Bulletin of the *Transilvania* University of Braşov
Series VIII: Performing Arts • Vol. 18(67) No. 2 – 2025
https://doi.org/10.31926/but.pa.2025.18.67.2.13

From Pianoforte to AI-driven Performance: Reinventing the Piano through Technology

Ligia-Claudia ŞUTEU[1]

Abstract: *The piano, since its invention by Bartolomeo Cristofori at the turn of the eighteenth century, has epitomized the intersection between musical artistry and technological innovation. From the early pianoforte, which radically expanded expressive possibilities beyond the harpsichord, through the industrial standardization of the nineteenth century and the electrification of the twentieth, the instrument has persistently mirrored broader socio-technological transformations. In the digital era, the piano has undergone unprecedented reconfigurations, becoming simultaneously a pedagogical tool, a compositional interface, and a platform for experimentation at the frontier of artificial intelligence. This paper traces the historical continuum of the piano, examining its evolution from mechanical craftsmanship to virtual simulation, with particular attention to the role of ICT in reshaping performance practices, educational paradigms, and modes of cultural dissemination. By situating AI-driven performance within this continuum, the study interrogates both the democratizing potential and the ethical challenges posed by algorithmic creativity. Ultimately, the piano emerges not merely as an instrument, but as a dynamic cultural artifact whose identity is continually reinvented at the nexus of tradition and technological modernity.*

Key-words: *Neuroplasticity, Piano performance, cognitive enhancement*

1. Introduction: Continuities of Innovation in Piano History

The history of the piano has always been entangled with broader technological and cultural transformations. When Bartolomeo Cristofori developed his early models around 1700, he was not merely crafting a new instrument but opening a paradigm in which mechanical design enabled new expressive affordances. This was a radical departure from the harpsichord and clavichord, whose sonic limitations confined performers to restricted dynamic and timbral palettes (Giordano, 2016).

[1] *Transilvania* University of Braşov, **claudiasuteu@yahoo.com**

Across more than three centuries, the piano has consistently mirrored the dominant technological spirit of its age. During the nineteenth century, industrial mass production redefined the instrument's availability and uniformity, transforming it into both a bourgeois domestic symbol and a concert-hall powerhouse (Loesser, 1990). In the twentieth century, the electrification of sound production and the advent of recording media expanded the piano's cultural resonance while dislocating its identity from physical presence to mediated reproduction (Durkin, 2024).

In the digital era, the instrument has transcended material constraints: software-based pianos, MIDI interfaces, and ICT-mediated pedagogy have turned the piano into a compositional and educational platform. Most recently, advances in machine learning have enabled "AI pianists" capable of style imitation, expressive rendering, and even real-time improvisation (Huang, Guo, & Zhang, 2024). These transformations raise profound questions about the meaning of performance, authorship, and creativity (Miranda, 2015).

The central aim of this article is to situate AI-driven performance within this longue durée history. Rather than presenting the digital and AI turn as a rupture, we argue for continuity: the piano has always been reinvented through technological mediation. This study therefore places algorithmic creativity in dialogue with centuries of mechanical, industrial, and digital reconfiguration, analyzing how each epoch reshaped performance practice, pedagogy, and cultural dissemination.

Beyond its mechanical evolution, the piano's cultural trajectory has been shaped by the social functions it served in different eras. In nineteenth-century Europe, the instrument became a domestic emblem of refinement, particularly within the emerging bourgeois class, reinforcing music's role in shaping social identity (Loesser, 1990; DeNora, 2000). This dual status—both household commodity and concert-hall powerhouse—helped standardize technique and repertoire, paving the way for the formation of a global canon that still dominates pedagogy today.

Equally significant is the historical dialogue between technological advances and expressive ideals. From the early hammer-action experiments that enabled dynamic nuance (Cole, 1998; Giordano, 2016) to mid-twentieth-century player-piano rolls and amplified keyboards that mediated touch (Durkin, 2024), each innovation reshaped not only how the piano sounded but also how audiences conceived of authenticity and virtuosity. This recurring interplay underscores that technical progress in piano making has consistently acted as a catalyst for both aesthetic innovation and shifts in performance practice.

2. From Mechanical Craftsmanship to Industrial Power

Cristofori's invention is widely acknowledged as the decisive moment when the keyboard transcended the expressive limits of its predecessors (Pollens, 1995). The harpsichord's plucked mechanism produced brilliance but lacked dynamic variability; the clavichord allowed subtle dynamic shading but at the cost of extremely limited volume. Cristofori's hammer action, by contrast, introduced a continuum of dynamics—from pianissimo to fortissimo—under the direct control of the performer's touch (Giordano, 2016).

This shift embodied Enlightenment ideals of individual expression. The fortepiano allowed performers to translate personal emotion into sonic gradation, thereby aligning musical practice with contemporary philosophical discourses on subjectivity (Cole, 1998). Instrument builders across Europe quickly modified and expanded Cristofori's design, experimenting with escapement mechanisms, check systems, and hammer coverings. Each of these refinements deepened the link between mechanical design and expressive capacity.

The eighteenth-century piano thus represented more than a technical novelty: it inaugurated a new ontology of performance. Expression became inscribed in the mechanism itself, rather than being an external ornamentation imposed on a fixed sound. This conceptual shift explains why the fortepiano so rapidly displaced the harpsichord as the preferred instrument for composers such as Mozart and Beethoven, who exploited its capacity for sudden dynamic contrasts, cantabile lines, and orchestral textures (Rosen, 1995).

From the outset, therefore, the piano embodied the dialectic between artistry and technology: a machine designed to translate physical gesture into expressive sound. This dialectic remains operative today, even as the "machine" now includes software algorithms and AI models.

The nineteenth century brought the piano into the age of industrial modernity. Iron frames, overstringing, and standardized keyboard dimensions transformed the instrument into a robust, powerful, and uniform product. Firms such as Steinway, Bechstein, and Érard perfected techniques that ensured consistency across instruments, allowing pianists to expect reliable touch and sound projection regardless of venue (Loesser, 1990).

This industrialization had at least three major consequences. First, it enabled the piano to dominate the concert stage. With greater volume and stability, pianists such as Liszt could perform in large halls, where the instrument's sound carried over orchestras and captivated mass audiences (Walker, 1987). The piano thus became central to the emerging culture of public virtuosity.

Second, industrial production democratized ownership. The piano became a fixture in middle-class households, where it functioned as both a musical instrument and a symbol of cultural refinement. Scholars of cultural history note that by 1900, owning a piano was as much a marker of bourgeois respectability as possessing bookshelves (DeNora, 2000). This domestic ubiquity had profound pedagogical implications: millions of children, particularly young women, learned piano as part of their social education.

Third, industrial standardization fostered a global culture of piano pedagogy and repertoire. Conservatories across Europe and the Americas could now train pianists on instruments of comparable design, reinforcing a canon of repertoire from Bach to Chopin and Brahms. This canonization was inseparable from the piano's technological stability: composers could assume consistent responses from the instrument, while teachers could codify technique around standardized key dip, escapement, and touch.

In this way, the industrial piano functioned simultaneously as a tool of mass education, a concert instrument of unprecedented power, and a cultural symbol of social mobility. Technology, once again, was not peripheral but central to shaping the meaning of pianism.

3. Electrification and the Mediation of Touch

The dawn of the twentieth century opened a distinct technological horizon. The player piano, already popular at the turn of the century, mechanized the reproduction of performances via perforated rolls. Later, the advent of electrical amplification and recording further displaced the centrality of live presence. For the first time, piano performance could be stored, disseminated, and consumed without the pianist's physical presence (Durkin, 2024).

Electro-acoustic instruments such as the Rhodes and Wurlitzer expanded the piano's sonic palette. By using tines or reeds with pickups, they introduced timbres that were warmer, more percussive, and often more suitable for jazz, rock, and funk idioms (Pfeifle, 2017). These instruments did not merely add new sounds; they generated new performance practices, idioms, and repertoires. For example, the Rhodes became inseparable from the sound of 1970s jazz fusion.

Meanwhile, recording and broadcasting technologies reshaped listening habits. Audiences could now experience piano performance through gramophone records, radio broadcasts, and later television, decoupling musical experience from the concert hall. This shift also transformed pedagogy: students could learn by imitating recorded interpretations, thereby fostering a new culture of standardized models of performance (Cook, 1998).

By the mid-twentieth century, therefore, the piano existed simultaneously as an acoustic instrument, an electro-acoustic innovation, and a recorded medium. Each modality altered not only sound but also the cultural meaning of performance. The pianist became both an interpreter on stage and a producer of reproducible media.

The electrification of the piano also redefined the tactile experience of playing. Unlike the purely mechanical response of the acoustic piano, electro-acoustic models introduced subtler variations in touch and altered the feedback loop between the performer's gesture and the instrument's sonic output. Musicians often described the Rhodes as "spongier" and more elastic compared to the resistance of traditional hammers, requiring adjustments in technique and inspiring distinct approaches to phrasing and articulation. This shift illustrates how changes in material design can shape the very gestures of performance, not merely the resulting timbre (Cole, 1998).

The widespread adoption of microphones and amplification systems likewise affected concert culture. Smaller ensembles and solo performers could fill large venues without the need for the massive projection of grand pianos, which in turn enabled more intimate styles of playing even in spacious halls. Amplification also encouraged experimentation with effects such as reverb, tremolo, and chorus, which became integral to popular genres. As a result, the pianist's artistic decisions increasingly included sound-engineering choices that blurred the boundaries between instrumentalist and producer (Loesser, 1990).

Another significant outcome of recording technologies was the emergence of the "recorded canon." For the first time, interpretations could be archived, compared, and disseminated globally, establishing a set of reference performances that shaped audience expectations and pedagogical norms. This phenomenon shifted the emphasis from the ephemeral uniqueness of live concerts to the reproducibility and repeatability of iconic recordings. While it democratized access to celebrated performances, it also risked promoting an ideal of technical perfection over spontaneity and interpretive diversity (Bontempi, 2023; Widmer and Goebl, 2004).

Radio and television broadcasts further transformed the cultural reach of the piano. Concerts could now enter domestic spaces, turning renowned pianists into international celebrities and changing the economics of performance careers. The notion of a geographically confined audience gave way to a mass listening public, profoundly influencing repertoire selection and performance. In response, pianists adapted their stage presence and programming to appeal to both live audiences and unseen listeners mediated by microphones and cameras (Walker, 1987).

Finally, these technological advances generated a new discourse on authenticity. Critics debated whether mechanically reproduced performances could capture the "aura" of live interpretation, and whether amplified or electro-acoustic pianos could legitimately represent classical works. This tension foreshadowed current debates about AI-generated performances: both raise questions about the role of physical gesture, human presence, and the listener's perception of immediacy. The mid-century fusion of acoustics, electricity, and media thus stands as a pivotal stage in the ongoing negotiation between innovation and tradition in pianistic art (Miranda, 2015; Cancino-Chacón et al., 2018).

4. Digital reconfiguration and the advent of AI-Driven performance

The late-twentieth-century digital turn marked yet another shift, transforming the piano from a purely acoustic instrument into a hybrid interface that bridged traditional craftsmanship with computational design. Digital pianos and MIDI controllers simulated acoustic timbres while also serving as interfaces for composition and production. The instrument now functioned as a hybrid: part piano, part computer (Downie, 2003).

In pedagogy, digital pianos offered advantages of affordability, portability, and headphone practice. More importantly, ICT enabled interactive tutorials, distance learning, and data-driven feedback systems. Research during the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated that platforms integrating audio-visual capture, computer-controlled pianos, and telematic systems (e.g., Yamaha Disklavier) facilitated continuity of instruction despite physical distance (Nusseck, 2025).

Studies further suggest that self-recording, replay, and automated feedback improve rhythmic precision, dynamic control, and student motivation (Lappe et al., 2018). At the same time, challenges persist: latency issues compromise synchronous online performance, and disparities in access to technology raise concerns about equity in music education (Tomita and Shoda, 1996). Crucially, the digital turn transformed the piano into a *data source*. Through MIDI capture, every nuance of timing, dynamics, and pedaling could be recorded and analyzed. This opened the door to computational models of expressive performance, a field that would later merge with AI-driven generativity (Widmer and Goebl, 2004; Cancino-Chacón et al., 2018).

Early computational models sought to formalize the principles of expressive performance. Rule-based systems proposed functions linking score structure to tempo and dynamics, aiming to capture stylistic tendencies observed in human performances (Todd, 1992). With the advent of machine learning, researchers

began to infer expressive micro-timing and dynamics directly from performance data, yielding models capable of generating human-like interpretations (Widmer and Goebl, 2004).

Recent reviews highlight both achievements and limitations. While models successfully predict expressive nuances at the phrase level, they often fall short in capturing individuality, spontaneity, and the embodied aspects of performance (Cancino-Chacón et al., 2018). This tension underscores a deeper question: can expression be fully reduced to computable parameters, or does it remain irreducibly tied to human embodiment (Santisteban et al., 2024)?

Neuroscientific studies reinforce the centrality of embodiment. Experiments with novice and expert pianists reveal that predictive motor control, auditory–motor coupling, and touch differentiation (pressed vs. struck keys) are fundamental to expression (Lappe et al., 2018; Jones et al., 2023). Such findings complicate purely computational accounts, suggesting that any adequate model of expressive performance must integrate both data-driven inference and embodied motor science.

AI has recently advanced from analyzing human performance to *generating* it. Current systems can render expressive performances from symbolic scores, emulate styles of particular pianists, or improvise in real time alongside humans (Huang, Guo, and Zhang, 2024). Industry-led initiatives, such as Yamaha's AI rendering technologies, emphasize naturalness and emotional plausibility, while academic research explores style transfer through diffusion models and deep learning (Huang et al., 2024).

This raises complex questions. To what extent can algorithmic processes be considered creative? Some scholars argue that AI recombines patterns from training data without genuine novelty, while others suggest that co-creative systems expand human potential by offering new materials and perspectives (Miranda, 2015). Human–AI interaction studies indicate that user control and transparency are crucial. When performers can steer expressive parameters, they experience the AI not as a replacement but as a partner. Conversely, opaque systems risk alienating musicians, who perceive outputs as imposed rather than co-authored (Bontempi, 2023). Thus, AI-driven pianism is less about replacing performers than about redefining roles: from interpreter to co-creator, from executor to curator of algorithmic possibilities.

5. Pedagogical Transformations and Ethical Horizons

AI and ICT infrastructures are increasingly integrated into piano education. Computer-controlled instruments allow teachers to capture high-resolution data

on student performances, replay them on identical instruments, and provide feedback grounded in objective measures (Nusseck, 2025).

Studies demonstrate that structured self-recording and playback can improve phrasing, rhythm, and expressive nuance (Jones et al., 2023). Moreover, gamified AI tutors and interactive "smart scores" enhance motivation and engagement for beginners (Santisteban et al., 2024).

However, challenges remain. Not all students have equal access to high-quality digital pianos or stable internet connections. Moreover, overreliance on automated assessment risks narrowing musicality to quantifiable parameters, neglecting the interpretive and aesthetic dimensions that remain central to pianism (Tomita and Shoda, 1996).

Pedagogical integration must therefore be cautious: AI can augment but not replace the nuanced mentorship of human teachers.

Three major issues define the ethical horizon of AI-mediated piano performance:

1. Authorship and Attribution. If expressive outputs are generated by models trained on human performances, to whom does the creative credit belong? Questions of copyright and authorship remain unresolved, especially as training datasets often include performances by identifiable artists (Miranda, 2015).
2. Aesthetic Homogenization. Models trained on canonized repertoires risk producing "average" expressions, thereby erasing individuality. Scholars warn that unless datasets are diversified and models expose parameters to user control, AI could standardize aesthetic outcomes (Cancino-Chacón et al., 2018).
3. Equity of Access. While digital pianos and AI tutors democratize access in some contexts, they exacerbate inequalities where resources are scarce. Studies in music education reveal persistent disparities in digital readiness across socioeconomic backgrounds (Nusseck, 2025).

These issues demand critical reflection: without careful design and governance, AI risks undermining precisely the diversity and individuality that constitute the essence of musical performance.

The advent of intelligent pedagogical tools inevitably redefines the relationship between teacher and student. As algorithmic systems begin to handle repetitive exercises and provide instantaneous visual analytics, the traditional authority of the teacher shifts toward that of a mentor who guides interpretation, context, and artistic intention. This redistribution of roles requires rethinking curriculum design: rather than focusing on mechanical accuracy alone, educators must emphasize decision-making, historical awareness, and stylistic versatility to ensure that students cultivate an authentic artistic voice in tandem with technological proficiency.

Another crucial dimension concerns the cognitive and psychological development of young learners exposed to AI companions from their earliest stages of training. Continuous interaction with predictive algorithms can foster habits of external validation—measured by numeric feedback or automated praise—that may unintentionally reduce intrinsic motivation and diminish resilience in the face of artistic challenges. Addressing these issues will demand research-informed strategies that integrate reflective practice, peer collaboration, and opportunities for improvisation, balancing the precision of algorithmic assessment with the unpredictability that fuels creativity.

The cultural ramifications of widespread AI-assisted instruction also merit sustained attention. If curricula increasingly draw on digital platforms optimized for Western classical repertoires, there is a risk of sidelining local traditions, experimental idioms, and historically underrepresented composers. Ensuring a pluralistic musical landscape will depend on diversifying both the content available to learners and the stylistic parameters embedded in algorithmic models. Such inclusivity not only broadens students' artistic horizons but also safeguards intangible cultural heritage in an era of rapid technological convergence.

Sustainability represents an often overlooked yet vital concern in this transformation. Frequent software updates, hardware replacement cycles, and the energy demands of cloud-based computation carry economic and environmental costs that educational institutions must weigh against the benefits of technological advancement. Policymakers and cultural organizations will need to prioritize investment in durable, modular devices and low-energy infrastructure while encouraging open-source solutions that reduce long-term expenses and minimize electronic waste.

Finally, the future of piano education in a technology-rich environment depends on sustained dialogue among musicians, engineers, ethicists, and policymakers. Establishing standards for data governance, privacy, algorithmic transparency, and equitable access is not merely a technical necessity but a cultural imperative. By framing these innovations as instruments that expand rather than constrain artistic possibilities, the global piano community can shape an educational ecosystem that honors diversity, nurtures creativity, and upholds the humanistic values at the core of musical practice.

6. Conclusion

The trajectory of the piano demonstrates that technological innovation has never been external to musical practice but rather constitutive of its very identity. From

Cristofori's hammer mechanism—an ingenious fusion of craftsmanship and acoustical insight—to the industrial standardization that enabled global pedagogy, each technological shift has redefined the boundaries of pianistic expression. Electrification and the rise of recording further decoupled performance from its traditional spatial and temporal contexts, introducing new listening practices that transformed the cultural economy of music.

This long historical arc reveals that the digital and AI-driven transformations of the twenty-first century are not a radical rupture but the latest phase in a continuous negotiation between mechanical mediation and artistic agency. Such a perspective helps to dispel the notion that algorithmic performance threatens the "authenticity" of the piano: authenticity itself has always been technologically mediated. Understanding this continuity encourages both scholars and practitioners to view AI not as an intrusion but as a partner in the ongoing redefinition of pianism.

Equally significant are the pedagogical and ethical stakes of these innovations. Digital platforms have already altered the ways in which students acquire technical skills, providing unprecedented access to self-assessment tools, telematic instruction, and large-scale data analytics. Yet these advances also risk exacerbating inequities, narrowing aesthetic diversity, and commodifying expressive nuance. Future research and policy must therefore aim to ensure equitable access to high-quality digital resources and preserve the interpretive freedom that has historically characterized pianistic art.

Looking ahead, the convergence of neuroscience, human–computer interaction, and AI-driven generativity suggests that the piano's future lies in hybrid ecologies of creativity. Rather than asking whether machines can rival human performers, the more urgent question becomes how these systems can be designed to enrich, rather than homogenize, the expressive palette of pianists. Cultivating transparency, user agency, and cultural diversity in algorithmic design will be pivotal in sustaining the piano's relevance as both an instrument of individual expression and a shared cultural medium.

In sum, the piano stands today not merely as a historical artifact but as a living laboratory of human–technological co-evolution. Its three-century journey underscores that artistic traditions survive not by resisting technological change but by assimilating and redirecting it toward new forms of meaning. The challenge for twenty-first-century pianists, educators, and technologists is to guide this next chapter of reinvention with critical awareness and a commitment to inclusivity, ensuring that the piano continues to serve as a dynamic bridge between heritage and innovation.

References

Bontempi, Paolo. 2023. "Research in computational expressive music performance: A systematic review." *Informatics* 10(2): 15. https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics10020015

Cancino-Chacón, Carlos Eduardo, Maarten Grachten, Werner Goebl, and Gerhard Widmer. 2018. "Computational models of expressive music performance: A comprehensive and critical review." *Frontiers in Digital Humanities* 5: 25. https://doi.org/10.3389/fdigh.2018.00025

Cole, Michael. 1998. *The Pianoforte in the Classical Era.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

DeNora, Tia. 2000. *Music in Everyday Life.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Durkin, Rachael. 2024. "Phantom Hands Will Live Forever: Reading the Player Piano Anew". *Journal of Musicological Research* 43(2-3): 222-238.

Giordano, Nicholas. 2016. "The invention and evolution of the piano." *Acoustics Today* 12(4): 26–34. https://doi.org/10.1121/AT.2016.12.4.26

Hong Huang, Junfeng Man, Luyao Li, Rongke Zeng. 2024. "Musical timbre style transfer with diffusion model." *PeerJ Computer Science* 10, e2194. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.2194

Jones, Gabriel and Anders Friberg. 2023. "Probing the underlying principles of dynamics in piano performance using a modelling approach." *Frontiers in Psychology* 14, 1269715. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1269715

Lappe, Claudia, Markus Lappe, and Peter Keller. 2018. "Predictive motor control in piano timing and sequencing." *PLOS One* 13(11), e0207462. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0207462

Loesser, Arthur. 1990. *Men, Women and Pianos: A Social History.* Dover Publications.

Miranda, Eduardo Reck. 2015. "Artificial intelligence in organised sound." *Organised Sound* 20(1): 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355771815000021

Nusseck, Manfred, Friedericke Wild, Christoph Sischka, and Claudia Spahn. 2025. "Effects of audio feedback interventions with the Disklavier on piano students." *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 16 https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1568021

Pfeifle, Florian. 2017. "Real-time physical model of Wurlitzer and Rhodes electric pianos." In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Digital Audio Effects (DAFx-17, 5-9 September),* 17-24. Edinburgh.

Pollens, Stewart. 1995. *The Early Pianoforte.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosen, Charles. 1995. *The Romantic Generation.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Santisteban, Iñaki Eduardo, et al. 2024. "Analysis of motor behavior in piano performance." *Frontiers in Psychology* 15: 1433441. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1433441

Tomita, Yoshie, and Shoda, Hideo. 1996. "New technology and piano study in higher education: Getting the most out of computer-controlled player pianos." *British Journal of Music Education* 13(3): 233–246. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051700003135

Walker, Alan. 1987. *Franz Liszt: The Virtuoso Years.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Widmer, Gerhard and Werner Goebl. 2004. "Computational models of expressive music performance: The state of the art." *Journal of New Music Research* 33(3): 203–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/0929821042000317804