KAPITTEL 2

The birth of the Oslo Conservatoire out of the spirit of the master-apprentice model

Stefan Gies Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen (AEC)

Abstract: The chapter sheds light on the history and background of the European landscape of higher music education institutions. This is done by investigating the historical reasons for the distinction between practice-based and theory-based knowledge, the social history of the musician's profession and the origins and characteristic features of the master-apprentice model and its adaptation in various historical contexts. It is shown how four formative models including the Neapolitan conservatoires of the late Middle Ages, the academies of the early modern period, as well as the prototype conservatoires in Paris and Leipzig, which were shaped by the ideals of the French Revolution on the one hand and those of the bourgeois 19th century on the other, left their mark also on the Nordic countries. The history of the Oslo Conservatoire – from Peter Lindeman's vision of a modern conservatoire to the founding of the Norwegian Academy of Music – can be seen as a good and typical example of how to tackle the tension between meeting the needs of modern times and staying committed to its roots and centuries-old European traditions. Special attention is paid to the particular role of the master-apprentice model in passing on music performance-related knowledge and skills, which is a common thread throughout the history of higher music education. Considered to be antiquated and outdated by many, it has over the centuries also proven to be very flexible and adaptable.

Keywords: History of higher music education institutions, Arts & Crafts, Master-apprentice model, Peter Lindeman

Citation: Gies, S. (2023). The birth of the Oslo Conservatoire out of the spirit of the master-apprentice model. In Ø. Varkøy, E. M. Stabell & B. Utne-Reitan (Eds.), *Høyere musikkutdanning: Historiske perspektiver* (Kap. 2, pp. 15–37). Cappelen Damm Akademisk. https://doi.org/10.23865/noasp.199.ch2

Introduction

When Peter Lindeman initiated the founding of the Oslo Conservatoire (*Musikkonservatoriet i Oslo*) in the 1880s, he was impressed by the effectiveness of the institutions he had seen and heard about abroad. At the same time, he kept sufficient critical distance to avoid blindly copying them. His ambition was to bring Norwegian music education up to European standards, and he was convinced that he could only be successful by founding an independent conservatoire in the country's capital (Lindeman & Solbu, 1976, p. 15). The fact that it was finally founded only after all the neighbouring countries already had comparable institutions was definitely to his advantage, because he was thus able to learn from their mistakes. Lindeman wanted a modern conservatoire that would meet the needs of the present. Simultaneously, he saw himself rooted in a centuries-old, specifically European tradition of passing on knowledge and skills in the field of music, which he could not (and did not want to) escape.

Parts of this tradition are: (1) a distinction dating back to antiquity between music as an 'academic' subject when dealing with theoretical and aesthetic aspects of music, and the skills-based know-how of the performing musician; (2) the related social status of those people dealing with music as professionals; and (3) the special role of the master-apprentice model for passing on music-related knowledge and skills, especially in the field of music performance. In the following, the above-mentioned aspects of tradition will be presented and explained, and it will be shown to what extent they were crucial for the development and implementation of the idea of establishing an institution of (higher) music education in Norway at the end of the 19th century.

The first section is devoted to the social history of music as a profession, followed by a section on the origins of the master-apprentice model and its adaptation in different historical contexts. The third section deals with some key tracks in the roots and history of higher music education institutions in Europe, which leads to a fourth section reflecting on the question why the master-apprentice model persisted to be a core and characteristic feature of the so-called 'Conservatoire model'.[1] The last section focuses on

1 The terms 'Conservatoire model' or 'Conservatoire mind-set' are part of colloquial jargon in many European languages; it is as a rule used in a derogatory or pejorative sense to brand the traditional structures of higher music education institutions as conservative and outdated.

the rise of higher music education in the Nordic countries, the emergence of related institutions in Oslo and how these developments fit in with the context as explained in the previous sections.

The social history of music as a profession

The definition of the terms *techné* and *phronesis* or – in a broader sense – between *techné* and *epistemé* provided by Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (Bartlett & Collins, 2012), based on the distinction between *poïesis* and *praxis*, was key to the further course of the occidental history of ideas. It is traceable to today's categorial differentiation between *craft* and *science* or between *applied knowledge* and *theoretical knowledge*. Aristotle described *techné* as the knowledge and skills that enable human beings to create objects. According to today's understanding, this can be an object of utility as well as a work of art. *Phronesis*, on the other hand, did not refer to application-related knowledge for Aristotle, but to knowledge enabling the individual to act ethically 'good' and thus also to act in a politically responsible manner (cf. Ebert, 1976; Gies, 2011; Massingham, 2019).

The idea that arts and crafts have in common, that they both belong to a realm which is characterised by practice-based or experience-based knowledge and thus are categorically distinct from the theory-based domain of science, dates back to antiquity and continued to live on into the late Middle Ages. This applies regardless of whether one looks at the matter from the perspective of action theory or sociology. In Roman times, no distinction was made between the professional domains of craft and art. The *faber* or *opifex* (from *opus facere* – 'the one who produces products') manufactured a piece of work which could be a table or a pair of shoes, as well as a poem or a sculpture (cf. Hauser, 1953).

Even when the concept of an academic canon of subjects developed in the early universities of Europe in the 13th century, the *septem artes liberales* (seven liberal arts) did not include the design and the production of a work of art. In other words, unlike disciplines to which the artist refers to in his or her work – such as grammar, logic, geometry and the theory of music – composing and performing music was not considered to be an *ars liberalis* (Ehrenforth, 2005, p. 176; Gies, 2019, p. 35; Lindgren, 1992; Salmen, 1997, p. 33).

Moreover, the first noteworthy shifts towards a categorical distinction between arts and crafts were triggered by changes in the social status of people active in these two domains more than by a growing gap in professional self-images. While the activity of the craftsman (including the activity of the artist in the modern sense, but also that of the healer or the scribe) was still considered socially inferior in Roman antiquity, it experienced a gradual increase in social prestige with the formation of the guilds in the Middle Ages. It can be shown that at least in the German-speaking area as early as in the first half of the 16th century, numerous master craftsmen were among the wealthiest citizens of the prosperous cities where they often held high offices or served on the city councils. Among them were renowned masters and heads of painting workshops known to this day, such as Albrecht Dürer, Lucas Cranach the Elder, Hans Baldung Grien and Tilmann Riemenschneider (cf. Brenner, 2012, p. 3).

A reorientation of the artist's self-image and the birth of a professional self-understanding as a 'genius' only arose in the first half of the 19th century, around the same time when the bourgeois musical life was flourishing. This also triggered a process that increasingly alienated the spheres of the craftsman and that of the artist. In music, however, the idea of the artist as a genius remained limited to a numerically very small group of composers and (virtuoso) soloists until after the First World War, while the large mass of orchestral musicians, dance musicians, conservatoire teachers and military musicians continued to consider themselves as craftsmen or service providers as a matter of course and were also seen as such in the eyes of outsiders. The idea that the employee of a city symphony orchestra or the vocal teacher at a conservatoire could share the social reputation and the aura of the 'genius' artist was completely foreign in the 19th century (cf. Prinz, 1995; Salmen, 1997).

Richard Sennett (2008) defines the term *craft*, in an epistemological sense, as a distinctive mode of knowledge of the world which he not only assigns to carpenters, bricklayers, glassblowers or potters, but also to the artist (together with the software engineer, the philosopher and the surgeon). Following Sennett, what distinguishes artists from craftsmen is not the character or nature of their activities, their way of thinking or their ethical self-conceptions, but solely their prestige and role in society. For Sennett, the existence of the occupational group of *artists* as distinct from *craftsmen* is first and foremost a sociological phenomenon (p. 73).

The origins of the master-apprentice model and its adaptations in different historical contexts

It is difficult to determine the origins of the models of learning and teaching which nowadays are commonly grouped together under the generic term *master-apprentice model*. One matter that complicates this is that some of the core features of this model correspond to what is known in learning and teaching research as *informal learning* and which is sometimes referred to as *natural learning* in colloquial usage. Both forms of learning are characterised by the lack of organisation and planning of learning processes in a structured way. Guiding principles of this kind of learning are trial and error and learning-by-doing. Learning progress results from participation in social life and from the accumulation of experience-based empirical knowledge (cf. Calvert, 2014; Coy, 1989; Lave, 2011). This differs from what we might understand by an archaic form of the master-apprentice model only by virtue of the fact that the role of the master was not yet on the cast list. But even at the moment when, from a historical point of view, the master stepped onto the stage of learning, he (most, if not all, early masters were men) did not do so in the role of a teacher who was actively shaping learning processes, but as someone who was assigned the role as a model to follow by the learner or those willing to learn. Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger, who provided fundamental insights into situated learning through social practice, expressed this as follows: 'The apprentice usually learns a great deal, although few tangible teaching activities appear to emanate from the Master's actions' (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 92).

It is no surprise that the master-apprentice model held a de facto monopoly on learning and teaching practice in antiquity. Especially the transfer of practical skills took place as a kind of embedded learning, in which the novices and ignorant apprentices were from the beginning considered as an integral part of the ongoing business, observing the operational processes and imitating them. It can be assumed that those apprentices received a wide range of support in their attempts to follow their workmates' examples (cf. De Munck et al., 2007). But there was obviously no such thing as a didactic concept, nor was there a clear assignment of the task of teaching to one or more individual members of the team. The instructors or facilitators in the learning processes that took place in this context were usually the apprentice's peers or those who were a little higher up in the workshop's

pecking order than the apprentice himself. It is more likely to have been the exception that the master himself took this role, unless it was a small workshop with very few employees.

Little changed in this learning-and-teaching setting from antiquity to the 18th century. The typology of such a master-apprentice model has been described many times and across all cultures and times (Alpers, 1988; Calvert, 2014; Coy, 1989; Lave, 2011; Rogoff, 1995). The characteristic features of this model include not only a holistic pedagogical approach and embodied or tacit learning through practice, but also the lack of agreed-upon teaching standards.

After all, with the increasing spread of the guild system from the 14th century, a certain standardisation in individual areas of crafts emerged. In many cities, the guilds acted as gatekeepers, because only members of the guilds were allowed to engage in professional activity. With the introduction of a master's examination, however, a kind of standardised norm for proof of professional qualification arose. The master's examination was an examination set up by the guilds in which the candidate had to present a so-called masterpiece to a commission of senior guild members. Passing the exam was the prerequisite for being accepted as a member of the guild and thus given the privilege to set up and manage one's own workshop. In contrast to the requirements for carrying out and passing the master's examination, the pathway that led to this examination remained unregulated.

Unlike in the field of fine arts, only a very small proportion of professional musicians were organised in the guilds, predominantly the so-called town pipers (cf. Sowa, 1973; Stilz, 1995). On the other hand, there was a huge number of musicians who earned their living as itinerant craftsmen or so-called *travelling journeymen* and who contributed as members of the social underclass to an overall rather poor image of the musical profession. But it is also true that since the Middle Ages, there have also been social spheres in which services that can be considered artistic services in today's sense were in demand and were provided, and in which other rules and social agreements applied than in the area of crafts. The two by far most important of these social spheres were the royal courts and the Church. However, these spheres were of little importance for the genesis of institutions of (professional or higher) music education. Moreover, the history of the emergence of the institutions of higher music education gained momentum at the very moment when the ownership of musical life was taken over by the bourgeoisie. Thus, the forms and traditions of passing

on knowledge and skills related to music performance practice remained in those spheres they belonged to in terms of social history: the area of the middle class, i.e. guild-related handicraft (cf. Gream, 2000; Hauser, 1953, pp. 331–338).

The roots and emergence of institutions of higher music education in Europe

Higher music education institutions, as we know them today, can be seen to be shaped by one or more of four different types of predecessor institutions. These not only emerged at different times, but also served different purposes:

1. The *Neapolitan model of a conservatoire*, which has its early roots in the 14th century. These conservatoires must be attributed to the social sector but not to the educational sector according to today's understanding, because they were orphanages or homes for foundlings (*orfanotrofi*) and not initially meant to be music schools (Rexroth, 2005).
2. The so-called *academies* that came into fashion in the Renaissance as a kind of aristocratic salon in which people came together to exchange ideas on the latest developments in science and arts and to promote them.
3. The *publicly-owned conservatoire* in charge of fostering and nurturing the musical life as a state task which includes the provision of vocational studies addressing young, emerging musicians. The *Conservatoire de la Musique de Paris*, founded in the middle of the turmoil of the French Revolution, can be seen as the prototype for this type of institution.
4. The conservatoire as a *higher music education institution*, for which the *Konservatorium der Musik Leipzig,* founded in 1843, can be considered the prototype. In fact, this institution was from the beginning deliberately meant to be something different from what was traditionally called a *Konservatorium* (i.e. a music school for everyone) and closer to what today is called a *Hochschule für Musik* (i.e. an institution addressing future professionals).

From the outset, all four types of institutions provided some form of musical instruction. But the role of learning and teaching music did not only differ depending on the type of institution, the context they were embedded

in and the goals to which they were committed. In some cases, music was moreover just one subject or activity among many others which was by no means the institutions' core purpose and raison d'être.

The Neapolitan model of a conservatoire remained a social institution even after it had spread all over Italy and was more focused on preparing young people to become professional musicians. This was the case from around 1600 in answer to the increasing demand for musicians on the job market, which offered the often socially uprooted pupils from the conservatoires good prospects of earning a living on their own (cf. Amato, 2012; Rexroth, 2005).

The academies which popped up throughout Europe from the late 17th century offered aristocratic connoisseurs and music lovers the opportunity to make music together, and these activities were frequently supported by musicians brought in from outside to reinforce the ensemble (Niemöller, 1993, p. 96). That is why *academy* was, until the end of the 18th century, also a common term to describe a musical performance, only later replaced with *concert*. This also means that, although it was not uncommon that the academies felt obliged or needed to provide tailored educational opportunities to young artists, if only because this was not done by anyone else in the secular world, education and music performance training were not their main focus, nor were they committed to fulfil an educational mission or mandate. Even if the academies in the field of fine arts adapted the idea of the masterpiece as introduced by the guilds as part of the master's examination and reinterpreted this idea as a prerequisite for admission to the academy, it would be a misunderstanding to consider the academies as educational institutions in the modern sense (cf. Niemöller, 1993).

Strictly speaking, this was not even the case for the Paris Conservatoire, at least when its founder and mastermind Bernard Sarrette laid its foundations (cf. Pierre, 1900, pp. 71–75). The *Corps de musique de la garde nationale parisienne* was basically a military unit, the sub-division of a revolutionary militia founded in the summer of 1789, whose mission was 'to sing the praises of freedom on the occasion of public celebrations', but also 'to hang the lyre on the wall when necessary to fight the enemy with weapons' (Pierre, 1900, p. 124). The institution grew only gradually and step by step into the role of a music education institution. When the *Corps de musique* was renamed *Institut national de musique* in 1792, systematic teaching activities became more important, but were still not at the core

of the institution's tasks and were only meant to be a junior staff development programme.

This only changed when the institution was also seen to be in charge of contributing to the implementation of a political agenda in line with the ideals of the French Revolution. Then it was in addition assigned the task of making music education accessible to those social classes who were deprived of it so far (Bongrain & Gérard, 1996, p. 90). On 3 August 1795, a law was adopted which provided, among other things, the opportunity to once more rename the institution, this time to *Conservatoire de Musique*. Teaching music moved more and more to the forefront of its activities, but even in its early days as the *Conservatoire*, the institution's main purpose was still to perform music at national festivities. The fact, however, that the employees of the conservatoire were referred to as 'professors' and no longer as 'artists' for the first time in 1796, clearly demonstrates that its raison d'être continued to be subject to change (cf. Pierre, 1900). At the same time, the institution's political agenda was strengthened by the implementation of a policy requiring the *Conservatoire de Musique* to enrol '600 students of both sexes, selected proportionally from all *départements*' without charging them tuition fees (Bongrain & Gérard, 1996, p. 124). Even if the ideas of its founders never became a reality, they remained groundbreaking for the future.

The Paris Conservatoire never ceased operations, but was formally closed down in 1816 in order to purge from it teaching staff members who were considered politically unreliable in the sense of the Restoration. The budget was drastically cut and the institution reopened with a changed mission under the name of *École royale de musique et de déclamation* (Bongrain & Gerard, 1996, p. 54). In this sense, the founding of the Paris Conservatoire in the early 1790s was not the birth of the bourgeois conservatoire which it later became, but first of all a Jacobean political project to promote the idea of *égalité*.

In contrast to the Paris Conservatoire, the Leipzig Conservatoire was from the beginning in 1843 designed as a bourgeois project. It was imbued with the spirit of a social class that was, due to its economic power, just about to take over the role of the ruling class in the succession of the nobility – and in this process discovering and developing the value and the appreciation of culture and education as a distinguishing feature. Unlike the original Paris Conservatoire, the institution in Leipzig was also from the outset a socially exclusive institution, not least because it was run as

a private enterprise charging quite high tuition fees (Sowa, 1973, p. 193). The fact, however, that almost all subjects were taught in groups in Leipzig was not only due to financial reasons. Behind this was also the hope for a positive educational effect that was expected to be triggered by peer-to-peer learning settings (Wasserloos, 2004a, p. 43).

As powerful as the above-mentioned models and prototypes were for the further development of the system of higher music education, none of these models was a success story from the start. The Paris Conservatoire was at the mercy of political events, and it was not until the 1830s that the institution found calmer waters. In the meantime, the institution's strategies and policies were fully guided by the needs of the bourgeois musical life. In the first decades of its existence, the Leipzig Conservatoire was more a place of experimentation than an exemplary implementation of a master plan (cf. Wasserloos, 2004a, p. 40). Not all the students seemed to be happy with the dominance of group classes and their dissatisfaction contributed to creating a system of extra one-to-one tuition with the main subject teacher on a private basis, which was offered to the students for a fee which came in addition to the already quite high tuition fees. In Paris, teachers were expressly forbidden to give their students additional private lessons (Bongrain & Gérard, 1996, p. 79).

One of the new features introduced by the Leipzig Conservatoire was the splitting up of lessons in the main instrument into technique (*Technik*) and interpretation (*Vortrag*), which were taught by two different teachers (cf. Navon, 2020). Although this reflects the academic ambitions that distinguished Leipzig from all previous models, this division was also a source of notorious discontent among the students. All in all, it can be said that in the first 25 years of its existence, the Leipzig Conservatoire enrolled a large number of students from all over the world, but also caused a great deal of dissatisfaction among students and graduates due to inefficient structures and a lack of supervision (cf. Wasserloos, 2004a, pp. 40–41). The splitting up of main instrument lessons into *Technik* and *Vortrag* was taken up by many institutions in later years, albeit usually in a modified form (i.e. as a sharing of tasks between the master and his or her assistant in a much more hierarchical setting than was considered ideal in the original Leipzig model).

During the first half of the 19th century and in the wake of the great style-forming institutions, numerous music schools and conservatoires came into being, in particular in the German-speaking countries, but also

beyond. Almost all of them were run privately, and there were no special legal requirements to meet in order to found a conservatoire. This also attracted numerous start-up entrepreneurs who were primarily looking for an opportunity to make money. At the time, the brand *Konservatorium* or *Conservatoire* sounded like a promise of seriousness and quality. However, most of these conservatoires did not see their main task as training professional musicians, but rather as providing instrumental or vocal tuition for 'wealthy dilettantes and lovers of music' (Sowa, 1973, pp. 21–22).

Why the master-apprentice model persisted to be a core and characteristic feature of the so-called 'conservatoire model'

The old-style Italian conservatoires were dissolved in the wake of the Napoleonic Wars. Those institutions which were newly established afterwards or continued under the same name had nothing in common with the orphanages of the old days. 'In 1799 Napoleon occupied Naples. That was the death for this type of conservatoire' (Sowa, 1973, p. 48).[2] Nevertheless, some characteristics and structures of instrumental and vocal tuition that had been developed in the old Italian conservatoires lived on. This included the subdivision of music tuition into subjects such as *solfeggio*, counterpoint, singing, ensemble playing and main instrument, which were often taught by the same teacher in the old Italian conservatoires. However, the master-apprentice model lived on at least in main instrument teaching. Enzo Amato (2012) reports on a teaching setting that shows a huge affinity to the workshop model and mind-set, but in which, at the same time, tasks were shared between the actual *maestro* and the so-called *mastricelli*. The *mastricelli* were advanced students who performed assistant duties for the *maestro*: 'They took care of the beginners, ensured didactic continuity and freed the *maestro* from boring and tiresome tasks' (Amato, 2012, p. 6). In return, the *mastricelli* could benefit from more lessons with the master himself.

This system was quite similar to the one in place at the Paris Conservatoire in the early years. At the top of the hierarchy were some

2 Phenomena such as El Sistema can, however, be seen as evidence that the symbiosis of social welfare measures and musical elite education is still relevant in the 21st century.

renowned musicians, surrounded and supported by paid and unpaid *répétiteurs* (selected from among the best students), who had a contractually regulated teaching load of three courses of two hours per week (Bongrain & Gérard, 1996, p. 63).

Both the system of Italian conservatoires described by Amato, which bloomed in the 16th and early 17th centuries, and the way the Paris Conservatoire was organised in its early years display remarkable parallels with the master-apprentice model, as it was found in the large painting workshops of the Renaissance and Baroque periods, but also in the craft guilds of the time. Common features were making the apprentice part of a hierarchically structured community of people who were pursuing a common goal, which was the collaborative production of an artistic and craft product or the performance of a piece of music. In this community, everyone learned in a way from the other members of the team but, above all, those at the bottom of the hierarchy learned from those who were above them. The masters were formally positioned at the top of this cascade of learning and teaching, but this does not necessarily mean that they spent a great deal of time and effort performing teaching tasks in the modern sense. They might have passed those tasks on to one or more assistants, for better or for worse. But that also means that the format of one-to-one-tuition under the guidance of a master, which we often consider today to be the distinctive and core element of the master-apprentice model, did not yet exist at that time, at least not as a systematically planned and organised feature.

From the early 18th century on, this form of top-down, peer-to-peer learning in the field of music performance faced competition from a certain sort of private tuition, which not only boomed suddenly, but also led to increasing professionalism in terms of didactics and methods. Musical personalities such as Francesco Geminiani, Carl Philipp Emmanuel Bach, Jean-Philippe Rameau, Johann Joachim Quantz and Leopold Mozart saw themselves not only as masters but also explicitly as teachers, and they made efforts to strengthen their reputations as such by publishing practical instructions and theoretical reflections on teaching musical instruments (cf. Mahlert, 2002; Roske, 1985). Unlike the studios and workshops of the master craftsmen and the early conservatoires and academies, this kind of private tuition, which was organised outside of the institutions, usually had one-to-one tuition as its core element. It was often the only element of the teaching activity (cf. Lüdeke, 1958, p. 118).

When we speak of the master-apprentice model today as the continuing predominant practice in music performance teaching in contemporary higher music education institutions, we are inclined to equate it with one-to-one tuition. But throughout the 19th century, this was the exception rather than the rule, not only due to financial constraints. It was only from the beginning of the 20th century onwards that one-to-one tuition became the predominant form of teaching an instrument at higher music education institutions. From a methodological and didactic point of view, this change also involved a further development of the master-apprentice model. But the example of instrumental teachers like Rameau and Quantz probably contributed more to this further development than pioneering institutions such as those in Paris and Leipzig. These institutions were not so much an inspiration for others through new teaching models or innovative methodology or didactics, but rather through their curricula and the development of systematic institutional structures. Even in this respect, the two institutions in Paris and Leipzig became role models for others not primarily because of their daily practice, but rather with reference to the concepts and rationales on which their foundation was based – even if these were only partly implemented on site.

In summary, it can be said that the increasing institutionalisation of teaching an instrument had no obvious serious consequences for the internal relationship between teacher and student, insofar as the master, who was still firmly anchored in the professional practice of the performing musician, continued to be at the core of the teaching process. The teacher, however, was now no longer part of a guild system, but hired as an employee or lecturer by a civil, state or private institution. Despite this, it still applied that his or her professional qualification as a teacher was based on competence as a performing musician, which he or she – at least ideally – continued to demonstrate regularly alongside teaching activities. Again, the learning-teaching setting as such was nothing new, but the context in which it took place – including the teacher's employment relationship – was.

The persistence of the master-apprentice model in an environment that to some extent had radically changed might seem surprising at first glance but, on the one hand, this model had already in earlier times shown itself to be flexible and adaptable to changing conditions. On the other hand, it had repeatedly proved to be without an alternative, especially at critical moments of further development in the sector.

Isaac Calvert (2014) argues that the master-apprentice model is not just an archaic, supposedly outdated and pre-rational teaching method, but also has particular strengths that made it both a widespread and successful teaching model to this day, especially (but not only) in the arts. He claims that, throughout time, the master-apprentice model has been linked to the idea of passing on knowledge, skills or abilities that cannot be explained in words, and concludes that 'isolating parts of the communication of such skill from the holistic experience of being in the presence of a master seems almost counterintuitive' (Calvert, 2014, p. 19). In other words, despite the criticism it has received in recent times (cf. Elliott, 1995; Campbell et al., 2016; Nerland, 2019; Perkins, 2013), the master-apprentice model should by no means be understood as old-fashioned or outdated, but as something which is not only able to adapt to constantly changing environments and contexts, but also to do so under pressure in order to prove its effectiveness again and again. In fact, the master-apprentice model has been subject to change and modification over the course of history, but these changes were triggered by the social and economic contexts in which the master-apprentice model was used rather than by new insights into the effectiveness of learning processes or reflection on teaching methods.

The rise of higher music education in the Nordic countries and its beginnings in Oslo[3]

On its website, the Royal College of Music in Stockholm (*Kungliga Musikhögskolan*) refers to the fact that the institution's roots trace back to 1771. This was indeed the year in which the Royal Swedish Academy of Music (*Kungliga Musikaliska Akademien*) was founded, from which, after intricate detours, the *Kungliga Musikkonservatoriet* first and the *Kungliga Musikhögskolan* later emerged. However, the academy founded in 1771 was not an educational institution but rather an academy in the sense of the institutions described above. Its foundation proves, above all, that the concept of this kind of academy spread as far north as Sweden early on.

The academy in Stockholm was not atypical for the many 18th century academies in Europe, including the fact that there were some attempts to set up a regular system of music performance tuition. But these attempts were of very limited success. After all, the founding of the Royal Swedish

3 This section was written in close collaboration with Jon Helge Sætre.

Academy of Music in Stockholm was partly due to the lobbying work of individual Stockholm musicians, who, among other things, drew the King's attention to the fact that it would be much cheaper to train the next generation of musicians within the country rather than hiring expensive musicians from abroad (Karlsson, 2000, p. 4). King Gustaf III followed the suggestion to found an academy in Stockholm, which was established in September 1771. He became the institution's patron, but neither contributed financially to run it nor showed any interest in making the academy an educational institution alongside its task of facilitating performances (mainly operas). This is why music education activities stumbled along with low intensity, and musicians for the opera continued to be hired from abroad. At the beginning of the 19th century, nothing remained of the idea of a music education institution other than an elementary singing school for girls (cf. Karlsson, 2000, p. 16; Walin, 1945).

Institutionalised music education that prepared young musical talents for the profession of a musician that was worthy of the name only came into being with the founding of *Kungliga Musikkonservatoriet* in 1856 (Öhrström, 2000, pp. 64–65). When it is claimed that the Royal College of Music in Stockholm is the oldest higher music education institution in the Nordic countries, this is, at most, correct with reference to the founding year of the conservatoire in 1856, but not with reference to the year 1771. Only a few years later, in 1867, the Copenhagen Conservatoire (*Kjøbenhavns Musikkonservatorium*) was founded.[4] When Peter Lindeman initiated the process of establishing a music education institution in Oslo in the 1880s, there were a number of role models, both in neighbouring countries as well as beyond, to which he could refer. Lindeman himself had studied at the conservatoire in Stockholm in 1878–79 and had lessons with the principal cellist of the Saxon Court Orchestra, Friedrich Grützmacher in winter 1884/85 (Lindeman & Solbu, 1976, p. 15).

The influence of the Leipzig Conservatoire was keenly felt in the Nordic countries in the second half of the 19th century. More than 100 Norwegian students enrolled at the Leipzig Conservatoire between 1843 and 1880 (Wasserloos, 2004b, p. 127), while the concept of the Copenhagen Conservatoire was essentially based on the Leipzig model (but also included elements that corresponded more closely to the Paris model). The founding

4 The institution is today known as the Royal Danish Academy of Music (*Det Kongelige Danske Musikkonservatorium*).

director of the Copenhagen Conservatoire, Niels Gade, not only studied in Leipzig, but was also a member of the teaching staff there for several years. Similar to Leipzig, a single major sponsor stood behind the founding of the Copenhagen Conservatoire, and both the range of subjects and the principle of group instruction that aimed at strengthening peer-to-peer learning corresponded to the Leipzig model (Wasserloos, 2004b, pp. 227, 230). Unlike Leipzig however, from the outset Copenhagen provided numerous student scholarships and study places for free for particularly gifted but poor students, and the main instrument tuition was not split up (Wasserloos, 2004b, pp. 232, 239). It can only be speculated as to why Gade did not follow the Leipzig model in certain respects. In relation to not splitting lessons in the main instrument, this can certainly be taken as a sign that Gade considered the Leipzig concept a failure. However, it is striking to see that great importance was attached to deprivileging access to the educational opportunities provided by the conservatoires, by awarding scholarships or free study places in Copenhagen (and later in Oslo). Even though it may be going too far to see this as an adaptation of the Jacobean model from Paris, it can still be taken as a sign that the idea of social equity had a stronger presence in Denmark and Norway in the 19th century than was the case in Germany at the time.

Like Gade, Lindeman also seems to have oriented himself towards the German model, even though inspiration must have come from Stockholm and Copenhagen as well. He might have preferred to take the original as a model instead of Copenhagen, an institution that he probably regarded as a copy of the German model. On the occasion of a study trip to Dresden, he got to know the local conservatoire and was deeply disappointed about its conservatism, which he wished to avoid when setting up a conservatoire in Oslo. Although it is recorded that he originally intended to inspect 'a number of different conservatoires in foreign countries' (Lindeman & Solbu, 1979, p. 15), there is no evidence that he ever visited any other music education institution abroad besides the one in Dresden (and the one in Stockholm that he got to know as a 20-year-old student). It is possible that the disappointment he experienced in Dresden prevented him from doing so, as well as perhaps lacking travel funds. But beyond this, there are good reasons to assume that Lindeman was deluded by Dresden's reputation as a music city, ignoring the fact that although Dresden was home to one of the best orchestras in Europe, the local conservatoire was on the one hand a private institution with no public funding and constantly facing economic

hardship and, on the other hand, in no way lived up to the reputation of Dresden as a *city of music* (cf. Heinemann, 2005).

Summing up some contemporary expert reports commissioned by the conservatoire's supervisory board, Michael Heinemann states the following about the situation at the Dresden Conservatoire (*Conservatorium für Musik Dresden*) in the 1880s: 'None of the teachers can […] despite their undoubtedly high merits – be counted among the pioneering artists of the time' (Heinemann, 2005, p. 22). It is possible that Lindeman deliberately decided not to refer to the model of institutions such as those in Leipzig or Berlin, which were better equipped and operated at a far higher level; that Dresden appeared as a viable model because it was clear to him that he also had to get along without (or with only little) financial support from third parties. In fact, the school he founded in Oslo was very similar to the Dresden model insofar as it was essentially a privately run institution that mainly counted interested and wealthy amateurs among its students and prepared only some of them on a rather informal basis for a future life as professional musicians (cf. Heinemann, 2005, p. 28).

Lindeman's school started as an Organist School (*Organistskolen*) with 2 teachers and 16 students in 1883 (Lindeman, 1889–1901; cf. Førisdal, 2022). The two teachers were Ludvig Mathias Lindeman and his son Peter. The school changed its name to the Music and Organist School (*Musik- og Organistskolen*) already in 1885, and nine years later to the Music Conservatoire (*Musik-Konservatoriet*). By 1888, the school had grown to 7 teachers and 80 students, many of whom were quite young children (but no beginner students below the age of 12 were accepted), which further increased to 260 students in 1892 and 490 in 1901 (Lindeman, 1889-1901). The majority of the students in these early years were in fact female. Of the 23 teachers employed in 1892, 6 were female. In 1892, the conservatoire gave lessons in a number of subjects, which were divided by the distinction between main subjects (*hovedfag*) and secondary subjects (*bifag*). The main subjects were instrument lessons, harmony, counterpoint and composition. The secondary subjects were elementary music theory and instrumentation, aural training (from 1894), ensemble (including choir) and piano tuning (Lindeman, 1889–1901). Instrumental lessons were given to student groups of two. Other disciplines were taught in groups of four students or more. Furthermore, the main instrument was not the only main subject. Also harmony, counterpoint and composition were main subjects. This may tell us that the school from the beginning tried to include and cope with both the craft-oriented organist

context (cf. Utne-Reitan, 2022) and the goal of establishing an institution for the professional training of musicians more broadly.

From an economic point of view, the initial phase of the Oslo Conservatoire was a constant challenge. Although the Norwegian parliament, the *Storting*, approved an annual subsidy of 1,000 Norwegian Crowns as early as 1886 – which at that time corresponded to a third of the total budget (Lindeman & Solbu, 1976, p. 8) – the number of students grew in leaps and bounds at the same time. It was not until 1909 that the Norwegian state subsidy was increased to 3,000 Norwegian Crowns (Lindeman & Solbu, 1976, p. 36). Royal scholarships – granted from the first year of the conservatoire's operation – allowed a few students per year to attend the conservatoire for free, which brought some additional financial relief (Lindeman & Solbu, 1976, p. 12). Regarding its economic situation, however, the Oslo Conservatoire was never able to compete with the flagship institutions of the time. It can therefore be assumed that both the limited range of minor subjects and the teaching of the main instrument in pairs were primarily due to economic constraints.

Concerts – called 'musical evenings' (*Musikkaftener*) – were a central part of the school's activities. They helped to build the institution and strengthened the position of the Lindeman name in Norwegian musical life (Førisdal, 2022). The most widespread forms of participation at the concerts were solo performances and soloists with accompaniment. Both teachers and students were used as accompanists. At Concert no. 49 (spring 1893), for example, both Peter Lindeman himself and the student Erika Michelsen acted as accompanists. Michelsen was a piano student in the school year 1892–1893 under the tuition of Chr. Johnson, and she became a piano teacher for the lower division the following year. On rare occasions, students actually played with their teachers. For example, Peter Lindeman's quartet for four cellos was played at the concert on 27 February 1893 (Lindeman, 1889–1901), by Peter Lindeman himself and his students Ulrik Hald, Johan Dahl and Antonius Knudsen. Several musical evenings had large productions, for example the 7th musical evening on 19 November 1886 where L. M. Lindeman's *Bygdøkantate* was performed by 60 singers (Lindeman & Solbu, 1976, p. 16), or 16 October 1892, which was the first concert in the new venue in Nordahl Bruns gate 8. Here, L. M. Lindeman's *Norafjeld* was performed with a text written by the student Olav Ziener. The student's poem was inspired by teacher Christian Fahlström's painting of *Brage and the Harp*, which was painted for the new

venue. Some students in composition also had their works performed, for example, Kristian Lindeman (a student in composition under Johannes Haarklou), who played his own composition *Fugue for Organ* at this inaugural concert. It seems that fewer and fewer teachers participated in the concerts. In 1897, there were several concerts in which no teachers played, for example, Musical Evening no. 200 (Lindeman & Solbu, 1976, p. 27).

The archive indicates that students and teachers were involved in a variety of student-teacher and student-student relationships (including the short-lasting scheme where older students taught younger students around 1890), suggesting that the master-apprentice model was as close to the workshop as the one-to-one version. It also suggests that this early music conservatoire in Norway strongly emphasised giving the students performing opportunities, which Rosie Perkins (2013) identified as a cornerstone of the learning cultures of modern higher music education institutions. However, even here we find that the financial situation played a role. From 1908, the ticket revenues were put aside in a fund that was used 20 years later to build an extension on the conservatoire building (Lindeman & Solbu, 1976, p. 35).

Epilogue

The further development of the institution in Oslo remained connected with the name of Lindeman for a long time, first with Peter Lindeman's son Trygve Lindeman taking over as head of the institution after his father, then with the establishment of the Lindeman Foundation (*Lindemans Legat*). The Oslo Conservatoire ceased to exist when the Norwegian Academy of Music was founded in 1973. This process of transition from a conservatoire to a higher music education institution was far from unusual and took place almost everywhere in Europe in one way or another.

Whilst the conservatoires originally aimed at both amateurs and future professional musicians and thus acted, as was the case in Oslo, as a mixture of music school and vocational school, their successors strived for full academic recognition and therefore tried to limit their activities to higher education. Also, the fact that an originally private institution was, as happened in Oslo, taken over step by step and, at the end, fully financed by the state, was quite common in many European countries. In 1999, this process came to a preliminary conclusion with the signing of the Bologna Declaration.

Today, the Norwegian Academy of Music is one of the leading institutions of its kind in Europe and operates according to principles that

– despite some differences in detail and some peculiarities shaped by country-specific cultural traditions and legal framework conditions – differ only slightly from other institutions all across Europe and beyond. These shared principles include the persistence of the master-apprentice model, which puts higher arts education in a unique position compared to university studies and other higher education programmes. The fact that performing arts studies in particular are organised as one-to-one tuition, at least in the student's main subject, is certainly one of those features that distinguish it from almost all other higher education studies. Another special feature, however, is the close, often personal bond between the student and the teacher/master.

In recent times, this model has been repeatedly questioned. Indeed, some characteristic features of the master-apprentice model appear to have become anachronistic, such as the strong personal dependency of the student on his/her master and the lack of transparency in the structures and interdependencies that can result from this. But also from a didactic point of view, it is questioned whether a master-apprentice learning and teaching setting is actually as efficient as it claims to be. Or, vice versa, it may be asked whether there might not be alternative models that are just as efficient as the master-apprentice model and at the same time maybe even cheaper and less elitist.

There are indeed trends and developments to be observed indicating that the way in which the master-apprentice model is implemented is under change. One of these trends is the opportunity given to students, especially in jazz programmes, to study with different 'masters' who are not necessarily experts in the student's main instrument. But also, the dramatically increased possibilities to access a great variety of teaching offers, master classes, online tutorials and online consultations due to new technologies are changing the role of the master.

In the USA, where school-like and instruction-oriented teaching, as well as learning music in huge ensembles, are traditionally more common than in Europe, criticism of the master-apprentice model is mainly challenging the content of study programmes and the design of curricula, which are considered to be not sufficiently diverse and inclusive (cf. Elliott, 1995, Campbell et al., 2016). In Europe, the main focus of criticism of the master-apprentice model is that it seems to contradict the paradigm of self-determined, student-centred learning (cf. ENQA, 2015; Nerland, 2019). The two partially identical, but also partially different discourses on both

sides of the Atlantic have the potential to complement each other and thus contribute in a productive and constructive way to a renewed further development of the master-apprentice model, which has always been adaptable and capable of survival. However, there is little evidence that this model is about to disappear.

References

Alpers, S. (1988). *Rembrandt's enterprise: The studio and the market.* University of Chicago Press.

Amato, E. (2012). *I Quattro Antichi Conservatori di Napoli.* https://www.academia.edu/38925360/I_Quattro_Antichi_Conservatori_di_Napoli

Bartlett, R. C., & Collins, S. D. (Trans. & Eds.). (2012). *Aristotle's Nicomachean ethics.* University of Chicago Press.

Bongrain, A.-M., & Gérard, Y. (Eds.). (1996). *Le Conservatoire de Paris: Des Menus-Plaisirs à la Cité de la musique (1795–1995)*. Buchet-Chastel.

Brenner, D. (2012). Die Trierer Arbeitsstelle für Künstlersozialgeschichte (TAK): Eine Projektvorstellung. *Kunsttexte, 2012*(3). https://doi.org/10.48633/ksttx.2012.3.88133

Calvert, I. W. (2014). *Investigating the one-on-one master-apprentice relationship: A case study in traditional craft apprenticeship* [Doctoral dissertation]. Brigham Young University. http://hdl.lib.byu.edu/1877/etd7197

Campbell, P. S., Myers, D., & Sarath, E. (2016). *Transforming music study from its foundations: A manifesto for progressive change in the undergraduate preparation of music majors: Report of the task force on the undergraduate music major*. The College Music Society. https://www.music.org/pdf/pubs/tfumm/TFUMM.pdf

Coy, M. W. (1989). *Apprenticeship: From theory to method and back again*. SUNY Press.

De Munck, B., Kaplan, S. L., & Soly, H. (Eds.). (2007). *Learning on the shop floor: Historical perspectives on apprenticeship*. Berghahn Books.

Ebert, T. (1976). Praxis und Poiesis: Zu einer handlungstheoretischen Unterscheidung des Aristoteles. *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung, 30*(1), 12–30.

Ehrenforth, K. H. (2005). *Geschichte der musikalischen Bildung: Eine Kultur-, Sozial- und Ideengeschichte in 40 Stationen: Von den antiken Hochkulturen bis zur Gegenwart.* Schott.

Elliott, D. J. (1995). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education*. Oxford University Press.

ENQA. (2015). *Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European higher education area (ESG): Approved by the Ministerial Conference in May 2015*. https://ehea.info/media.ehea.info/file/2015_Yerevan/72/7/European_Standards_and_Guidelines_for_Quality_Assurance_in_the_EHEA_2015_MC_613727.pdf

Førisdal, A. (2022). Kontinuiteter i spill: Om habitusdannelse og institusjonelle baner ved Musik-Konservatoriets elevkonserter. *Studia Musicologica Norvegica, 48*(1), 41–56. https://doi.org/10.18261/smn.48.1.5

Gies, S. (2011). Kann denn Werkeln Sünde sein? Über das Bildende des Klassenmusizierens. *Diskussion Musikpädagogik, S3*, 98–103.

Gies, S. (2019). How music performance education became academic: On the history of music higher education in Europe. In S. Gies & J. H. Sætre (Eds.), *Becoming musicians: Student involvement and teacher collaboration in higher music education* (pp. 31–52). Norges musikkhøgskole. https://hdl.handle.net/11250/2826985

Gream, M. (2000). The production of art during the Florentine Renaissance. http://matthewgream.net/Professional/HistoryOfArt/workshops_1.pdf

Hauser, A. (1953). *Sozialgeschichte der Kunst und Literatur*. C. H. Beck.

Heinemann, M. (2005). Tradition & Effizienz: Zur Geschichte des Dresdner Musikhochschule 1856 bis 1914. In Gervink, M. (Ed.), *Hochschule für Musik Carl Maria von Weber: 1856–2006* (pp. 7–36). Michel Sandstein Verlag.

Karlsson, H. (2000). *Vad vet vi om Kungl. Musikaliska akademiens historia? Bakgrund till ett forskningsprojekt.* Kungliga Musikaliska akademien.

Lave, J. (2011). *Apprenticeship in critical ethnographic practice*. University of Chicago Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Lindeman, P. (1889–1901). *Oversikt over lærere, elever, m.m.* Musikkonservatoriet i Oslo (RA/PA-1761/F/Fa/L0001 and L0002). National Archives of Norway, Oslo. https://media.digitalarkivet.no/db/browse?depository%5B%5D=27&archives%5B%5D=no-a1450-01000003154662

Lindeman, T., & Solbu, E. (1976). *Musik-Konservatoriet i Oslo 1883–1973.* Tanum-Norli.

Lindgren, U. (1992). *Die Artes liberales in Antike und Mittelalter: Bildungs- und wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Entwicklungslinien*. Institut für Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften.

Lüdeke, R. (1958). *Zur Geschichte der Privatmusikerziehung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert: Ein Beitrag zur sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung des privaten usikerziehungswesens in Deutschland von der Einführung der Gewerbefreiheit bis 1920* (Vol. 1) [Doctoral dissertation]. Humboldt University of Berlin.

Mahlert, U. (2002). Historische Instrumentalschulen heute: Einige Beobachtungen und Anregungen. *Üben & Musizieren, 2002*(3), 28–36.

Massingham, P. (2019). An Aristotelian interpretation of practical wisdom: The case of retirees. *Palgrave Communications, 5*, Article 123. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0331-9

Navon, J. (2020). The Leipzig Conservatory and the production of *Werktreue*. *Journal of Musicology, 37*(1), 63–93. https://doi.org/10.1525/jm.2020.37.1.63

Nerland, M. (2019). Beyond policy: Conceptualising student-centred learning environments in higher (music) education. In S. Gies & J. H. Sætre (Eds.), *Becoming musicians: Student involvement and teacher collaboration in higher music education* (pp. 53–66). Norges musikkhøgskole. https://hdl.handle.net/11250/2827028

Niemöller, K. W. (1993). Accademia musicale – musikalische Akademie: Zum Wandel einer italienischen Institution im nördlichen Europa bis um 1800. In W. Frobenius, N. Schwindt-Gross & T. Sick (Eds.), *Akademie und Musik: Erscheinungsweisen und Wirkungen des Akademiegedankens in Kultur- und Musikgeschichte: Institutionen, Veranstaltungen, Schriften – Festschrift für Werner Braun zum 65. Geburtstag* (pp. 89–106). Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag.

Perkins, R. (2013). Learning cultures and the conservatoire: An ethnographically-informed case study. *Music Education Research, 15*(2), 196–213. https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2012.759551

Pierre, C. (1900). *Le Conservatoire national de Musique et de Déclamation: Documents historiques et administratifs.* Imprimerie nationale.

Prinz, M. (1995). Der Orchestermusiker im historischen Kontext. *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music, 26*(1), 61–76.

Rexroth, F. (2005). Armenhäuser – eine neue Institution der sozialen Fürsorge im späten Mittelalter. In M. Matheus (Ed.), *Funktions- und Strukturwandel mittelalterlicher Hospitäler im europäischen Vergleich* (pp. 1–14). Franz Steiner Verlag.

Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship. In J. V. Wertsch, P. del Rio & A. Alvarez (Eds.), *Learning in doing: Social, cognitive and computational perspectives* (pp. 139–164). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139174299.008

Roske, M. (1985). *Sozialgeschichte des privaten Musiklehrers vom 17. zum 19. Jahrhundert.* Schott.

Salmen, W. (1997). *Beruf: Musiker, verachtet, vergöttert, vermarktet: Eine Sozialgeschichte in Bildern.* Metzler.

Sennett, R. (2008). *The Craftsman*. Yale University Press.

Sowa, G. (1973). *Anfänge institutioneller Musikerziehung in Deutschland (1800–1945)*. Gustav Bosse Verlag.

Stilz, B. (1995). Von Stadtpeiffern und Hoboisten: Holzbläser als Berufsmusiker in der frühen Neuzeit. *Das 'rohrblatt, 10*(1, 3), 3–7, 101–106.

Utne-Reitan, B. (2022). *Harmony in conservatoire education: A study in the history of music theory education in Norway* [Doctoral dissertation]. Norwegian Academy of Music. https://hdl.handle.net/11250/3031991

Walin, S. (1945). *Kungl. Svenska musikaliska akademien: Förhistoria, första stadgar och instiftande: En studie i det musikaliska bildningsväsendets historia i Sverige.* A.-B. Lundequistska bokhandeln.

Wasserloos, Y. (2004a). *Das Leipziger Konservatorium der Musik im 19. Jahrhundert: Anziehungs- und Ausstrahlungskraft eines musikpädagogischen Modells auf das internationale Musikleben.* Olms.

Wasserloos, Y. (2004b). *Kulturgezeiten. Niels W. Gade und C.F.E. Hornemann in Leipzig und Kopenhagen.* Olms.

Öhrström, E. (2000). Akademien och musikundervisningen 1771–1971. In M. Wisén (Ed.), *Bidrag till Kungl. Musikaliska akademiens historia. Vol. 3: Förstudier och problemfält* (pp. 61–72). Kungliga Musikaliska akademien.