

2 The concerto and society

TIA DENORA

As something ‘that people do’,¹ music shapes and takes shape in relation to the social settings where it is produced, distributed and consumed. Within those settings, music may provide exemplars and resources for the constitution of extra-musical matters. Through the confluence of performance and reception, musicking makes and partakes of values, ideas and tacit or practical notions about the social whole, agency and social relations; in this respect, music is an active ingredient of social life.²

The concerto – the form par excellence of *contrast* – provides a useful case in point for socio-musical exploration. Following its vicissitudes will reveal music’s role as a medium of social values and as a medium enabled and constrained by practical, conventional, material and organizational factors. This chapter explores the concerto and its link to society from two interrelated perspectives, the focus on local and pragmatic features of musicking and music’s role as a meaningful medium and a medium of social change. I use three case studies to explore the concerto’s social features, in especial relation to the keyboard concerto – Bach’s Brandenburg No. 5, Mozart’s career as a concerto composer/performer in 1780s Vienna, and Beethoven’s innovations in keyboard performance and their connections to the gendering of the repertory during the early nineteenth century.

Case study one: Bach’s Brandenburg Concerto No. 5

J. S. Bach’s six Brandenburg Concertos, written separately but collected as a set and dedicated to Christian Ludwig, Elector of Margrave, Brandenburg, in 1721, constitute a milestone in the concerto’s history,³ not least because of the degree of virtuosity they displayed and demanded of the players. The fifth Brandenburg, for a combination of flute, violin and harpsichord, merits special attention, not only because it ‘marks the beginning of the harpsichord concerto as a form’⁴ but because it opens up a range of themes within music sociology. It has already been the subject of socio-cultural analysis⁵ and this account can be used as a springboard for further exploration of the concerto as a social medium.

[19] The stylistic strategies Bach appropriated in this work, Susan McClary argues, can be read as embodying social values.⁶ In particular, his

adoption of the Italian concerto style, via Vivaldi, makes greatest use of what McClary sees as the bourgeois properties of tonality more generally ('values . . . held most dear by the middle class: belief in progress, in expansion, in the ability to attain ultimate goals through rational striving, in the ingenuity of the individual strategist operating both within and in defiance of the norm') so as to depict and celebrate values associated with the new individualism ('virtuosity, dissonance and extravagant dynamic motion').⁷

In Brandenburg No. 5, which begins ostensibly as a concerto for flute and violin, the harpsichord is initially presented as a 'darkhorse competitor for the position of soloist'.⁸ During the course of the first movement, the harpsichord comes to occupy an extreme foreground position in the extended cadenza ('delivered by a frenzied continuo instrument'),⁹ the longest cadenza then known, lasting roughly a quarter of the entire movement's length. As McClary puts it: '[T]he harpsichord, which first serves as continuo support . . . then begins to compete with the soloists for attention . . . and finally overthrows the other forces in a kind of hijacking of the piece'.¹⁰

McClary's essay illustrates an interesting and important analytical approach to the Concerto–Society topic, namely, narrative analysis. She considers in particular the disruption of convention, represented by the prominence of the harpsichord as a solo instrument (the harpsichord had hitherto played the background role of continuo, namely blending into the background to provide harmonic and rhythmic stability). By bringing this 'service' instrument to the limelight and allowing it to indulge in 'one of the most outlandish displays in music history',¹¹ Bach, McClary argues, musically presents (and in an extreme form) then-emerging notions of individual freedom of expression:

In the eighteenth century, most musical genres testify to a widespread interest in integrating the best of both those worlds into one in which social harmony and individual expression are mutually compatible. The concerto, the new formalized opera aria, and the later sonata procedure all are motivated by this interest.¹²

As McClary observes – and this is at the heart of her semiotic method – the strategies of an individual piece (such as in Brandenburg No. 5) can only be perceived as significant if they are held against a backdrop of musical norms and conventions. Such a method, she observes, is:

both ad hoc . . . and dialectical in so far as its strategies take shape in relation to the specific demands of particular compositions and in so far as the method seeks to account for the ways that particular compositions relate to the norms and conventions that enable and constrain the compositional process.¹³

All methods of analysis reveal and conceal, and semiotic methods are by no means immune to this predicament. The semiotic toolkit consists of a catalogue of conventions, an understanding of the history of ideas, politics, economics and some astute interpretative observation. At the same time, the analytic strategy of reading musical works may promote a kind of theorizing that is disconnected from the *actual* mechanisms through which music plays a mediating role in social life. Elsewhere, I have suggested that semiotics is useful but not sufficient as a method of socio-musical analysis and that semiotic analytical strategies occupy what the novelist and philosopher Iris Murdoch has described as ‘a wrong level of generality’,¹⁴ one that foregrounds analytical concepts such as style, compositional strategy and idea but leaves in shadow the rather more ‘down-home’, and more overtly sociological, matters of music’s material culture and physical practice, custom and local meanings, networks, occupational worlds and structures, and pragmatic and mundane matters.¹⁵

In short, reading music for its ideological content implies a conception of the music–society nexus in terms of homological relationships between *macro* historical trends and developments in musical *works*. However, social life (for example, what Bach did in Brandenburg No. 5) happens in the here-and-now and is embedded in local conditions. It is at this *local* level that large-scale social trends are *mediated* by what is ‘do-able’¹⁶ – by material culture, by the specific concerns of patrons and other local contextual issues such as occasion and dedicatee, and by an individual composer’s particular appropriation of ideas, models and working materials.

In short, there is no one-to-one connection between musical forms and the world of ideas (for how does the genie of ‘The Social’ actually get into the music and how, even more complicatedly, does the music inform the social – what are the *mechanisms*?). Rather, there are always a multiplicity of connections and possibilities and it is only at this level of actual doing that what we describe as social structure is produced and reproduced.¹⁷ The particular pathway through these possibilities taken by a particular composer at a particular time is thus shot through with layers of significance that cannot be reduced to the history of ideas. It is only through an appreciation of the myriad conditions of a work’s genesis (and regeneration via performance, reception, scholarship and other cultural practices) that it is possible to begin to describe how it is *actually* linked to society.

Again, Brandenburg No. 5 provides a case-in-point. Looking closely at the specific features of Bach and the local musical worlds in which he operated extends our understanding of music–society connections by

helping to explain why, *in this case*, Bach came to position the harpsichord so prominently in the musical limelight.

Prior to his move to Cöthen, Bach's experience at Arnstadt (1703–7), Mülhausen (1707–8) and Weimar (1708–17) was – in both church and court contexts – as an organist. As such, Bach was intimately acquainted with musical instrument technology. He was frequently called upon, for example, to test new organs, such as the one in Halle in 1716 about which, in company with Johann Kuhnau and Christian Friedrich Rolle, he produced a highly detailed report.¹⁸ Bach was also familiar with the convention of dedicating a new instrument; he was present for the dedication of the Halle organ (two weeks after the report was filed), and he served as the soloist at other organ dedications.

On such occasions, flamboyant display was *de rigueur*, so as to display the instrument's capacities and, as a by-product of that primary display, inevitably also the capabilities of the performer. Also, during these years just prior to the composition of Brandenburg No. 5, musical skill was conceived as a kind of sport; Bach took part or was scheduled to take part in various musical tournaments for the amusement of aristocratic patrons. Improvisation would be fundamental to both types of occasion and, of course, Bach was a master improviser, praised by virtually all who came into contact with his art.

Enter the arrival of a new harpsichord in 1719:

On 1 March 1719 Bach travelled to Berlin to acquire a splendid new harpsichord for the Köthen court – 'The great harpsichord or Flügel with two keyboards, by Michael Mietke'. It has been suggested that he may have had this instrument in mind when he conceived two of his most brilliant harpsichord works – Brandenburg Concerto No. 5 in D major BWV 1050, and the Chromatic Fantasia and Fugue in D minor BWV 903. . . . According to Forkel, 'When he played from his fancy, all the 24 keys were in his power. . . . All his extempore fantasies are said to have been of a similar description'.¹⁹

Christoph Wolff has also suggested that Brandenburg No. 5 was written to inaugurate the new harpsichord, as has Malcolm Boyd, who reasons that, '[p]ossibly it was with this new and unprecedentedly elaborate cadenza that Bach celebrated the arrival of the new instrument from Berlin'.²⁰

Bach spent a good deal of time in Berlin negotiating for the new harpsichord (between June 1718 and March 1719). During this time he played for and came to know Christian Ludwig, Elector of Margrave, to whom Bach dedicated the Brandenburg Concertos in 1721. The harpsichord would have loomed large for Bach during this phase of his life and it seems reasonable to suggest that it would have loomed not only as

a 'dark horse' figure in Concerto No. 5 (possibly the last to have been composed)²¹ but behind the entire set on which he worked during these years.

In this context, and bearing in mind Bach's intimate knowledge of keyboard instrument technology, the predominant display of the harpsichord no longer seems, in McClary's terms, 'deviant' but rather, within the musical culture of Bach's world, appears as a fitting practice, one devoted to celebrating the new instrument. This would have been even more the case if the first performance were indeed the instrument's 'inauguration', where an extended unaccompanied frenzy would allow the instrument to be put through its paces (simultaneously allowing Bach, who apparently premièred the work, to display his own abilities). And indeed, the *type of frenzy* in that extended cadenza (numerous scales up and down the keyboard, the chromatic passages) seems precisely to place on public trial the instrument's capacities, testing its entire range. Set against the 'self-contained' character of the ritornello,²² this trial is made ever more celebratory, entirely fitting, in other words, for the local occasion. And the otherwise inexplicable way in which the cadenza 'blurs almost entirely the sense of key'²³ also makes good local sense, displaying the instrument from the full gamut of harmonic perspectives.

In sum, one can imagine how Bach took advantage, in this case, of an emerging rhetorical strategy (the solo concerto), gave it a new twist (as a keyboard concerto) that was charged with a frisson (that unruly keyboard!) in a way that was wholly appropriate and meaningful as an occasioning device under the local conditions of musical culture at Cöthen. The form that emerged from these local circumstances, practices and resources was eventually bequeathed as a 'work' that could be read (by variously located readers) as historically significant (for example, McClary's reading). To provide a reading, however, is to engage in situated meaning-making. It is also a very different activity from the gathering of information about the local environment of production, distribution and reception/use.

In short, as the music sociologist Antoine Hennion has observed, by merely reading musical works we risk providing just one more in 'a long line of Bach interpretations'.²⁴ (Indeed, music criticism can be understood as involved in the *performance* of meaning.²⁵) By contrast, we need to consider works from a range of perspectives including: cultural trends (new rhetorics, values, devices, discourses); large-scale events (including natural disasters, political change, economic developments); features of the worlds²⁶ in which music is made (conventions, technology, support personnel, funding, performance practices, reputation, distribution structures); local events (occasions, situations, news, local history,

events); and reception (time after time as the meaning of works is recursively established and modified, in their own time and later, by musicians, critics, scholars, listeners, patrons and others). In short, the question of ‘how’ musical meaning is possible needs to focus on the complexity of situated meaning production and the status of this production as a form of interpretative ‘work’,²⁷ that is as culture creation. Such an approach has affinities with the study of the everyday and with ethnography of history and cultural experience.

Case study two: occupational structure and local Enlightenment culture in Mozart’s Vienna

During the eighteenth century concert life was transformed across Europe. This transformation involved a shift from private to public funding for music. In Vienna and the German-speaking lands, the old *Hauskapelle* (house ensemble) was abandoned and musicians increasingly had to build careers in a nascent freelance economy.²⁸ This inevitably involved compiling an income from teaching and touring, private commissions and private concertizing in the salons, and from benefit concerts. The new system meant that reputation took on heightened salience – to live, and to have enough work, a musician had to become known. As Moore has observed, this shift towards a ‘star system’ worked well for some musicians, some of the time.²⁹ However, it was antithetical to most musicians, most of the time.

For a while, during the 1780s, the system worked well for Mozart. In 1784, describing a series of highly successful subscription concerts, he wrote exuberantly to his father: ‘The first concert . . . went off very well. The hall was overflowing; and the new concerto [possibly K. 449] I played won extraordinary applause. Everywhere I go I hear praises of that concert.’³⁰

Next to opera, the piano concerto was one of ‘the two worlds in which Mozart was supremely predominant’ during these, his ‘golden years’.³¹ Between 1782 and December 1786, Mozart introduced a total of fifteen concertos to the Viennese public, nearly all of which he premiered himself. This was his heyday for the piano concerto (he subsequently introduced only two more between 1787 and 1791).

This choice was first of all pragmatic. Johann Schöpfung’s *Jahrbuch*³² lists 167 virtuoso and amateur performers. Of these, seventy (41 per cent) were keyboard players. During the 1780s the keyboard was a ‘hot’ instrument: it was undergoing technological development as keyboard artists increasingly used it as a means for display. (During the 1760s and 1770s the most popular instruments for concerto treatment were the violin and

flute.³³) It was also an instrument of conspicuous consumption (expensive and like a piece of furniture) and, related to this, an aristocratic instrument. To distinguish oneself as a keyboard virtuoso was simultaneously to enhance one's chance of recruiting wealthy pupils. In addition, one can find signs of a growing trend towards musical display all over Europe during these years. As Morrow has observed, concertos were the 'central showcase' within which musicians' talents could be displayed.³⁴ 'For Beethoven as for J. C. Bach, Mozart and Clementi before him and Hummel, Moscheles, and Liszt after him', writes Leon Plantinga, 'the concerto was mainly a personal vehicle for the composer-virtuoso's performances, a means for displaying new musical ideas of which a central feature was his own distinctive style of playing'.³⁵

In Josephinian Vienna, c.1784, the 'new musical ideas' elaborated in the concerto genre resonated with new, 'enlightened' ideas and practices – liberalism, toleration, the suppression of aristocratic powers (via a refusal to rule through the Hungarian and Bohemian Diets),³⁶ the lifting of censorship and, to some degree, economic resurgence. All of these ideas were forcefully promulgated by writers such as Josef Sonnenfels and his notion of the 'mittleren Klassen', whose desires and aspirations could, with care, be aligned with the needs of the state. In short, it is in Mozart's Vienna that we can observe a prime example of what has been termed the emergence of the public sphere.³⁷

Central to the Enlightenment notion of the public sphere was the idea that individual will could be brought into convergence with (be constructed as) public opinion, via various forms of discussion and cultural persuasion. It is during this period, throughout Europe, that social thinkers (Locke and Rousseau, for example) began to concern themselves with the concept of moral, as opposed to political, law. Echoing Rousseau, Sonnenfels wrote: 'the most important aim is to ensure the uniting of the individual with the general good . . . through which the individual citizen is bonded to society as a whole, bringing the understanding of the honourable citizen to enlightenment, and at the same time ensuring that his own desires are met'.³⁸

It is at this time that the arts, in particular those art forms that depicted action and experience over time (as opposed to the static arts of painting and sculpture), took on a new social function, the moulding not so much of public opinion, but of two other Enlightenment inventions, subjectivity and the self. As George Eliot came to put it, some time later and in reference to a fictional character, 'Hetty had never read a novel: how then could she find a shape for her expectations?'³⁹ In the late eighteenth century numerous fictional and non-fictional pamphlets were produced and circulated, in which the individual's role was modelled. Similarly, in

the dramatic arts, and, perhaps most kinaesthetically, in opera, social relations were performed for widening audiences, and for some of these less literate audiences, the performing arts would have been the primary contact with the new imagery – models – of agency and social being. This imagery was Rousseauian; it depicted an individual who, via his desires and passions, could be bound to the needs and structures of the whole.

One of Mozart's most significant contributions to the history of the concerto was his conceptualization of the relationship between soloist and orchestra. From 1784 onwards technical difficulties increase, enhancing the drama of the form. Also at this time the orchestra comes to be used in a wider variety of ways than hitherto, as Simon P. Keefe has observed, sometimes in dialogue with the soloist, via individual instruments and collectively.⁴⁰

Thus the concerto – the form of figure-ground, solo-tutti – was a highly charged form, one that was produced and received as an object lesson in new forms of agency. '[I]t is not fanciful', Till observes, 'to hear in Mozart's piano concertos a representation of this dynamic relationship; a progressive dialogue between the individual expressive voice of the soloist and the wider "community" of the orchestra, the former distinguished from the latter, yet frequently drawing from the same fountain-head of ideas, and both ultimately uniting in joyous unanimity'.⁴¹

As Keefe has observed, the concerto was much more than a metaphor, whether for Mozart's audiences or for the readings provided by today's music analysts and critics. Understood in the context of dramatic theory as circulating in Mozart's Vienna, Mozart's concertos can be seen to provide templates against which knowledge about social relations could be produced.⁴² They carried (or may be explored as having carried), in other words, intellectual significance for their recipients:

Following every stage in the process of relational change in each movement would have been a highly demanding exercise for a contemporary listener; Mozart's concertos would certainly have provided a prime example of the kind of instrumental music that, according to Adam Smith, can 'occupy, and as it were fill up completely the whole capacity of the mind so as to leave no part of its attention vacant for thinking of anything else'. By engaging the listener in a challenging intellectual pursuit, Mozart offered him or her an excellent vehicle for learning about cooperation (or, more precisely, the quest for cooperation), a value deeply cherished in the age of Enlightenment. Mozart's concertos thus fulfilled the single most important requirement for all late-eighteenth century music and drama: the general instruction of the listener-spectator.⁴³

In other words, music was not merely 'about' an abstract correlation between sonic structure and social structure. Rather, as we have seen in

the case of Brandenburg No. 5 above, we risk, in Hennion's and Fauquet's words, providing yet another 'in a long line'⁴⁴ of interpretations if we confine our analytical attention to 'readings' of music's social significance. By contrast, a more nuanced understanding of music's connections to social structure and social action can be achieved by situating that analysis in the context of the music's contemporary contexts of production, distribution and consumption. Considering the interaction between musical practice and other cultural practices of the time and place is part of this project as is the often-overlooked topic of music's material practice. These topics are considered in the next case study.

Case study three: gendering the piano concerto

At a time when all music was performed live, musical performance was always, and at least implicitly, a visually dramatic event, one that inevitably involved bodily procedures, strictures about comportment and, at times, choreography. To speak of these matters is to deconstruct the technical neutrality of musical performance, and to recognize by contrast how musical performance may itself provide significant factors in the overall understanding of works and their perceived meanings. Here, much more than mere phrasing is at stake. More significantly, it is the performance *of* performance that is at issue. Music may, for example, make demands upon the body. It may be used by performers, as implicitly described above, for embodied display. In these respects, music performance is dramaturgical: the practices of performing may delineate various meanings.⁴⁵

Circa 1800, there was probably no realm within musical performance as charged with social meaning as the keyboard. The piano in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Vienna was at the heart of debates over aesthetic practice, a site at which new and often-competing aesthetics were deployed and defended, at times through the overt medium of the 'piano duel'.⁴⁶

Enter Beethoven and the piano performing body. Using the Concert Calendars in Morrow's study of Viennese musical life as a database,⁴⁷ we can determine that between 1793 and 1810 – during which time Beethoven was perhaps the most frequently performed composer for fortepiano in Vienna – his works were performed most often by men: 79 per cent of performances of *all* his piano works were performed by men and 21 per cent by women; and 84 per cent of his concertos by men, 16 per cent by women. This contrasts dramatically with the proportion of male performances of Mozart: 26 per cent of all his piano works

were given by men and 74 per cent by women; and 27 per cent of his concertos performed by men during the years 1787–1810 and 73 per cent by women.

Between 1803 and 1810 the number of performances of Beethoven's concertos was increasing. The number of performers who played his concertos (particularly after he retreated from performing them himself as his hearing failed) was also growing. And yet, there would appear to be no extant evidence of a female performance of a Beethoven concerto in Vienna after 1806 and before 1810, a time during which men increasingly took up his works. (Once a concerto was published, Beethoven tended not to perform it again himself.) Never before had women and men been divided within the piano repertory in this way, at a time when women continued to be active (Josepha Auernhammer, Frauline Kurzbeck, Baroness Ertmann, Countess Anna Marie Erdody and others were all featured on the concert stage at this time). Indeed, women would appear to have given as many and sometimes more performances of piano concertos than men during these years.

Why then, this segregation? Elsewhere I have suggested, tentatively, that Beethoven's music made new demands upon the piano performing body in terms of how it was to be performed – it required a more visceral keyboard approach, and more demonstrative physical action (the choreography associated with this action was sometimes lampooned as the century progressed).⁴⁸ For women, bodily composure was doubly important because of the risk not only of transgressing one's social status, but also one's femininity and propriety. Speaking of the oboe, for example, John Essex described it in 1722 as, 'too Manlike ... [looking] indecent in a Woman's Mouth'.⁴⁹

Thus, the physicality demanded by Beethoven's music was incompatible with late eighteenth-century piano technology. It was also in opposition to strictures about appropriate feminine comportment – whether at the piano or elsewhere. But it was linked to the ways in which Beethoven cast himself within the form. As Plantinga notes: 'In his concertos, Beethoven typically cast himself as a leader; the concerto was for him mainly a youthful preoccupation intimately bound up with his prowess and ambition as a public pianist'.⁵⁰

In short, and delineated through the material-practical realm of piano performance, Beethoven's concertos introduced a new (visceral and heroic) role for the soloist and also provided an exemplar of a new type of individual and his (*sic*) relation to the social whole. Beethoven's concertos provided a vocabulary of gestures and a compendium of movement styles associated with powerful individualism and with struggle. In this respect he pioneered strategies later exploited by Liszt, Chopin and

Paganini. As Charles Rosen observes, describing the athletics of double-octave effects:

The true invention of this kind of octave display – or at least, the first appearance of a long and relentlessly fortissimo page of unison octaves in both hands – is to be found in the opening movement of Beethoven's Emperor Concerto. It marks a revolution in keyboard sonority. . . . It is initially with the generation of composers that followed Beethoven that the performer must experience physical pain with such octaves, starting with Liszt.⁵¹

Speaking of how music in the nineteenth century came to involve a 'look' as well as sonority, Richard Leppert has suggested that, 'more than ever before, performers' bodies, in the act of realizing music, also helped to transliterate musical sound into musical meaning by means of the sight – and sometimes spectacle – of their gestures, facial expressions and general physicality'.⁵²

Is it possible to explore more specifically the kind of meaning that the material performance of Beethoven concertos helped to delineate? It is worth pausing here to reconsider Kant and the ways in which his notion of the sublime came to be linked to instrumental music in general, and to Beethoven in particular during the early nineteenth century. As Christine Battersby tells us, Kant's conception both of the sublime and of the genius was gendered, something clarified only in his less central texts. As Kant put it: 'Strivings and surmounted difficulties arouse admiration and belong to the sublime. . . . Laborious learning or painful pondering, even if a woman should greatly succeed in it, destroy the merits that are proper to her sex.'⁵³

As it was elaborated in and through musical performance practices, the Beethoven imago came to be associated with a visual imagery. It also resonated with new ideas about the connections between appearance and social capacity and with configurations of social agency. At the same time, not everyone could occupy the new socio-musical spaces that the Beethoven imago implied. This is to say that the form of pianistic display that came to be associated with heroism, and with the ability to resist nature, was not only a masculine attribute but also one associated with a particular kind of male performer. This imagery was consequential for then-emerging conceptions of gender and sexual difference, for masculinity as well as femininity.

This gender divide widened over the course of the nineteenth century and throughout Europe as musical practice provided object lessons in gender-linked modes of agency. As Katharine Ellis has described it, during the nineteenth century musical life was increasingly characterized by, 'a stereotypically feminine world of decorative and sweetly plaintive

expression, contrasting with the gigantic outbursts of Beethoven or the dazzling virtuosity of Liszt and Thalberg'.⁵⁴ The new forms of musical display, and the agencies they implied, not only excluded women from the heart of the musical canon; they also celebrated a currency of bodily capital (appearance, physique, comportment and temperament) that was not equally available to all men. Indeed it is during these years and shortly later that the discourse of piano playing begins to engage in gender stereotyping, Kalkbrenner's music, for example, being described as requiring 'muscular power' (and thus essentially better suited to male performers) as opposed to the 'grace' required for the performance of Chopin's works.

Ellis observes, with regard to mid-nineteenth-century France, that female pianists were, 'caught in a web of conflicting ideas concerning the relative value of particular keyboard repertoires that were themselves gendered, either explicitly or implicitly'.⁵⁵ (Parisian critics during this period were concerned not only with repertory, but also with the use of the body, with feminine 'attitudes' at the keyboard and with what was considered to be the 'appropriate' level of acting in performance.) From the perspective of French observers, the chief problem with women on the concert stage c.1844–5 (a time in which there was an influx of female performers) was that the vision of a woman at the keyboard, engaging in showmanship and physical power, was in direct conflict with Parisian mores concerning feminine conduct (mores reinforced by the Napoleonic Code of 1804 but stretching back to Rousseau's 'Lettre à M. D'Alembert'). No woman was to make, as Ellis observes, 'a spectacle of herself'⁵⁶ and it was for this reason that women came to be associated with the 'sweeter' and more delicate music of earlier times.

In short, women came to be marginalized in relation to the canon as a result of Beethoven's incorporation into his concertos (as well as into his other piano works) of particular types of bodies and bodily habits. As the century waned, and musical discourse (and musical technology) further reinforced these notions, it is possible to see the gender segregation of musical life being institutionalized through discourse and performance practice. The concerto, c.1803–10, played a significant role in this process.

The late nineteenth century and beyond – future directions for socio-musical research

As a culturally 'live' or 'hot' form, the heyday of the concerto occurred during the nineteenth century. Over half of the concertos performed in Vienna between 1800 and 1810 were performed by musicians who were

not their composers.⁵⁷ By the early twentieth century, the concerto was an institution of musical life, more a performer genre than a composer-performer genre, and the soloist–orchestra relationship has been explored in a wide variety of manners. Concerto strategies have ranged from emphasis on the whole orchestra, allowing each section a turn for display, to conflict between soloist and group, to forms that play with audiences’ pre-conceptions of the solo-instrument’s properties and also with conventions about a concerto’s length.⁵⁸ The form has also been appropriated for comic effect, as in Kleinsinger’s *Tubby the Tuba*, where a stereotypically ‘clumsy’ instrument is featured as soloist (in turn helping to illuminate the ways in which instruments and their musical assignment itself reproduces social stereotypes),⁵⁹ in the antics of Victor Borge and in pieces such as Leroy Anderson’s *Typewriter Concerto*. At the same time, preference for flamboyant and dramatic solo forms has been cited as a marker of social standing, at least in Paris.⁶⁰

Within music sociology directions for future research would include the following interrelated topics: performance practice, in particular how soloists employ various performing strategies as part of their on-going professional identity construction, and also for the production of other forms of identity – gender identity, class, race and age (and including attention to embodied conduct as described above and also decisions concerning phrasing, tempo, instrumentation);⁶¹ solo competitions and the production of musical judgement; cinematic depictions of concerto performance, rehearsal or composition; listening practices and consumption patterns; further analysis of musical-critical discourse; and, finally, the ways in which the concerto may come to be ‘active’ in extra-musical realms, how it may be drawn into interaction with other cultural practices and thereby come to provide resources for knowledge production.⁶²

