
<td>ACAD ELEC (3/3)</td>
<td>ACAD ELEC (3/3)</td>
<td>ACAD ELEC (3/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHYS EDU 1&amp;2 (3/1)</td>
<td>PHYS EDU 1-2 (3/1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: RHEToric; LANGuage & LITerature; PSYChology; EDUcation; HISTory; ECONomics; PHILOSophy; PHYSical EDUcation; APPROVed ELECTive; ENGlish; ACADemic/COLLege ELECTive.
Initial Course Offerings – Applied Piano

1905 - Prospectus

Courses offered: Ear-training, sight-singing, chorus
Theory and composition
Lectures
Pedagogy

Piano faculty: Sigismund Stojowski, head of department, plus 14 additional teachers

1906-07

All regular students will be required to follow a prescribed course of study. Sufficiently elastic to enable director to fashion each student’s work in accordance to individual requirements. May be advanced in one area yet elementary in another.

Subjects:
Theory and Composition:
  Acoustics; dictation; form and analysis; harmony-counterpoint-composition; elements of music
Lectures - History and Aesthetics of Music; interpretation
Sight-reading, sight-singing and sight-playing; score reading and playing from Old Clefs
Ensemble playing
Music Pedagogy in all its branches
Pianoforte playing
Piano, regular course: (3 years)

The piano – technique, touch, phrasing, interpretation
Ear-training; sight-singing; music dictation; choral practice
Elements of music – notation, intervals, rhythm
Theory of music – melody writing, harmony, form, analysis, counterpoint
Sight-playing – ensemble with 2 pianos and with strings
Attendance at lectures, recitals, rehearsals, concerts

Artist’s course (post-graduate)

The piano – advanced
Theory – advanced
Ensemble playing in chamber music and orchestra
Attendance at lectures, recitals, rehearsals, concerts

Twenty Years Later – Applied Piano

1935-36

For admission a high education or its equivalent was required. As well all candidates were tested in ear-training and theory and had to show aptitude and talent.

Students in all courses are enrolled for the entire year and are liable for the full amount of the tuition.

The minimum requirement for pianists included a study by Czerny, an etude by Heller, a sonatina by Clementi or a sonata by Haydn or Mozart, and a work by Mendelssohn, Chopin, or Schumann.
The regular course for pianists each week consisted of two one-half hour applied lessons, two hours of ear-training, and two hours of theory; in addition pianists were required to take keyboard harmony and ensemble; lectures and chorus were optional.

Lectures and recitals took place weekly; performances at the Graduate School were open to students at the Institute as were ten lectures given by John Erskine.

Exams in the applied subject were given in February; all other exams were given at the end of each semester.

Candidates for the certificate had to be approved by the applied instructor and the dean; they must have completed Theory III and Ear-training III, Keyboard harmony III and Ensemble III, and must have spent one year in residence. The pianist must also have presented a program representative of the Preludes and Fugues of the WTC, the sonatas of Beethoven or Schubert, and a work by Brahms, Schumann, or Chopin. The examination programs were assigned in February and were to be played from memory. In addition pianists were to prepare within a week and without assistance a work of moderate difficulty selected by the faculty. They would also be examined in scales, arpeggios, and chords.

No time limit was set for the Post-graduate course although that was usually completed within two additional years. Candidates for the artist’s diploma/certificate were required to play 1) one of the larger compositions by Bach; 2) a sonata by Beethoven later than Op. 22 and omitting Opuses 49, 106, 109, 110, and 111; 3) a nocturne, ballade, scherzo or the F Minor Fantasy by Chopin; 4) two pieces from the Fantasy or Novelettes or Kreisleriana by Schumann; 5) a rhapsody, transcription or etude by Liszt; 6) a work by MacDowell, Debussy, Ravel, Rachmaninoff, Scriabine, or any other modern composer, one of which was to be prepared without any assistance.

Diploma, post-graduate candidates were to have completed Theory IVA, Dictation V, and Keyboard harmony V.

Piano faculty numbered twenty-six.

**Theory Classes**

- Introductory theory (2 hours weekly)
rudiments; melody writing; keyboard harmony; analysis

Theory I  (2 hours weekly)
harmony; small forms; modulation; two-voice counterpoint; analysis

Theory II  (2 hours weekly)
chromatic harmony of the late nineteenth-century; two- and three-part forms; two- and three-voice counterpoint; analysis

Theory III  (2 hours weekly)
three-voice counterpoint, mixed species; harmonization of chorales in the style of Bach; unaccompanied canon; double counterpoint; three-voice fugues with analysis; form and style through analysis of compositions from the sixteenth to the twentieth century

Post-graduate courses:

Theory IV-A  (1 hour weekly)
chorales; three- and four-voice fugues; double fugue; accompanied canon; analysis of fugues of Bach and composers of the romantic school

Theory IV – B  (1 hour weekly)
study and development of form; modal and polyphonic music; sonata form; music of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century

Theory V  (1 hour weekly)
variation, rondo, sonatina, sonata-allegro forms

Theory VI  (1 hour weekly)
complete sonata; chamber music; larger vocal forms; overture; symphony; orchestration
Ear-training and sight-singing

Introductory ear-training  (2 hours weekly)
   diatonic intervals; major and minor triads

Ear-training I  (2 hours weekly)
   coordinated with theory I – harmonic and melodic dictation

Ear-training II  (2 hours weekly)
   coordinated with Theory II – dictation of chromatic chords; modulation; irregular rhythms and more difficult melodies

Ear-training III – A  (2 hours weekly)
   continuation of II with more advanced exercises; soprano, alto, and tenor clefs

Dictation IV  (1 hour weekly)
   chorales of Bach in C clefs; two- and three-voice counterpoint

Dictation V  (1 hour weekly)
   study, analysis, and writing from dictation of chords and progressions in modal, twelve-tone, and whole-tone systems; writing selections from works of late nineteenth and early twentieth century

Keyboard harmony

Keyboard harmony I  (1 hour weekly)
   harmonization in four-voice harmony; free accompaniment; improvisation; transposition; modulation

Keyboard harmony II  (1 hour weekly)
   coordination with Theory II; continuation of Keyboard harmony I

Keyboard harmony III  (1 hour weekly)
harmonization of folk songs; score reading; continuation of above

Keyboard harmony IV (1 hour weekly)
Chorale harmonization with simple contrapuntal imitation; vocal and string quartet score reading

Keyboard harmony V (1 hour weekly)
reading and analysis of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century compositions; reading of string quartet and orchestral scores

Ensemble

Piano ensemble I (1 hour weekly)
piano four-hands and two or more pianos

String and piano ensemble III (1 hour weekly)
sonatas and trios for piano and strings; to give instruction in ensemble playing and sight-reading and to familiarize students with ensemble literature

Chamber music IV (2 hours weekly)
students assigned to definite groups and work together throughout the year

Five Years Later – Applied Piano (Diploma and Degree Courses)

1940-41 Piano admission and exam requirements the same as earlier.

Admission requirements for the diploma the same.
Admission for the degree required sixteen high school units, 4 in English, 2 in a foreign language, 1 each in science, mathematics, history, ½ in civics, 6 ½ in music electives.

**Diploma program (in hours):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 hr. piano</td>
<td>1 hr. piano</td>
<td>1 hr. piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hrs. theory</td>
<td>2 hrs. theory</td>
<td>2 hrs. theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hrs. EarT</td>
<td>2 hrs. EarT</td>
<td>2 hrs. EarT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hrs. KBHar</td>
<td>2 hrs. KBHar</td>
<td>2 hrs. KBHar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hr. ens.</td>
<td>1 hr. ens.</td>
<td>1 hr. ens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hr. lect.</td>
<td>1 hr. hist.</td>
<td>1 hr. lect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hr. chorus</td>
<td>1 hr. chorus</td>
<td>1 hr. chorus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Degree program (in points):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Year (30 pts.)</th>
<th>2nd Year (33 pts.)</th>
<th>3rd Year (32 pts.)</th>
<th>4th Year (27 pts.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 – piano</td>
<td>6 – piano</td>
<td>6 – piano</td>
<td>6 – piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – theory</td>
<td>4 – theory</td>
<td>4 – theory</td>
<td>3 – pf meth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – EarT</td>
<td>4 – EarT</td>
<td>4 – EarT</td>
<td>3 – th meth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Dict</td>
<td>4 – KBHar</td>
<td>4 – KBHar</td>
<td>2 – acoustics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Forgn. lang.</td>
<td>2 – Ens.</td>
<td>2 – Ens.</td>
<td>4 - Mus. hist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – PhysEd</td>
<td>6 – Eng. lit.</td>
<td>6 – Psy. (gen &amp; ed)</td>
<td>6 – Hist. &amp; Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 – Hist.</td>
<td>6 – Hist./prin.of ed.</td>
<td>1 – Chorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – PhysEd</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Elec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theory Courses**

Theory 01 Introductory (4 pts., not credited for graduation).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory 11-12</td>
<td>Elementary harmony and counterpoint</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory 21-22</td>
<td>Advanced harmony and counterpoint</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory 31-32</td>
<td>Chorale harmonization, strict counterpoint, canon, fugue</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory 32S</td>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>(2 pts., 1 sem.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arranging and scoring 31-32</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form and analysis</td>
<td>(1 pt., 1 sem.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-graduate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory 104</td>
<td>Advanced counterpoint and fugue</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 104</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory 105</td>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>(6 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory 106</td>
<td>Advanced composition and orchestration</td>
<td>(6 pts.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ear-training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ear-training 01</td>
<td>Introductory</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear-training 11-12</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear-training 21-22</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear-training 31-32</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight-singing 31B-32</td>
<td>Advanced sight-singing</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation 104</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Keyboard Harmony**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KeyHarm 11-12</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeyHarm 21-22</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeyHarm 31-32</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeyHarm 104</td>
<td>Score-reading</td>
<td>(4 pts.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ensemble**

Pianists are required to study sight-reading until they are qualified by the ensemble instructor for admission to the following courses: piano ensemble and chamber music.

- **Piano ensemble**
  - two pianos
  - (2 pts.)

- **Chamber music**
  - sonatas and trios for piano with strings and/or winds
  - (2 pts.)

- **Advanced chamber music**
  - (4 pts.)

- **Chorus**
  - required of all students in all departments; works from the sixteenth century to present time
  - (1 pt.)

**History**

- **Foundations of modern Europe**
  - (3 pts., 1 sem.)

- **History of modern Europe**
  - (3 pts., 1 sem.)

- **American history and civilization**
  - (3 pts., 1 sem.)

- **History of music**
  - a survey of musical style from the Greeks to the present
  - (4 pts.)

- **History of music seminar**
  - research methods for the master’s degree
  - (3 pts.)
Physical education

Degree students were required to have two years of physical education and hygiene.

Hygiene 11-12: Personal hygiene
consideration of the place of intelligent control in modern civilization (1 pt.)

PhysEd 11-12: Gymnastics, sports, stunts, dancing
two periods a wee.
sports such as tennis, basketball, and archery (1 pt.)

PhysEd 1-2: Conditioning exercises
balanced physical exercise for those with remediable defects (1 pt.)

PhysEd 011-012: Recreation activities
every student is advised to have at least one avocation in which he or she can become absorbed and proficient during leisure hours; courses offered such as dancing, sports, tournaments, and contests (1 pt.)
### INSTITUTE OF MUSICAL ART: Bachelor of Science with a Major in Piano

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Piano</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Ensemble/Meth.</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st Year</strong></td>
<td>PIANO (6)</td>
<td>TH 11-12 (4) EAR TR/DICT (6)</td>
<td>FOR LANG (6)</td>
<td>PHY ED/HYG (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd Year</strong></td>
<td>PIANO (6)</td>
<td>TH 21-22 (4) EAR TR (4) KEYBD HARM (4)</td>
<td>ENG LIT (6) HIST (6)</td>
<td>PHY ED (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd Year</strong></td>
<td>PIANO (6)</td>
<td>TH 31-32 (4) EAR TR (4) KEYBD HARM (4)</td>
<td>GEN &amp; ED PSY (6) HIST &amp; PRIN ED (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th Year</strong></td>
<td>PIANO (6)</td>
<td>ACOUSTICS (2)</td>
<td>PF METH (3) TH METH (3)</td>
<td>MUS HIST (4) HIST &amp; ETHICS (6)</td>
<td>CHORUS (1) ELECTIVE (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHART G
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#### Regular Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>PIANO</th>
<th>THEORY</th>
<th>EAR TRAINING</th>
<th>KEYBD HARM</th>
<th>PEDAGOGY</th>
<th>LECTURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCT 29, 1924</td>
<td>Sieveking 19-0</td>
<td>Murphey GR I B 19-0</td>
<td>Soudant S.S.I B 17-2</td>
<td>Donovan GR I B 18-1</td>
<td>Donovan GR II</td>
<td>Sieger II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2, 1925</td>
<td>Excellent in every respect.</td>
<td>Book work very good.</td>
<td>Eligible to II.</td>
<td>Excellent.</td>
<td>Excellent.</td>
<td>9-10 No exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wedge DICT I B 19-0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eligible to II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT 8, 1925 –</td>
<td>Sieveking 30-0</td>
<td>Donovan GR II 29-1</td>
<td>Soudant S.S. II 30-0</td>
<td>Wagenaar GR II 29-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seeger Hist M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 1, 1926</td>
<td>Excellent musical talent &amp;</td>
<td>Book work excellent.</td>
<td>Excellent.</td>
<td>Excellent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>25-5 Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very good mind. Application</td>
<td>Examination very good.</td>
<td>Crowthure Dict. II 29-1</td>
<td>Promoted to III;</td>
<td></td>
<td>from both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>good. Progress fairly good.</td>
<td>Promoted to III.</td>
<td>Clear work, excellent;</td>
<td>Examination</td>
<td></td>
<td>examinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>examination perfect.</td>
<td>perfect.</td>
<td></td>
<td>GEN Musicianship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75-65=70% 28-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Musicianship</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT 7, 1926-</td>
<td>SIEVEKING 29-1</td>
<td>Excellent musical talent; very good mind; application excellent; progress very good.</td>
<td>30-0</td>
<td>RICHARDSON GR III</td>
<td>29-1</td>
<td>Good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY 31, 1927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WEDGE Dict. III</td>
<td>30-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT 6, 1927-</td>
<td>SIEVEKING 30-0</td>
<td>Excellent talent and mind. Application and progress excellent.</td>
<td>30-0</td>
<td>MANNES GR IV Practical</td>
<td>29-1</td>
<td>Term work very good. Finish exam. Fairly good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2, 1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WEDGE Dict. IV</td>
<td>29-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT 21, 1928-</td>
<td>SIEVEKING</td>
<td>Excellent in all aspects.</td>
<td>30-0</td>
<td>WEDGE GR V</td>
<td>30-0</td>
<td>Very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2, 1929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WEDGE GR V</td>
<td>30-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT 10, 1929-</td>
<td>SIEVEKING</td>
<td>Excellent musical and mental qualities. Application and progress excellent.</td>
<td>23-3</td>
<td>GR IV Composition I</td>
<td>29-1</td>
<td>Qualified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY 31, 1930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GR V Composition II</td>
<td>29-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WEDGE GR VI</td>
<td>2-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HENDERSON 80-90=80% 21-8 Qualified.
NORMAL CLASS Weak; to repeat.
## Post-Graduate Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PIANO</th>
<th>THEORY</th>
<th>EAR-TRAINING</th>
<th>KEYBOARD HARM</th>
<th>PEDAGOGY</th>
<th>NORMAL CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCT 9, 1930-</td>
<td>SIEVEKING</td>
<td>27-3</td>
<td>MANNES GR V 6-0</td>
<td>Qualified S.S. IV</td>
<td>GR VI</td>
<td>Qualified.</td>
<td>Excused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY 30, 1931</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent in all respects.</td>
<td>Discontinued. MANNES Composition III 28-2</td>
<td>Qualified Dict. V.</td>
<td>Excused.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Academic Courses 1925-1926

English Literature
Advanced Composition
English Poetry
Comparative Literature
Elementary English Diction
Advanced English Diction

French Literature of the Nineteenth Century

1st term: survey of the French novel; schools of Romanticism, Realism, Naturalism, Symbolism, and Impressionism

2nd term: Lyric and dramatic literature from the first Romanticists to the end of the Nineteenth Centur.

Elementary French
Intermediate French A and B
Elementary French Diction
Elementary German
German Diction
Advanced Italian
Italian Diction
Survey of History
Psychology
History of the Evolution of Music from its Origins to the Modern Age focusing on genres rather than biographies of composers
Series of lectures on composers and movements of modern age
History of musical composition
Music appreciation and criticism
A Comparative Arts Series:
Development of artistic civilization revealing the intimate relationship and comparative values of Arts and emphasizing currents of thought which have contributed notably to the development of music. Considers the contribution to cultural development of the human race made by music the plastic arts and literature. The relation of Art to ethical thought and philosophy is also considered. This course was a continuation of the 1924/25 series and consisted of thirty-two lectures given over the year.
1. Venetian School of Painting
2. Spanish School of Painting
3. Spanish Literature of the Golden Age
4. English Literature of the Eighteenth Century

5. The Scottish Romance and the Psychological Novel

6. Carlyle

7. Three Novelists of the Nineteenth Century

8. Wordsworth and Burns

9. Keats and Coleridge

10. Shelley and Byron

11. Tennyson and Browning

12. “Browning’s Message for our Time”

13. German Lyricism

14. The Dutch School of Painting and the Predecessors of Rembrandt

15. Rembrandt

16. Threshold of Modern Musical Era

17. The Literary Background of Richard Wagner’s Work

18. Richard Wagner and His Place in the History of all the Arts
19. Richard Strauss as the Inheritor of the Wagnerian Tradition

20. The Civil War as Awakener of America to Self-Consciousness

21. English Painters of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries

22. French Painters of the Nineteenth Century

23. The Impressionist and Modernist Painters

24. The French Realists

25. The French Symbolists

26. Italian Literature of the Nineteenth Century

27. Modern French Music

28. The Modern Russian School

29. The Austrian and German Schools

30. Spain and the Scandinavian Countries

31. The English School

32. Democracy—The New Social Ideal and its Interpretation in Art
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CURTIS INSTITUTE OF MUSIC:

Plans of Study

1926-27: Subjects offered to Students in Piano

Applied Piano
  Piano*
  Accompanying*
  Ensemble

Theoretical Music
  Solfège
  Harmony
  Counterpoint and Fugue
  Composition*

Supplementary Subjects
  English
  Modern Languages (French, etc.)
  Comparative Arts
  History of Music
  Psychology
  Comparative Literature
  World History
  Platform and Stage Deportment
  Acoustics
  Eurhythmics

*Private instruction

*1931-32 Plan of Study for Piano

Applied Piano
  Chamber Music
  Solfège and Theory
  History of Music
  English
  French
  German
  Italian
  Spanish
  Psychology
  General History
  Introduction to Science
  Platform Deportment
  Eurhythmics
  Physical Training

*1932-33 omitted both history courses, psychology, science, and physical education.
### For the Diploma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>all years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Solfège</em></td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterpoint</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements of Music</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber music</td>
<td>all years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### For the Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>all years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Solfège</em></td>
<td>2 years (2-3 yrs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterpoint</td>
<td>1 year (I/1; II/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>1 year (I/1; II/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements of Music</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestration</td>
<td>1 year (I/1; II/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber music</td>
<td>all years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>1 year (I/1; II/1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Elements of Music course includes Acoustics, Theory of Harmony, Theory of Rhythm, Form, the Greek System, the Modal System, the Constitution of Polyphonic Forms, the Rise of Opera and Oratorio, the Flemish Schools, the Italian Schools, the German Schools.

Notations in parenthesis indicate additional study for the additional year in the degree program.

Attendance is required at all recitals given in Casimir Hall. Public performance and performance in Casimir Hall (at Curtis) are credited toward graduation.

Students are permitted to accept professional engagements, with the approval of the Director.