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Reading Music: Representing Female Performance in Nineteenth-Century British Piano Method Books and Novels

The editorial content of piano method books published in the nineteenth century contributed to the gendering of the domestic piano by targeting a middle-class female audience. At the same time, these tutorials circumscribed the ability and ambition of female pianists, cautioning women against technical display or performing challenging pieces in company, thereby reinforcing the stereotype of the graceful, demure woman who played a little. However, this effort was complicated by both the tutorials themselves and contemporary fiction. The middle-class women reading these tutorials also read novels—a fact the method books occasionally acknowledge—which often presented a very different picture of women’s musical abilities. Reading these two genres together offers new ways of understanding both Victorian literature and the cultural contexts in which amateur pianists performed. My essay, therefore, challenges the claims of musicologists who assess amateur women’s musical accomplishments as meager on the basis of prescriptive texts and the claims of literary critics who argue, in the absence of this
particular contextual material, for the disciplinary function of fiction and sensation novels in particular.

Historians of leisure in nineteenth-century England have focused on middle-class efforts to orchestrate the time and activities of the working classes, but middle-class attempts to discipline a segment of their own class have been overlooked.¹

And when historians consider music as a leisure activity, they turn their attention to the development of public concert life or to working-class pursuits such as choral societies, mass singing movements, brass bands, and music halls. Examining domestic music as a middle-class recreation reveals that the middle class attempted to control the leisure time of its female members by instituting music-making—and for much of the century this meant playing the piano—as a central feminine activity.

Piano manufacture and sales figures reveal just how prevalent this pastime was. Production of the instrument rose exponentially during the nineteenth century due to industrialization, which streamlined construction, and consumer demand. In 1784, the English piano manufacturing firm John Broadwood and Sons sold 38 harpsichords and 133 square pianos.  

---


2 See William Weber, Music and the Middle Class: The Social Structure of Concert Life in London, Paris and Vienna between 1830 and 1848 (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1975). For working-class musical leisure activities, see Golby and Purdue, Walvin, and for his extensive research on the music hall, Bailey.

3 Cynthia Adams Hoover, “The Workshop,” in Piano Roles: Three Hundred Years of Life with the Piano, ed. James Parakilas (New
Just ten years later, they had increased their output by almost 900 percent to 1,500 pianos (Hoover, 42-43). And by the 1830s and 1840s, they were selling 2,500 to 3,000 pianos a year (46). By 1910, sales of pianos had tripled over 1851 rates, resulting in one piano for every ten to twenty people in Great Britain. During the course of the century, the piano went from an elite instrument affordable only to the upper classes to one within easy reach of the working classes. Thus, as Cyril Ehrlich writes, “middle class girls could hardly escape the piano” (Piano, 7).

As a requisite accomplishment for the middle-class woman, music served a Foucauldian disciplinary function. While piano practice was not a disciplinary institution like those that are Foucault’s focus in Discipline and Punish (1975), I contend that it similarly was a means of replicating middle-class hegemony. Music-making was not a centralized institution like the military, education, or hospitals, but it was certainly a cultural institution for young middle-class women. Also, it was an activity that controlled the operations of women’s bodies,

Haven: Yale UP, 1999), 42. Hereafter cited parenthetically as Hoover.

channeling their energies and producing useful yet “‘docile’ bodies.” 

5 This discipline was necessary because the emergent middle class had created a leisured class of women, many of whom would have worked in family economic enterprises in previous generations. 

6 The middle class was uneasy with this leisure, according to Peter Bailey, since it was associated with the “irresponsible preoccupations” of the aristocracy and the “reckless carousing” of the working class, and it conflicted with the middle-class value of “unremitting industry” (Bailey, 64). Released from the discipline of work, middle-class women potentially were free to engage in the “irresponsible” and “reckless” behavior associated with the aristocracy and the


6 Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850 (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1987), 13. Thorstein Veblen argues in The Theory of the Leisure Class (1899; New York: Penguin, 1994) that “conspicuous leisure” was one of the means by which the wealthy achieved class status (106). Women’s freedom from work was one of the ways the Victorian middle class demonstrated its position.
working class. Instead, these women industriously pursued a variety of feminine accomplishments, including music, which served the dual purpose of signaling their class status and occupying them. For example, conduct and piano method books recommended that women spend several hours a day practicing, and this time was often regimented into periods of practicing scales, practicing old pieces, and learning new music, thereby establishing a time-table for leisured middle-class women.⁷

Piano practice requires a certain amount of self-discipline, putting hours into what are often monotonous tasks, and this self-monitoring was established and reinforced by the period’s piano tutorials. While not as effective as Foucault’s Panopticon, for reasons I will discuss below, piano instruction manuals functioned as the “faceless gaze” of disciplinary power, reminding women of predominant social opinion about how they should behave at the piano, from what they wore and how they held their bodies to what they played in company, encouraging

⁷ While many piano tutorials recommended practicing two to three hours a day, Maria Edgeworth notes that four or five hours a day is necessary for a woman “to keep up her musical character.” Maria Edgeworth and Richard Lovell Edgeworth, Practical Education, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (Boston: T. B. Watt, 1815), 2:112. Hereafter cited parenthetically as Edgeworth.
their internalization of middle-class gender ideology (Foucault, 214).

Playing the piano disciplined not only women’s free time but also their bodies. Method books delineated the “correlation of the body and the gesture” in positioning the pianist’s body in relation to her hands (Foucault, 152). But whereas Foucault argues that the aim of a correspondence between body and gesture is “efficiency and speed,” we will see that piano tutorial authors were concerned with maintaining gendered norms of bodily movement (152). Tutorials also specified “body-object articulation,” or the relationship of the woman’s body to the instrument, a focus that invokes Foucault’s description of “disciplinary power” as synthetic: “The regulation imposed by power is at the same time the law of construction of the operation” (152, 153). In other words, thedictates of the tutorials simultaneously govern a woman’s body and enable her to play the instrument. This fusion of woman and piano produced music, marriageable girls, and middle-class domesticity.

The discipline imposed by this activity was not totalizing, however. The joining of body and machine, like the regimented timetable, had affinities with factory work, pointing to the similar disciplinary nature of both institutions. Middle-class women, like working-class men, spent hours engaged in repetitive tasks (such as scales) at a machine. Maria and Richard Edgeworth
point out in *Practical Education* (1798) that the dehumanizing aspects of a career in repetitive machine work could extend to piano practice when she asks mothers whether it is worth turning their daughters into “automaton[s] for eight hours in every day for fifteen years” just so that they will be recognized as first-rate performers in fashionable society (110). In addition to analogously recalling the labor on which a segment of the middle class was founded, the woman at the piano mimicked the paid work of professional musicians.\(^8\) Finally, rather than circumscribing her through hours of monotonous tasks, industrious piano practice could have unwanted consequences, resulting in skilled pianists who defied gender expectations of women’s merely amateur abilities. Even as the woman was

---

\(^8\) I use the term “professional” to indicate those who were dependant on music for their livelihood. The connotations of professionalism—institutional training, professional associations, and clear lines of advancement—were being developed for music in the nineteenth century. For fuller discussions of the professionalization of music, see Cyril Ehrlich, *The Music Profession in Britain Since the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985); and Deborah Rohr, *Careers of British Musicians, 1750-1850: A Profession of Artisans* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001).
controlled through her union with the piano, the practice’s associations with labor and professional skill resisted this disciplinary power, creating other possibilities for female pianists.

Nineteenth-Century Piano Method Books

A closer examination of the piano method books of the period demonstrates the intended disciplinary function of music practice.⁹ As the middle class expanded during the course of the nineteenth century, so did the production of teaching materials aimed at this audience. Market demand, an increase in the number

⁹ See Appendix A for a list of piano method books consulted for this essay. I surveyed the editorial content of more than 100 piano method books published between 1785 (the earliest date one included “pianoforte” in the title) and 1899 (by which time the piano’s popularity with the middle classes had declined). That these method books were largely directed at the middle-class demand for music tuition for women is evident in the titles of the tutorials; the editorial content’s identification of women as the intended audience, both as students and as teachers of young children; the illustrations accompanying the tutorials; and the female authorship of several titles.
of music publishing firms, and the availability of cheap editions resulted in an explosion in the number of tutorials directed at the middle class.\textsuperscript{10} It is my contention that these tutorials functioned as a form of conduct book, especially when addressed to a female audience, disciplining women’s bodies and abilities through their directives.

The method books are remarkably similar in content over the course of the century. They are fairly uniform in advising the pianist to sit upright in the center of the keyboard with arms and wrists in a straight line with fingers gently rounded over the keys, and many texts caution against facial distortions and grimaces. For the female pianist, this positioning of the body has the added benefit of being graceful. In fact, Francis Tatton Latour warns in his \textit{New and Improved Method of Instruction for the Piano-Forte} (1827): “Nothing is more ungraceful than to see the head of the performer constantly on the move or bent

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
forwards—besides it produces round shoulders.”¹¹ According to Olive Dussek Buckley, “The performer whose hands, elbows, and body are in constant commotion whilst playing, is awkward and as painful to behold.”¹² Carlo Tiesset suggests that such movement is humorous rather than uncomfortable, warning that “it may excite hilarity when, through being excessive, it verges on the ludicrous.”¹³ Audience members are not the only ones who may experience distress as a result of the pianist’s gestures. Latour notes that “it is often said that such a lady is a very great or dashing performer, Why? Because she rattles away on the keys and often raises her hands as high as her head; but often strikes her knuckles against the desk of the Instrument and dashes the lights into the middle of the room” (11). The aspiring pianist is thus presented with a vivid picture of the social embarrassment that awaits her if she resists the disciplining of her body. Physical restraint at the piano


¹² Olivia Dussek Buckley, Musical Truths; or an Analysis of Music (London: Joseph Mallet, 1843), 26.

appears to be the only way for a woman to avoid making a spectacle of herself. Physicality is problematic because it is not “proper and becoming”: too reminiscent of the labor of the working classes and not the idleness of middle-class women.\textsuperscript{14} Moreover, it is such dramatic gesturing and responsive facial expressions for which virtuosi like Franz Liszt were known. Women, however, were admonished to draw less attention to themselves to distinguish their amateur performances from the work of professional musicians.

In addition to distancing the (female) amateur from the (male) professional by disciplining the body, piano method books also prescribed women’s selection and performance of music with their advice on playing in company. The author of “Desultory Remarks on the Study and Practice of Music, Addressed to a Young Lady” (1796) advises: “A chaste, correct and expressive delivery evinces Judgment in the Performer as well as skill, and argues a deference towards the Composer; while, on the contrary, an eager endeavor at embellishment, with an earnestness to display dexterity of Finger, without regard to the text of the Lesson,

shews that Conceit and Vanity predominate in the Performer, who plays not to give pleasure, but is labouring to extort applause” (180). Women are to follow orders—the male composer’s score and the male author’s directions—participating in and affirming the construction of women as modest and self-effacing. Any attempt to receive recognition for one’s own abilities, rather than “defer[ring] towards the Composer,” is chastised as unwomanly behavior. Women’s aim in performing, according to this author, is to provide pleasure for others rather than “to extort” admiration through the self-display that was a perceived characteristic of both aristocratic women and male virtuosi.

Carl Czerny, a prolific author of piano tutorials, some of which are still in use today, likewise constrains his fictional pupil, recommending in Letters to a Young Lady (1837) that she choose compositions within her powers rather than “a difficult piece by some celebrated composer.”15 He advises that she play her chosen piece “with tranquility and self-possession” and that she “avoid any inconvenient mode of dress” (Czerny, 38). Furthermore, he urges her to memorize “a good number of little,

easy, but tasteful pieces” so that she will not be embarrassed when unexpectedly asked to play. For this purpose he suggests “short rondos, pretty airs with variations, melodies from operas, nay, even dance tunes, waltzes, quadrilles, marches, etc. etc.” (Czerny, 38–39). Thus Czerny also directs his female pianist to reify notions of femininity for her audience, advising that she not be too ambitious in her choice of music, that she not draw attention to her person by her manner of performance or clothing choices, and that she have a few “little, easy, but tasteful” pieces at the ready. These piano tutorials instruct women to perform their gender, reminding them to be modest while engaging in an activity that puts them at center stage, to be self-effacing in thinking of the pleasure of others first, and to not overreach their (by implication) limited abilities by choosing difficult music.

But the amount of ink spent reminding middle-class women of proper musical behavior suggests that they were surpassing the bounds of this femininity through their performances. An 1873 article in Belgravia: A London Magazine, which echoes Czerny, suggests the costs of eager female pianism. The author recommends that women stick with songs, ballads, or “an elegant but modest composition” because “these are within the range of their ambition, and with these they may, if they will, avoid
ill-natured criticism, and make their homes bright and happy." Belgravia categorizes women’s attempts to exceed a limited repertoire as a threat to domesticity and the tranquility of their “bright and happy” homes. Similarly, Tiesset argues that, though the pianoforte may fill up its place with perhaps as much distinction as any of our other musical instruments, on the platform of the concert-hall, this is not in reality its domain. Its essential place—its realm, as it were, is the drawing-room, and, better still, the snug and cosy parlour, where, after the labours of the day, all the family assemble and enjoy the purest pleasures which are granted to our species. (155)

Tiesset constrains ambitious students, reminding them that they are amateurs, not virtuosi. Rather than aspiring to concert hall stages, domestic performers should recognize their “realm,” or sphere, as the humble drawing room and their function as making family life pleasant by providing music after the day’s work is over. Indeed, for the single young woman, it is a home of her

---

own that is presumably the end goal of piano playing, not individual distinction or social autonomy.

This kind of advice raises the question of how skilled these middle-class female pianists were and points to an unwanted side effect of music’s disciplinary function. While music was a rational use of women’s leisure time, the hours of practice each day could result in highly skilled pianists, which was problematic since they were expected to have only amateur abilities. According to Katherine Ellis, “For the vast majority of young middle-class women, the practice of music—invariably in the form of playing the piano—remained no more than a social skill.”  

The editorial comments in piano tutorials directed

---

toward women would seem to bear this out. William Steetz, in his Treatise on the Elements of Music in a Series of Letters to a Lady (1812), remarks that his correspondent “Cecilia” wants “to know a little more of Music, than how to rattle a country-dance upon her Piano-forte, or how to accompany a doleful air with a few doleful notes.”¹⁸ She wants to study music “at least so far as the knowledge of its principles may be agreeable and useful to an Amateur” and is therefore “the first female in Briton whom I ever heard express such a desire” (Steetz, 5). Thus Steetz, a German, reflects the international understanding that the English are not a musical people, implying that Cecilia is unusual among Englishwomen for her initiative in taking her social skill beyond playing for dancers and accompanying singers. Her desire to learn more is bounded, however, by what is useful for an amateur. As we have seen, Steetz is not alone in setting the bar low for women’s musical accomplishments.


“Desultory Remarks,” therefore, limits the amount of time a woman should spend on music: “the Time bestowed on Music more than is requisite for attaining the Character of a true Amateur, is improperly applied, especially if taken from those hours which ought to be employed on Studies absolutely necessary to the forming of an accomplished Woman, in an age when Female Adornments, mental and personal, are so much the objects of Parental Care and Solicitude” (358, emphasis in original). Since, as the author assumes, a woman will never be a professional performer, hours spent developing her skill beyond the amateur level is time wasted. However, if she shows talent, her passion can be encouraged: “the Fair inspired one may safely cherish her Propensity for it by devoting to her darling Subject, a Portion of that Time which usually is allotted to Dress, to Visits, and Public Amusements” (358). Serious study is still discouraged by the author, as only a “portion” of the time spent on those distinctly feminine activities which consume the leisured woman’s day may be sacrificed.

Steetz likewise puts women’s music-making in the context of other frivolous female pastimes. Writing during the rage for Gothic novels, he tells his fictional student that: “you cannot read my letters straight forward, as you may Ann Radcliffe. It is perfectly indifferent to you, whether the silver moon, which she orders to shine through the gratings of a Northern Tower, be
the same as that which reflected on the murmuring brook forty or fifty pages before; or whether the Nightingale, that enchants a lover’s ear in the third volume, be the same bird which she made to warble in the middle of January, in the preceding. This is not the case with my rules” (61, emphasis in original). Steetz’s point is that whereas “Cecilia” may overlook inconsistencies in Radcliffe’s novels, she must go back and reread his previous letters since the lessons build on each other. His reference to Radcliffe’s novels provides a jab at both stereotypical conceptions of women’s reading matter and women’s (both authors and readers) lack of attention to detail. Steetz continues to characterize women as flighty when he offers tips for what to do when “your mind is so much taken up with the pleasures of the preceding night’s ball, that you have forgotten which is the Major key requiring five sharps” (74-75). Thus, he presents women as more concerned with romance—in novels and at balls—than musicianship, reinforcing constructions of middle-class femininity, including their amateur status.

However, these method books’ chastisement of women who try to play ambitious compositions suggests that their disciplinary power in limiting women’s skills was incomplete. Women were clearly capable of more, a fact in evidence in Phillip Klitz’s complaint in Principles and Precepts, or the Tutor’s Assistant (1852):
How many hundreds of young ladies do we hear, who with the most amiable desire to excel, rarely attain much beyond “a wonderful execution” which however difficult to accomplish, seldom succeeds in eliciting more than an expression of surprise and astonishment, at the rapidity of their fingers. The true office of music is either unknown or not appreciated, it ought to elevate the mind, amuse and gratify the intellect or it may be rendered interesting in a variety of ways far more praiseworthy than merely to astonish!19

“Hundreds” of women have mastered the technical difficulties of execution and, here, are censured for being too skilled. In achieving this level of facility, women obscure what Klitz calls “the true office of music”—which sounds similar to the role of the middle-class woman: To “elevate the mind” through her moral influence, to “amuse and gratify” her family, and to focus on their interests rather than her own. Thus, I suspect that his complaint has more to do with the expression of femininity than of music.

19 Philip Klitz, Principles and Precepts, or the Tutor’s Assistant (London: Purday, 1852), 27-28, emphasis in original.
In his introduction to a collection of country dances, Charles Chaulieu likewise advises his readers that domestic audiences do not appreciate demonstrations of superior skill:

O ye young females destined to form the ornament of society, listen to advice dictated by long experience. Believe that those long and difficult pieces which you play in the drawing-room, astonish sometimes, when they are perfectly well played, (a rare occurrence), but hardly ever impart real delight to the hearers. They must be considered as objects of study, and as a means of enabling you to play with grace, precision, expression, and neatness, brilliant compositions of a secondary degree of difficulty, and, above all, of a moderate length. You perhaps despise such, but you are in the wrong; for then you will please, you will charm your auditors; and those around you will no longer exclaim

What, the Piano again!20

---

Chaulieu accounts for the difficult compositions in piano tutorials and music collections marketed to women by identifying them as practice pieces that are to be played only in order to develop facility with pieces “of a secondary degree of difficulty.” He thereby reinforces women’s amateur status by reminding them of their function as “ornament[s] of society” whose first office is pleasing their audience and by reserving the first degree of musical difficulty for others, presumably virtuosi. Moreover, he recommends pieces that are, “above all, of a moderate length,” which limits the time women spend performing in front of others. Thus Chaulieu and Klitz admonish women who defy gender expectations by demonstrating a high degree of musical skill, putting their pleasure in performing above the audience members’, or prolonging their time in the spotlight.

A handful of tutorials did encourage women to develop their abilities. Despite his prescriptions on what women play in company, Czerny sets a course of study for his fictional pupil that will result in a quite accomplished pianist. He advises she begin with the studies of Henri Bertini and Johann Baptist Cramer, the Grand Scale-Exercises of Muzio Clementi and his own School for Virtuosi (1836), School for Graces and Embellishments (1840), and School of Legato and Staccato (1820), in addition to the easier works of Bertini, Henri Herz, Franz Hünten, Friedrich
Kalkbrenner, and Ignaz Moscheles (Czerny, 40-1). After ten months, she is ready for the more difficult works of those composers and also Johann Nepomuk Hummel, Cramer, Jan Ladislav Dussek, Ferdinand Ries, Daniel Steibelt, and the easier works of Ludwig van Beethoven (Czerny, 41-42). And, if she continues with her studies with “industry and zeal,” she “will be enabled to study by [her]self, and with the best results, the difficult works of the present as well as of past times” including those of virtuosi like Frédéric Chopin, Sigismond Thalberg, and Liszt; the concertos of Hummel, Kalkbrenner and Moscheles; and the more complex compositions of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Clementi, Beethoven, Cramer, Dussek, and Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia (Czerny, 42). Similarly, Florence Wickins’ Rapid Method for the Pianoforte (1892) includes lessons that range from “elementary” to “difficult,” with the difficult lessons containing selections from Chopin, Johann Sebastian Bach, Franz Schubert, Robert Schumann, Carl Maria von Weber, and Beethoven’s “Moonlight Sonata” (1802). That many women achieved a high level of skill is indicated Edward P. Rimbault’s comment on the sales of “classic” music: “Everywhere we now find the pianoforte sonatas of Mozart and Beethoven in the hands of amateurs who really play them. . . . Then we have the classical works of more modern
writers—Schubert, Schumann, and Mendelssohn; the sale of these works is daily increasing.”  
If the market for difficult piano music is any indication, women were in fact becoming very skilled musicians.

Moreover, as James Parakilas has argued, the “volumes of exercises” included in these method books went far beyond training women to provide light amusement in the drawing room.

He speculates that, despite cultural prohibitions against professional female pianists, many women did achieve this skill level, both because they were encouraged to spend many hours a day practicing and it was more profitable for teachers to train virtuosas because this would require more lessons (Parakilas, 150). To this I would add that piano tutorials published for a specifically female audience that contain no exercises, only text whose disciplining prescriptions I have sampled above, were meant to supplement other gender-neutral method books or teaching. The production of these gender-specific tutorials

indicates not only female domination of domestic music-making, but also suggests a concern that women were developing professional musical abilities and had to be reined in. Therefore, despite the limitations placed on women by many piano tutorials, there were certainly some very skilled female pianists during the nineteenth century.\footnote{A list of skilled amateur female pianists would include Nina Lehman and Bettina Walker. Walker, who studied with Sterndale Bennett and briefly considered a concert career, records her mother’s discouragement of her professional plans in \textit{My Musical Experiences} (London: Bentley, 1890).} This failure of disciplinary power is also evident in fictional representations of highly talented nonprofessional female pianists who are quite equal to the music of Mozart, Schumann, Beethoven, Felix Mendelssohn, and Thalberg.

Nineteenth-Century Fiction

Reading was another and equally problematic way for middle-class women to occupy their leisure time, as Steetz’s comment
about Anne Radcliffe indicates.\textsuperscript{24} Some believed that a correct course of reading, such as that set out by John Ruskin in \textit{Sesames and Lilies} (1865), would produce dutiful, domestic girls, reinforcing middle-class gender ideology. But others felt that reading was a dangerous pastime for women because it might inflame their imaginations and make them dissatisfied with their restricted lives.\textsuperscript{25} Like piano practice, reading could be a double-edged sword.

While fiction in general was suspect, sensation fiction in particular was castigated for its supposed negative effects on female readers since women were believed to be more susceptible to its chills and thrills.\textsuperscript{26} This subgenre of the Victorian novel, characterized in part by its affinities with stage

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{25} An author writing for the \textit{Christian Remembrancer}, for example, worried that sensation fiction would “make reality insipid and the routine of ordinary existence intolerable to the imagination.” “Our Female Sensation Novelists,” \textit{Christian Remembrancer} 46 (1863), 212.

\textsuperscript{26} See Flint, 274-93, for nineteenth-century concerns about sensation fiction and women readers.
\end{flushleft}
melodrama, is especially apt for a study of fictional representations of women’s musical performance. As I have argued elsewhere, melodrama established musical conventions that Victorian listeners would have recognized when they encountered them as readers of fiction.  

Therefore, audiences could be expected to extend their “reading” of music to the novel. Moreover, like stage melodrama, sensation fiction tends to play to the cheap seats, amplifying emotions and suspense, often, as we will see, through scenes of women playing the piano.

Sensation fiction’s spotlight on women at the piano is a departure from literature published in the first half of the century in which women who give serious attention to the piano are often minor characters presented satirically. Mary Bennet in *Pride and Prejudice* (1813), for example, is mocked as a pedant by the narrator who notes that she was, “as usual, deep in the study of thorough bass and human nature.”

Her study of the theory of harmony is attributed not to a great love of music or

---


great talent, but “in consequence of being the only plain one in the family” (17). Likewise, Jane Eyre sardonically notes Blanche Ingram’s attempts to attract Mr. Rochester by carrying on a conversation while playing a “brilliant prelude.” In contrast to these overachievers who use their piano skills to try to attract husbands, the heroines of Austen’s and Brontë’s novels are women who possess modest musical abilities, like Elizabeth Bennet, Emma Woodhouse, and Jane Eyre. By the 1850s, however, piano prices dropped while middle-class incomes rose, making the instrument affordable for an increasing number of families. My study shows a surge in the number of method books published in this decade, outpacing all other decades of the century, suggesting that these new piano owners were also purchasing instruction manuals. A greater number of women had access to the instrument and, consequently, attitudes toward women playing the piano shifted.

Perhaps as a result of this proliferation of the piano, in the sensation fiction of the 1860s, musical women take center stage. These characters are often read as stereotypical models of Victorian femininity, and their piano playing has contributed to this view. Placing their performances and repertoire in the context of contemporary piano tutorials, though, reveals that

---

these women are simultaneously transgressing the very social codes that defined them. Critics from D. A. Miller to Nicholas Daly have argued that sensation fiction is itself a disciplinary technology, shaping certain kinds of readers. I contend that this argument must be tempered when sensation fiction is considered in light of other contemporary reading material—material with its own disciplinary intentions. In this case, sensation fiction undermines the disciplinary effects of piano method books. As a result, a broader range of rebellious female behavior comes to light, and a greater number of female characters in sensation fiction can be understood as seditious.

In Wilkie Collins’ *The Woman in White* (1860), for example, the reader might expect Marian Halcombe, with her masculine features and preference for masculine pastimes, to be the novel’s nontraditional woman. However, Laura Fairlie also defies gender expectations with her piano repertoire and performances.

She plays Mozart and the “dexterous” music of an unidentified composer that critics speculate is Wagner or Schumann. Thus, she defies Czerny’s recommendation that women play “little, easy, but tasteful” selections in company, instead playing “difficult piece[s] by some celebrated composer[s],” which he advises against. Moreover, she performs Mozart’s music “without the book” (Collins, 107). That Laura is able to play Mozart from memory indicates that she has spent a great deal of time practicing the music.

In addition to demonstrating a degree of skill with her choice of composers, Laura’s performances threaten to disrupt domestic harmony, but not because she wants to show off or has professional aspirations as some piano tutorials assume. Rather, she uses music to convey her thoughts and feelings to her lover, Walter Hartright. On what appears to be Laura’s last evening with Walter,

---

she played unintermittingly—played as if the music was her only refuge from herself. Sometimes, her fingers touched the notes with a lingering fondness, a soft, plaintive, dying tenderness, unutterably beautiful and mournful to hear—sometimes, they faltered and failed her, or hurried over the instrument mechanically, as if their task was a burden to them. But still, change and waver as they might in the expression they imparted to the music, their resolution to play never faltered. (Collins, 108–9)

Laura displays more expression than technical skill in this performance, but it is an articulation of her own emotions, sorrow and love, and an eroticism displaced onto the piano, which she touches with “fondness” and “tenderness.” Her performance has none of the self-effacing “tranquility and self-possession” that Czerny advises women to maintain, but rather approaches that of virtuosi who were famed for infusing music with their own personalities. This emotional performance is a threat to domestic harmony because it reveals her feelings for Walter, a forbidden love since she is engaged to another man. Moreover, her performance conveys sexual feeling typically
denied unmarried middle-class women. However, despite her departures from the musical score’s tempo notations and from appropriate female behavior at the instrument, she does not draw attention to herself and is not socially embarrassed—the consequences piano tutorials foretell. Thus, her transgressions are diminished by the fact that her playing is received simply as evening entertainment by other listeners and that they pale in comparison to the actions of other characters in the novel (forgery, faked identities, false imprisonment in an insane asylum), bringing into doubt method books’ warnings of humiliating social repercussions.

Likewise, in Mary Elizabeth Braddon’s Lady Audley’s Secret (1862), the titular character initially seems like the ideal Victorian woman, in part because of her musical abilities. She creates a happy home by playing music for her husband and by occupying her time with the piano. She fills her days with her toilet, amateur gardening, and music: “sitting down to the piano to trill out a ballad, or the first page of an Italian bravura,

---

or running with rapid fingers through a brilliant waltz.”  
While she appears to be dutifully applying her music skills to social ends, her repertoire, which includes Mendelssohn and Beethoven’s sonatas, indicates that her abilities exceed what was recommended by most piano tutorials. Lest we think she plays the easier compositions of these composers, the narrator informs us that her piano is “covered with scattered sheets of music and exquisitely-bound collections of scenas and fantasias which no master need have disdained to study” (291). Her skill level, which surpasses the modest compositions recommend by piano tutorials, is an early indication that Lady Audley does not follow patriarchal prescriptions for women’s behavior.

Her musical performances also raise an eyebrow when read in light of piano method books. She plays “a pensive sonata of Beethoven’s” for her husband and nephew Robert “from memory,” suggesting that, like Laura Fairlie, she has spent a good deal of time practicing this difficult piece (90). While she plays, Robert “lingered by her side, and as he had no occupation in turning over the leaves of her music, he amused himself by watching her jewelled white hands gliding softly over the keys, with the lace sleeves dropping away from her graceful arched

---

wrist. He looked at her pretty fingers one by one... From the fingers his eyes wandered to the rounded wrists” (90).

Lucy’s performance, entertaining her husband and guest with music, appears to be an example of the proper woman engaged in her domestic duties. However, in doing so she defies piano tutorials’ prescriptions against making a spectacle of oneself at the instrument. Robert’s and the reader’s attention is drawn not to the music she plays but to the materiality of Lucy’s body. Robert focuses on her “white hands,” “pretty fingers,” and “arched” and “rounded wrists” as well as her body’s motion—her “hands gliding softly over the keys” as if caressing them—rather than the music’s movement. The position of her hands suggests that Lady Audley is aware that she is the focus of attention, since the strain of arching her wrists is not practical for playing for a long period of time and defies the almost universal piano method book instruction to keep one’s arms and wrists in a straight line.

Robert’s response to Lucy’s performance, indicative of arousal, suggests what can happen when women do not play by the piano rules. As if he is watching a strip tease, Robert ogles her fingers “one by one,” then moves his gaze up to her “rounded wrists,” tantalizingly exposed because her sleeves have fallen back while she plays. Thus, this scene at the piano creates a moment of frisson between a man who desires his uncle’s wife and
a woman who, it is clear, is willing to break some of the rules of behavior for proper middle-class women. As with Laura Fairlie’s performance, defying piano tutorials seems to bring women’s emotionality and materiality to the fore, defeating piano practice’s attempt to discipline women’s bodies. This early hint of Lady Audley’s seditiousness is born out when she is later revealed to be a bigamist and attempted murderer. While Lady Audley might be considered a cautionary tale of the slippery slope embarked on by women who defy piano tutorials, I would argue that this message is refuted by Braddon’s other female pianists.

In contrast to Lady Audley, Braddon presents the reader with a true domestic angel in the figure of Clara Talboys. However, Clara’s status as the dutiful, submissive woman who inspires Robert to uncover the mystery behind her brother’s disappearance is complicated by her musical ability. Her skill is apparent when Robert, strolling in a churchyard, hears “the solemn music of an organ... the slow harmonies of a dreamy melody that sounded like an extempore composition of an accomplished player” (253). Robert enters the church and “the music still rolled on. The organist had wandered into a melody of Mendelssohn’s” (254). The organist is revealed to be Clara. Here, she is presented as “an accomplished player,” one who can play impromptu, original compositions in addition to
Mendelssohn.\textsuperscript{34} Just as she defies her father’s rule that she not show any emotion about her lost brother, Clara also defies method books which warn against embellishing or going beyond the composer’s score. Thus, while Clara may be presented as the traditional version of womanhood and the appropriate love interest for Robert, Braddon hints that Lady Audley is not the only woman capable of defying patriarchal law. However, as with The Woman in White, women’s piano transgressions are diminished in the context of other actions in the novels, in this case arson and attempted murder, thereby undermining piano tutorials’ warnings.

In Aurora Floyd (1863), Braddon again presents seemingly compliant women who rebel against gendered social constraints with the piano. A description of Mrs. Lofthouse’s performance, for instance, reveals a pianist with little use for piano tutorials’ dicta:

\textsuperscript{34} As Phyllis Weliver notes, “these skills seem more like Clara Wieck who, before her marriage to Robert Schumann in 1840, included improvisation or an original composition in every recital,” in Women Musicians in Victorian Fiction, 1860-1900: Representations of Music, Science and Gender in the Leisured Home (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 113, emphasis in original.
Mrs. Lofthouse was rather a brilliant pianist, and was never happier than when interpreting Thalberg and Benedict upon her friends’ Collard-and-Collards. . . . At seven-and-twenty minutes past eight Mrs. Lofthouse was seated at Aurora’s piano, in the first agonies of a prelude in six flats; a prelude which demanded such extraordinary uses of the left hand across the right, and the right over the left, and such exercise of the thumbs in all sorts of positions,—in which, according to all orthodox theories of the pre-Thalberg-ite school, no pianist’s thumbs should ever be used,—that Mrs. Mellish felt that her friend’s attention was not very likely to wander from the keys.35

Mrs. Lofthouse disobedys Czerny’s and others’ advice for performing for company and instead chooses a technically “demand[ing]” piece that requires “extraordinary” hand work. The result is the kind of flamboyant, dramatic performance that piano method books warned against. Moreover, the repeated mention of Thalberg, along with the description of Mrs.

Lofthouse being in “the first agonies of a prelude,” associates her performance with the energy and intense emotion linked with male virtuosi, as does the fact that she is “interpreting” these composers’ work, rather than simply executing it. Thus, she defies the male composer’s score as well as male authors’ prescriptions, surpassing expectations for female pianists on multiple fronts.36

While her “earnestness to display dexterity of Finger” (“Desultory,” 180) and disregard for the norms for female performance stipulated by the method books make her a figure for the narrator’s mockery, this censure is diminished by the context of her performance. The showy piece absolves Mrs. Lofthouse’s attention in playing it, but it captivates no one else’s in listening to it, thwarting any desire she may have of demonstrating her skill and undercutting tutorials’ warnings of the disastrous effects of showing off. Rather, the piece functions melodramatically as background music for the scene and facilitates the far more unorthodox behavior of her listeners.

36 At least one method book encouraged performances like Mrs. Lofthouse’s. Edward Frost’s Thalbergian Exercises [1853?] aimed to help pianists strengthen their thumbs and the left hand so that they could play “Thalberg-ite school” compositions (Aurora, 343).
Her performance enables bigamist Aurora Floyd Mellish to slip out of the drawing room for a secret meeting with her first husband on the grounds of her second husband’s estate in order to bribe him to leave the country. Thus, Mrs. Lofthouse’s departure from norms of femininity is overshadowed by the even more scandalous behavior of her hostess.

Also overlooked in the novel are the performances of Aurora’s cousin, Lucy Floyd. Lucy, described as hyperbolically pure and innocent, loves Talbot Bulstrode and suffers in silence as she watches him fall in love with Aurora. As Jeni Curtis notes, her reticence undercuts the ideal of feminine transparency in that she, and not the transgressive title character, becomes the woman with a secret—her sexual desire for Bulstrode.37 However, I would like to amend Curtis’s argument that Lucy “finds no voice in the hegemonic discourse” (90). Lucy is not in fact silent—she plays Beethoven’s symphonies and sonatas. While the narrator does not comment on how Lucy plays, suggesting that her physical performance does not depart from

piano tutorial prescriptions, Lucy does betray her feelings through her musical repertoire, which suggests the tumult and passion she experiences and also invokes Beethoven’s innovation and pushing the boundaries of classical form. Thus her musical choices, which speak of her mental state and her advanced skill level, which enables her to play notoriously difficult piano reductions of symphonies, indicate that Lucy is not the meek and compliant woman she appears to be, but one who defies the confines of amateur female pianism and notions of normative femininity. As we have seen, attention to piano playing in these novels reveals that women’s rebellious behavior extends beyond the obvious and sensational crimes that are central to the plots and encompasses women who otherwise are understood to be embodying nineteenth-century gender norms.

By contrast, the ostensible villainess of this sensation novel, Aurora Floyd Mellish, barely plays the piano at all. Although she is a bigamist like Lady Audley, her lack of transgressive piano skills ironically signals an obedience to gender norms. As the footman tells a guest, Aurora “don’t play—leastways only pawlers, and that sort of think” (Aurora, 346). While polkas ranged in difficulty from simple piano arrangements to more complex orchestral pieces reduced for the piano, the implication here is that Aurora only plays easy, popular music—the repertoire recommended by the method books—nothing with the
same intellectual weight or challenges as the art music of Beethoven or Thalberg, the choices of the other pianists in the novel. It is not clear whether Aurora’s limited skills are due to an adherence to piano tutorial dictates or to a preference for other activities, but her repertoire suggests her rebellion against male authority is limited to her secret elopement with her father’s groom. As she believed her first husband to be dead before she married her second, her youthful indiscretion is succeeded by compliance, unlike the other women’s continual rebellion against male power through their virtuosic pianism.

In each of these examples, the musician has a potentially disruptive effect on the domestic harmony and tranquility which piano tutorials set out to maintain with their restrictions on women’s ambitions and behavior. And yet, these women’s violations are not recognized by the other listeners or are diminished in the context of bigamy, arson, murder, forgery, and false imprisonment, perhaps leading modern readers to overlook their wayward acts. Reading their performances in the context of piano tutorials then, exposes the range of women’s transgressions in sensation novels. But these novels also offered a counter-narrative to contemporary piano method books, undermining their disciplinary intent by making space for highly skilled amateur female musicians who are not censured for their physicality, repertoire, or skill. Indeed, I would suggest that
they paved the way for talented female musicians to be taken more seriously in literature and perhaps in life.38

Piano method books directed legions of women in a feminine pursuit that signaled middle-class respectability, established gendered norms of behavior at the instrument, managed the female pianist’s time, and delimited her ambition. However, their disciplinary function was countered by another female pastime—reading. In particular, sensation fiction’s depiction of women flaunting piano tutorials’ dictates without consequences undermines the prescriptive power of these manuals and creates other models for female pianism. The outcome of this clash is reflected in new representations of talented women pianists in the later decades of the nineteenth century. While evidence of highly proficient female pianists may be difficult to recover today, a close look at the period’s piano method books and fiction suggests there were more than has commonly been assumed. Examining these two genres together also indicates the limits of

relying on a single textual source or genre for understanding
and interpreting culture since the disciplinary function of any
text is circumscribed by what else its audience is reading.
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