Roundtable: Performance as a Master Narrative in Music History

DANIEL BAROLSKY, SARA GROSS CEBALLOS, REBECCA PLACK,
AND STEVEN M. WHITING

The Editors

For a Roundtable in this issue the Editors invited musicologists from various institutions to engage in an e-mail conversation with Daniel Barolsky over the summer of 2012 to discuss the how music historians engage students with issues of performance in their classes. As Barolsky states in his opening essay "The music in our existing histories is restricted to past compositions, as mere museum artifacts. Yet the identities of the wonderful performers who brought these pieces to life (and many of whom we can still see and hear today!) are relegated to the liner notes, their presence and interpretive contribution repressed and ignored." Are there ways we can enrich, transform, or adapt our teaching to focus more on a history of performance? Would such a change be more meaningful to our students, most of whom see themselves as young performers, rather than as young composers? What new questions, discussions, and course assignments would arise from such changes?

The Editors invited musicologists who teach at a variety of schools (small liberal arts college, conservatories of various sizes and locations, and large state schools) to discuss the issue of teaching about music performance in music history courses and to share their thoughts and experiences about their work in this area. Daniel Barolsky began the conversation with an opening essay to which the panel responded by e-mail during the summer of 2012.[1] Among the several threads that develop are questions about the choices for recordings of the score anthologies that accompany textbooks, the differences between teaching a survey for undergraduates and an advanced seminar, and teaching suggestions that address performance more clearly—such as

1. For a model of such a conversation, see Paul N. Edwards, et al., "AHR Conversation: Historical Perspectives on the Circulation of Information," *American History Review* 116, no. 5 (December 2011): 1392–435.

Journal of Music History Pedagogy, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 77–102. ISSN 2155-1099X (online)
© 2012, *Journal of Music History Pedagogy*, licensed under CC BY 3.0
(http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/)

including multiple recordings of the same work. From this dialogue, an essential question arises: What do we teach, and to whom? Are music historians at schools of music and conservatories "beholden" to the performance faculty to teach an essential repertoire? Or are there other ways to investigate and challenge the historical dimensions of music with our students?

Daniel Barolsky (Beloit College)

Music history is inherently a beautiful and contentious discipline where the present and the past intersect. By focusing exclusively on the moments of compositional innovation in our textbooks and classes, we ignore the presentness of music that audiences listened to in the moment: sounds from the past heard, reshaped, and re-interpreted in performance. The music in our existing histories is restricted to past compositions, as mere museum artifacts. Yet the identities of the wonderful performers who brought these pieces to life (and many of whom we can still see and hear today!) are relegated to the liner notes, their presence and interpretive contribution repressed and ignored.

In his *Oxford History of Western Music*, Richard Taruskin (in a different but not unrelated context) tempts us with, but ultimately withdraws a glimpse of a revolutionary new "master narrative" or, at the very least, a transformation to the way we might teach music history:

> Another way of restoring women to music history is to change the nature of the story, giving less emphasis to composition and more to performance, patronage, and other areas in which the contributions of women have been more commensurate with those of men. The present account, with its constant reminders that the literate repertory is not the sole subject of music history and its constant attention to the social contexts in which music has been made, shows the influence of this trend. And yet to the extent that it remains the aim and obligation of a text like this not only to narrate the story of the past musical activities and deeds but also to provide an introduction to the material products—the textual remains—of those activities, the literate repertory must, despite all caveats, retain its privilege and remain the primary focus of the story.[2]

As someone who has taught undergraduate music history classes to both undergraduate music majors and non-majors, at a liberal arts college and at a school of music, I find Taruskin's teasing offering exciting and puzzling. Why are our existing history texts so obligated to this kind of story? Why, after everything that's happened in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, to say nothing of recent developments in the field, must the "textual remains" be

2. Richard Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music*, Vol. 2, *The Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 82.

privileged in these narratives? Why must we continue to reinforce a narrow aesthetic view that ultimately obstructs and limits our view of music in history? At what point does the focus on the "material products" ultimately distort our understanding of music's place in history and, instead, perpetuate and reinforce existing canons, themselves products of modern nineteenth-century aesthetic values, gendered and racial biases, theories, and institutions? To his credit, Taruskin, in his history, probes, problematizes, and polemicizes the centrality of the text (and its emphasis over the act of performance). But that the starting point and focus for this history is almost always the composer and, more often than not, his text, distorts more than it clarifies, thus intensifying the prescriptive rather than descriptive nature of the story. In other words, it reinforces the Romantic celebration of genius and compositional originality in a span of time where, these ideas were either of no great importance or had become vestiges held onto by only few.

That we emphasize a so-called "literate repertory" reflects, ultimately, the limits presented by the transient nature of music and our dependence on permanent objects/texts. There is clearly an awareness of this problem as an obstacle to the study of music history, even before the shift of music history from "musical functions, uses, and styles" to "'great names' and 'masterpieces'."[3] Consider a representative pre-Romantic history, Charles Burney's *A General History of Music* from the late eighteenth century:

> Theorists may be well compared to legislators, whose dominion ends not with their existence, but continues sometimes with increasing reverence, long after their decease. With Practical Musicians and Composers it is very different; the memory of these is of short duration; for however extensive their power, and splendid their reign, their empire, like that of Alexander and other rapid conquerors, acquires no permanence; but as the territories of these were divided among their captains, so the disciples or followers of great musical leaders soon appropriate the revenue and reputation of their masters, so entirely, that, when divided into small portions, they add no great profit or power to the new possessors, who generally retain and enjoy them in obscurity, till seized and appropriated by some new and more powerful conqueror.[4]

It is by no means a coincidence that Burney's claim should come in his chapter "Of the State of Music, from the Invention of Printing till the Middle of the XVIth Century." In other words, he acknowledges the impact of technology on the telling of his history, the limitations of music's ephemerality. Indeed, as his history reaches the less distant past and the fleeting nature of

3. Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 241.

4. Charles Burney, *A General History of Music: From the Earliest Ages to the Present Period* (1789), Vol. 1 (New York: Dover Publications, 1957), 706–77.

sound becomes less an obstacle, Burney's accounts of significant musicians and their legacy include descriptions, accounts, interpretations and histories of performers and performing composers as a central presence to the musical world that he describes alongside the scores and theories. This is to say that the actual mode of historical writing changes as technologies, memories, ethnographies, and experience become more accessible.

One would expect a similar transformation in our histories of the twentieth century, where acoustic traces from the early century permeate our musical experience. Nevertheless, the twentieth century and the emerging popularity, pervasiveness, and prominence of recordings and films, a development comparable to the invention of the printing, not only receive modest or tangential mention in current narratives, but the performers and listeners they give voice to are drowned out by the emphasis on composers' use of this technology.[5] The ultimate irony is this: At the same time that modern conceptions of the musical work and its relationship to a composer's authoritative intentions became more fixed, the influence of new works by living composers became less and less present in every day musical life.[6] As William Weber has demonstrated, a trend noted repeatedly by other scholars, the performance of new works over the nineteenth century (a tendency that has not significantly changed in the recent centuries) declines significantly as the performance of older, canonic works became standard fare.[7] Who has, instead, come to the fore? Performers! Yes, perhaps they reinforce canons by playing much of the same music, but the effect of this repetition is significant. Indeed, it says much more about twentieth-century practices, tastes, and culture than many contemporary developments in composition. Or, at the very least, the predominance of so-called common practice repertoire speaks to the persistent and continued significance of the market as determined reciprocally by performers and audiences. By ignoring performers and insisting on restricting our narratives to composers, are we as historians, in fact, trying to change contemporary practices and silence the influence and contributions of performers? The neglect of these musicians, at the very least, makes us question what the value of music history is . . . . And for whom?

5. See J. Peter Burkholder, Donald Jay Grout, and Claude V. Palisca, *A History of Western Music,* 8th ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 2010), 774; Mark Evan Bonds, *A History of Music in Western Culture,* 3rd ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2010), 495-496 and 507-9; and Craig Wright and Bryan Simms, *Music in Western Civilization* (Boston: Schirmer Cengage Learning, 2010), 745–48.

6. Additionally, recent studies on the relationship between performance and analysis have further blurred the line between performance and composition in the first place. See, for instance, Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, "Compositions, Scores, Performances, Meanings," *Music Theory Online*, 18.1 (2012).

7. See William Weber, *The Great Transformation of Musical Taste: Concert Programming from Haydn to Brahms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

In short, why do histories of music ignore the impact of figures like Glenn Gould, Enrico Caruso, Maria Callas, Wilhelm Furtwängler, Arturo Toscanini, Marion Anderson, Yo-Yo Ma, Roger Norrington, or David Tutor, just to name a few. Not only are most of these figures perhaps better known than many if not most of the twentieth-century composers whose names grace our time-lines as well as models for many of us and our students, but the influence of these individuals goes beyond narrow histories of musical style (however interesting they may be). Indeed, they should not be included as mere token figures to further inflate the already massive museum of musicians discussed.

What better way to address the tension between music and politics or the complicated connections between aesthetics and nationalism than to look at the reception of Furtwängler's performances of Beethoven and Wagner in wartime Germany (See István Szabó's movie, *Taking Sides*), especially in juxtaposition with Toscanini and Pablo Casals' celebrated rejection of fascism? Or imagine what a study of Callas and the so-called "fetishization" of performers would reveal about the cultural and sexual milieu of the 1950s and 60s as well as the emerging underground culture of pirated recordings that treated ephemeral events as texts (See Terrence McNally's *The Lisbon Traviata*). Our existing histories and their attention to compositional origins, would have us presume that bel canto singing was only significant in the nineteenth century, that the dynamic and interactive audiences described in the context of opera seria died out in the eighteenth-century, or that the performance of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony by Furtwängler in Berlin in 1942 (or by Leonard Bernstein in 1989, also in Berlin) tell us nothing about the meanings of Beethoven's symphony which can only be understood through the lens of the 1820s.

And to what degree do the frenzied popularity of such celebrity performers as Van Cliburn, Vladimir Horowitz, or Glenn Gould bridge the divide between "classical" and popular genres as they became almost cult figures? (See François *Girard's 32 Short Films about Glenn Gould*, or Thomas Bernhard's *The Loser*, or Sylvain Chomet's *The Triplets of Belleville*). Gould, in particular, is a figure whose dynamic performances and deliciously provocative writings and recordings open up a window to conversations about the role of recordings, the problematic underpinning to claims of authenticity, conceptions of the musical work and, perhaps most important and underappreciated, about the way in which Arnold Schoenberg's claim that the evolution of music's history is ultimately an evolution of listening expectations, a claim that Gould's idiosyncratic interpretations embraces.

We have seen exciting changes and revisions to the most popular music history textbooks over the last decades that include new material with increasingly diverse and expanding geographic and cultural repertoires. Yet sadly the

"nature of the story," as Taruskin puts it, remains set in its ways. Additionally, even as recordings become an essential component of our historical texts, the selection of performers neglects an entire history of music that was and is very much alive today: recordings by Boulanger, Berio, Bartók, and Berberian to say nothing of Gould, Furtwängler, or Caruso. Are their performances not part of "the music itself"?

The history of Western Music has in many ways shifted from a descriptive narrative (e. g. Burney . . . although hardly unbiased) to a prescriptive account of musical developments that unreflectively reinforce a teleological or modernist view of musical growth that becomes increasingly blind to the larger changes that have taken place in the twentieth and twenty-first-century to musical experiences and tastes. In particular, by wedding ourselves to an emphasis on composition, we restrict our view of the past. The study of performers and their recordings, by comparison not only opens up windows to the complexity of the last century (imagine a comparison of Norrington and Furtwängler, Gould and Gustav Leonhardt, or Emma Calvé and Susan Graham[8]), but it solves many of the other problems that Taruskin poses.

I recognize that one could easily make a similar claim about the absence or, at the very least, the supplemental treatment of popular musics or practices/traditions that extends beyond Europe and North America. Indeed, as J. Peter Burkholder has written, it is an immense challenge to decide what to include and what constitutes "art music" or "Western music" should that be the intent.[9] However, I would suggest that the focus on composition makes it more difficult to deal with nuance, the complex relationship between notions of high and low art, the exchange between cultures, the impact of technologies, and the role of the audience and markets. It ultimately forces the history of music into a more and more closed story.

Additionally the idea that we consider Taruskin's fleeting suggestion need not mean that we throw the baby out with the bathwater. The composers and their music that we love and adore should not disappear. Rather they could be situated within a broader network of people, places, cultures, aesthetics, and values that ultimately enriches our understanding of their music. Nor does should redirected focus be restricted to the twentieth century. Just as Gould and Schoenberg have suggested that listening expectations and tendencies have evolved over time, so too can our perspective on the distant past. Recent scholarship by Martha Feldman, Elizabeth Le Guin, Roger Feitas, Bruce Holsinger, Dana Gooley, Suzanne Cusick, and others reflects the exciting and illuminating direction music history can take when we think not only about

8. The only composition that is played in two different ways is the fragment by Euripides and a demonstration of varying genera in the Norton edition.

9. J. Peter Burkholder, "Music of the Americas and Historical Narratives," *American Music* 24, no. 1 (Winter 2009), 399–423.

the act of performance but the performers themselves. Giving performers a significant place within the story serves as a counterbalance to existing accounts. If the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries have radically transformed the way we think about music, we would be doing our students a disservice if we neglected to adopt the teaching of music history to these changes.

Sara Gross Ceballos (Lawrence University, Conservatory of Music)

My comments focus on two different ideas.

Part I: On Teaching Pre-Twentieth-Century Performers and Performances

Daniel's call to study historically relevant performers—Gould, Caruso, Callas, Furtwängler, etc.—could do much to help historians more fully represent the musical landscape of the twentieth and twentieth-first centuries. Recording technology makes it less difficult (but by no means easy) to undertake this kind music history. Discussing performers and performances from the nineteenth century and earlier proves more challenging, though no less important. Some performers are known, though many more are unknown. "Records of performances"—written accounts, images, treatises on performance, and scores—are scarce and problematic. Here, I think that educators (and scholars) would do well to allow for historically informed exercises in imaginative re-creation.[10]

In my music history survey classes (and occasionally in upper-levels), I ask my students to use the above "records of performances" to adopt plausible historical performer-personae and discuss assigned works from the perspective of these personae in "letters," "journal entries," and occasionally in scores. They have become courtiers singing Arcadelt madrigals from partbooks, amateur performers of Haydn string quartets, and "improvisers" on Corelli violin sonatas (for this exercise borrowed from Elisabeth Le Guin, I ask them to use rules *The Division Viol* and recordings by Andrew Manze and Monica Huggett to ornament a Corelli slow movement). They have also imagined themselves as historical listeners and compared a "live" performance by Mozart of one of his piano concerti with the score they purchased of the same concerto.

I think that they enjoy this kind of work, I enjoy reading it, and it helps to begin to restore the "present-ness" of music Daniel refers to at the start of his essay. I realize that such exercises move beyond "cold hard facts," but by restoring warm, living bodies to history of music, I think that they do much

10. Samples of Prof. Ceballos's assignments are included as Appendix A.

more than facts ever could. I don't teach the whole survey in this manner, but I hope that these exercises serve as periodic reminders that the "literate repertory" of their textbooks was and is still a living repertory that has never existed in a vacuum.

Part II: On Making Performers Think Critically about the Power of Performance

Bringing performers and performances into our study of music history has the potential to be very meaningful for students hoping to enter into performing careers themselves. Yet, I think that most of my students perceive the act of performance as impartial and objective ("letting the music speak for itself"). They are tuned into listening critically to performances (especially their own), but I think are very much challenged by the project of considering the power that performances have over listeners' interpretation of musical and cultural meaning. They often listen for style, technique, and musical interpretation, but do not often consider the ideologies that may have shaped these performance decisions. At times, some seem to adamantly resist this kind of questioning of performance.

So as much as possible, I try to challenge the perceived neutrality of performance. For example, in an upper-level seminar titled "Music and Colonialism in the Age of Exploration" we focused extensively on the use of music in colonial encounters to examine the political, racial, and religious ideologies that shaped composition, performance, and reception of New- and Old-World repertoires. We also read Geoffrey Baker's remarkable essay on performance practice, "Performance as a Post-Colonial Act?" in which he challenges the "world music"-style of current performance trends in Latin-American repertoire of the colonial age and argues that its multicultural sound obscures the (now) distasteful historical reality of the racial politics of the repertoire.[11]

For the final exam in the class, the students had to propose a lecture-concert of works selected from our class listening list for an imaginary scholarly conference called "Power and Identity in the Age of Exploration." Within the proposal, they were required to describe their choice of repertoire, discuss what performing forces they would use and why, provide a script for a lecture or narrative component to the performance, and describe necessary audio-visual materials or other extramusical resources. Finally they had to justify the above performance choices to the "conference submissions panel " (me). I would love to say that all of my students succeeded brilliantly with the task and really thought critically about how a contemporary performance might shape understanding of the historical past. I was somewhat dismayed that

11. Geoffrey Baker, "Performance as a Post-Colonial Act?" *Early Music* 36, no. 3 (2008): 441–48.

many didn't diverge from the typical ("neutral") concert format and thus didn't really get into the prompt as I imagined they might. However, I will never forget the exams of those students who opened up their eyes to the power of performances and provided fascinating proposals that presented this repertoire in decidedly non-neutral and challenging ways.

As future performers, I think that my students must learn to interrogate performance practice decisions. I'm set to challenge them again this fall with a course on the "History of Early Music Revivals" in which we will examine how (performance practice) and why (ideology) performers of the past (beginning with the Academy of Ancient Music) and present have performed and continue to perform Early Music. For their final exam, they will give a concert instead of just proposing one. I can't wait.

Rebecca Plack (San Francisco Conservatory)

These are fascinating ideas, and I, for one, am looking forward to trying out some of Sara's approaches. Here are some thoughts . . .

I agree with Sara: it can be challenging to discuss performers and performing from the nineteenth century and earlier. Luckily, the little we do know is often eye opening. Consider, for example, how a little knowledge about performers and performance traditions can affect our understanding of what a critical edition is. Students who are used to thinking of musical works as sacrosanct are surprised to learn that the Urtext version of *Le nozze di Figaro* combines arias Mozart wrote in 1786 for the original Susanna, Nancy Storace, with the Act II Finale scoring as he adjusted it to accommodate Adriana Ferrarese del Bene, who sang Susanna in the 1789 revival. In other words, the Urtext score that students are taking to their lessons represents not a monolithic work, but rather the needs of two different performers, diverse productions and centuries of performance traditions. As students absorb information like this, their understanding of so-called canonical works begins to shift.

Questions on the Recorded Anthology

Bringing recordings into the classroom has its own challenges, but as Daniel suggests, recordings should be an essential component of a music history curriculum. To their credit, the editors of the *Norton Anthology of Music* (NAWM) have included Rachmaninoff's own recording of his Prelude in G Minor, suggesting that a recording made by a composer is a worthy source. There are certain problems with this; namely, that

1. composers aren't necessarily the best proponents of their own works (as Robert Philip explains in *Performing Music in the Age of Recording*[12]) and
2. focusing on composer recordings further emphasizes the great composers/great works paradigm.

That said, early performance styles are often foreign to students, who frequently feel defensive when a recording sounds like it's not "true to the composer." So when a recording turns out to have been made by the composer, students are forced to reconsider their reactions. Both Saint-Saëns and Strauss made recordings that are shockingly different from the "literal" readings of notation favored by modernist interpretations. And then there are recordings made by performers who were intimately associated with composers. If you're teaching the Berg *Violin Concerto* anyway (and many of us do, in our survey classes), why not play Louis Krasner's recording? It's live, but the sound is pretty good.

None of these ideas, however, addresses what I perceive to be Daniel's essential call to arms: why do we continue to privilege music's "textual remains" in our classes—especially when this limits our view of music in history? One approach is to create a seminar that changes the narrative, as Sara describes doing in her upper level seminars—and as I hope I do in a graduate seminar called "Opera on Record" where the focus is on performers and performances rather than works. Over the course of the semester, it's exciting to watch the students question their preconceived notions about *Fach*, technique and performance style. As they learn to question the assumptions they (and their teachers) make about how music "should" go, they become more empowered to make their own stylistic decisions, and to become mature performers.

But what about our undergraduate survey courses? So far, the techniques Sara and I have suggested are correctives, but don't overhaul the curriculum.

Daniel, I wasn't entirely sure which you were advocating in your essay. Towards the end, you spoke of not giving up the music we love, not throwing the baby out with the bathwater, but rather (if I understood you correctly) situating works within a broader context. But at the beginning of your essay, it was my sense that you envisioned a curriculum in which the "textual remains" would no longer be the predominant narrative. Is that so? If not, then I'm wondering how what we're discussing is so different from what Taruskin suggests. But if so, then I'm wondering: were you envisioning a re-worked undergraduate survey syllabus? What might that look like, and what might the overarching principle (or principles) of a new curriculum be?

12. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004).

Sara Gross Ceballos

Rebecca, your last paragraph got me thinking about survey, a course I love to teach and teach every term. Yet each term, I find myself dissatisfied with the course and my teaching of it in new and different ways. This discussion has opened up yet more problems and possibilities.

Survey Courses vs. Seminar Courses

I find focusing on issues of performance in seminars is much easier than it is in a music history survey. I have to confess that I very rarely even look to see who the performers are on the NAWM recordings (!) when I teach our fast-paced-all-of-music-history-in-approximately-twenty-weeks music history survey. When I do talk about recordings in the survey, I tend to do so only with early music (seventeenth century and earlier) and twentieth- and twentieth-first-century music. That means that for the repertoire that most music students play and already know coming into the classroom, I don't talk at all about the recordings I'm using at all. There are several exceptions (Robert Levin's Mozart concerti, Tom Beghin's *Sonata Pathétique*, and Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau's Schubert), but they are few and far between. Why is this?

1. Talking about (each) recording I use takes time in an already hectic schedule and can open up to discussions that, while productive in their own right in that they get students thinking about what gets recorded when and how, and what recordings they like and why, are also digressive and even disruptive to the historical narrative I'm trying to present. But then again, why shouldn't we think about and talk about the power of taste in shaping music history?
2. I don't know how and why NAWM performers were chosen. Are they the "best available" (whatever that might mean)? Are they the cheapest to license? Are they particularly interesting? It strikes me that I have a better sense of the editors' thinking about what is and isn't included in the score anthologies, but have no idea about the recording anthologies.
3. I don't know enough about available recordings for much of the repertoire outside my personal and scholarly interests to "sub-out" the NAWM recordings for ones that are offer better teaching opportunities.
4. I need to think about it some more, but my gut feeling is that it isn't always interesting/relevant/important to talk about every recording that I use.

5. I like to think that, following periodic examples demonstrated in class, they can do some of this work themselves (and I know that some do explore multiple performances and recordings, whether because they are players themselves, because they don't want to buy the anthology CDs, or because they are simply aficionados).

Has anyone looked into the thinking behind the recording compilations for NAWM? Has anyone compiled alternate recording collections?

Steven M. Whiting (University of Michigan, School of Music, Theater & Dance)

What Daniel seems to be trying to shed is the notion (inherited from Guido Adler?) that music history is "really" a history of musical style features encoded in and decipherable from the textual remains of the day gone by. Even in English translation, Carl Dahlhaus's argument (in *Grundlagen der Musikgeschichte*[13]) that music exists simultaneously in historical practice and in the aesthetic present goes unheeded. For it to exist in the aesthetic present it must be performed, or its performance must be imagined. The stuff of music history ought to be performances—real, imagined, contextualized.

I teach at a school of music that, since 1929, has been attached to a major research university. The tension (sometimes fruitful, sometimes not) between studio and classroom instruction is an old story. A certain canon has been conserved at this conservatory, from a sense not only of reverence but also of pedagogical responsibility: music students ought to learn what they will be expected to play and teach when they enter the professional lists. History typically furnishes the context for that canon. Musicians being the ornery sorts they are, the very emphasis on the canon prompts many of them (students and teachers) to seek out other repertoires, to cross whatever divides seem to present themselves (classical/popular, high/low, European/American, Western-Eastern, literate/non-literate, etc.), to re-canonize and re-contextualize. This crossing-over is welcome. We don't need Aristotle's reminder that education is a painful process to know how much we can learn when nudged out of our received comfort zones. Fortunately, the larger state universities usually have the resources to promote such crossings-over, which also serve their explicit or implicit mandate to provide comprehensive training.

Daniel quotes Richard Taruskin's caveats about the limitations of the literate repertory, then is disappointed that, for Taruskin, the very need to focus

13. Translated by J. B. Robinson as *Foundations of Music History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

on the aesthetic present (i.e., to "provide an introduction to the material products") prompts him to give the usual pride of place to "the textual remains." Later in the same volume of the *Oxford History*, Taruskin quotes Dahlhaus in a passage apposite to Daniel's concerns: whereas the written text of a musical composition was once "a mere recipe for a performance," it became ca. 1800 a more or less sacred writ "whose meaning is to be deciphered with exegetical interpretations."[14] To read this is to be reminded that a chief goal of teaching history is to teach students to think historically: to reflect that styles and canons and practices and composers and performers and ways of paying for it all come and go.

Students (and their teachers) need the reminder that the intense focus on textual remains that we associate with theoretical analysis may be appropriate to an era when composers began fretting about accurate texts and seemed convinced that their intentions should weigh more heavily than the co-creative contributions of performers. That attitude arose under a certain set of historical contingencies, and exegesis may do some justice to music written by composers who shared those assumptions. Move back a generation (say, to C. P. E. Bach) or move into the twentieth-century avant-garde (say, to Ives and Cowell), and that attitude becomes irrelevant, needs replacement with the recognition that what we are left with is much less than what was once there (and expected to be there). We then need to learn what we can about how a twelfth- or seventeenth-century musical imagination worked to begin to imagine what else needs to be supplied to the recipe, the starting-point, to make it into what contemporaries might have recognized as a whole musical experience. Then we should be delighted that Glenn Gould and Gustav Leonhardt and Jordi Savall have pondered the same issues and given aural testimony to their findings.

Daniel rightly insists on the role of performers in creating (or at least reinforcing) the canon. Certainly no responsible teacher of music history will neglect or downplay the importance of the concert culture that emerged in the latter half of the eighteenth century and increasingly favored repeat performances of works not written by the performers themselves but by dead people. Pity the poor nineteenth-century composer who had to measure up to the bygone "classics" and, at the same time, be "original."

Multiple Performances of the Same Work

Daniel properly suggests how fruitful it could be to compare, say, Furtwängler's performances of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony for Hitler's birthday with Bernstein's celebrations of the razing of the Iron Curtain with

14. Carl Dahlhaus, *Ninteenth-Century Music*, trans. J. B. Robinson (Berkeley and Los Angles: University of California Press, 1989), p. 9, quoted in Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music*, 2:650.

the premiere performance under the tenuous direction of the composer. But for us teachers to do that, students already have to know (or be taught on the fly) a certain amount of history, not to mention an enormous musical composition. Then they can be led to ponder whether there is some Platonic essence of the Ninth that somehow remains the same under three quite different sets of performance circumstances. To teach an entire semester that way, however, begs the question of whether we have not simply substituted one set of limitations for another. And, in an era when the instant replay threatens to eradicate our sense of chronology per se, do we want our next music history to be a series of engaging vignettes? Or do we want to introduce such vignettes strategically, along the way, to show what fruitful inquiries become possible once we have a rudimentary sense of chronological narrative that includes musical practices, composers (once they come into view as such), performers, patrons, and consumers? If this teacher of music history can make palpable to students that music is a proper object of intellectual inquiry, transcending notes played on schedule and sound-files to be swapped, then it's been a good day.

Daniel Barolsky

Thank you so much for your thoughtful responses and for taking the time to read and consider my initial "prompt." As is expected, I feel as though a plethora of new questions have been posed, only so many of which we can begin to address.

Differences between Survey and Seminar

There's one issue that seems to bring all three of the responses together, namely, the place of performance in the teaching of historical and/or chronological surveys. The upper-level classes that Rebecca and Sara described ("Music and Colonialism in the Age of Exploration" and "Opera on Record") are the kinds of courses that give us a greater freedom to do what we want, to focus on the issues we find more personally engaging, relevant, or stimulating. Indeed, when teaching courses on Glenn Gould or the idea of virtuosity, I found it liberating to explore many of the issues of performance that often get ignored or merely touched on during the surveys. But this distinction between a core survey and upper-level courses also seems to create a hierarchy between material or ideas that are deemed essential, foundational, or canonic, and those which are exciting but perhaps more supplemental.

When I was in graduate school, there was a running joke that what we taught undergraduates was ostensibly an oversimplified lie, and it was the role of upper-level classes to dispel these misconceptions. My own teaching of

historical surveys has evolved over the years (or at the very least changed) in reaction to this joke. On one hand, I felt it important for students to be aware of the many prevalent if not powerful narratives that pervade our views of music history, but I also wanted them to be wary of them and to learn how to examine them critically as well. In other words, I find myself constantly teaching and, in a sense, un-teaching. Both my students and I have questioned the significance of this re-telling, thus, reinforcing, in essence, the vitality of the older accounts or, at the very least, perceptions. What's really fundamental?

"Engaging Vignettes"

Steven wrote:

> in an era when the instant replay threatens to eradicate our sense of chronology per se, do we want our next music history to be a series of engaging vignettes? Or do we want to introduce such vignettes strategically, along the way, to show what fruitful inquiries become possible once we have a rudimentary sense of chronological narrative that includes musical practices, composers (once they come into view as such), performers, patrons, and consumers?

I wonder if you could speak about the distinction between a vignette and something more rudimentary or part of the chronology? Could one not suggest that, in a sense, that all of our histories, from Kerman/Tomlinson's appreciative *Listen* to Taruskin's Oxford magnum opus, are already a collection of vignettes of sorts even if many of them are framed as more foundational than others. Indeed, the composers, patrons, and practices that our history texts describe are already selected out of a much richer musical history. And the compositions that are examined are not timeless artifacts but, instead, reflect and tell the story about a particular moment and place in time, vignettes, if you will. To put this another way, is it necessary or even helpful to distinguish between that which is a rudimentary part of the chronology and that which enriches it? Is this a distinction between what might have once been (events/performances/vignettes) vs. that which still is (score)? And how much is this changed in the twentieth century when what was (an event) still remains (a recording)?

In some ways, this leads me to my larger point, one that Rebecca and Sara hinted at when they asked whether we or I want to convert the entire survey to the focus on performance or performers. The simple answer is, "No." I no more want to convert the entire survey any more than I wish to dispense with the textual remains. Rather I would like to see (and have tried in my own teaching) to think more critically about and beyond the centrality of the musical score and its analysis. In the words of Dan Leech-Wilkinson, I want my students to learn to recognize that the score is not the "music itself" but

instead a window into and just a part a more complicated musical world, especially for repertoire before and after (and during) the nineteenth century.[15]

I also recognize that it is difficult to completely revamp our curricula. I would be a hypocrite if I didn't admit that there are elements of my surveys that resemble those of more conventional texts. My students learn (I hope) to hear ritornello form in a Vivaldi concerto, sonata form in Beethoven's Fifth Symphony (aided by Hoffmann's review), the irony in Schumann's setting of Heine, and to recognize the stylistic differences between centuries, composers, and geographical regions. But I also seek to de-centralize the basic chronology (or the implied teleology) and use the subject of each unit as one of many loosely connected mini case studies.

The chronology is there in the broadest sense (so that students know that Bach was born before Brahms and that Stokowski came after Lully), but the linear trajectory is at a minimum. I can, however, imagine the study of performance and performers counter-balancing the emphasis usually given to certain prominent ideas, enriching many of the topics we already teach and, as Rebecca's Mozart example has suggested, sowing seeds for a more critical examination of other subjects.

Teaching Multiple Performances

Steven also commented on my suggestion that we teach the two ninths (Bernstein/Furtwängler) and commented, "But for us teachers to do that, students already have to know (or be taught on the fly) a certain amount of history, not to mention an enormous musical composition." Why is it more difficult to explain the context of these performances than to teach the context of Beethoven's original conception and creation of the work?

A unit on the two performances of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony is a case in point. To include these recorded performances says much if not more about the relationship between music and German nationalism or identity politics than almost any twentieth-century composition to say nothing about modern modes of listening. And given the debates that continue to rage both in academe as well as in the more popular press about the political implications of Furtwängler's performances, the effects of these performances continue to live on. More to the point, they offer a vastly different view on how music can has conveyed meaning, ways that go beyond more conventional analyses of the "work itself" and even suggest that the qualities we often celebrate in the work are, perhaps, not necessarily the elements that signify the most.

15. Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, *The Changing Sound of Music: Approaches to Studying Recorded Musical Performances* (London: CHARM, 2009), Introduction, http://www.charm.kcl.ac.uk/studies/chapters/chap1.html.

A few more examples from my own surveys might demonstrate other ways in which I've found study of performance can expand individual units and entire courses.

Music from 1900-present

I break the semester into fourteen case studies, one per week (more or less). The final week is devoted to Glenn Gould as a representative figure with whom to discuss the role of an influential performer in much the same way that Reich stands in minimalism and Shostakovich allows me to observe the relationship between music and totalitarianism. This unit serves a number of purposes.

First, it indicates that a performer is, in some sense, as equally a valid artistic subject for this class, on par historically with Debussy, Berg, or Berio whom I discuss earlier. Next, Gould's performances, recordings, and writings address the same thematic elements that we have already studied: the evolution of listening (Schoenberg), the naturalness of musical recordings (Cage, Reich), or the notion of authenticity or fidelity to a composer (Busoni or Berio). Consequently, students start to think not of composers and performers but musicians and creators.

Gould's performances of, in particular, Bach and Schoenberg, shed light on the way in which performance can tell and re-tell musical history, as Gould creates his own lineages between composers and/or re-positions their music in a revealing light. Indeed, Gould's performances of Schoenberg and Berg (along with Louis Krasner's Berg *Violin Concerto* conducted by Webern [mentioned by Rebecca] or Schoenberg's recorded performance of *Pierrot Lunaire*[16]) present a kind of Romantic and lyrical freedom and flexibility that challenges a dominant image of the 2nd Viennese school as a movement merely concerned with pitch or notions of absolute music, a conception that's often reinforced by their reputation in Darmstadt after the war.

Finally, many of the questions that come up with Gould (the idea of a musical work, the active role of the listener, etc.) are anticipated and prepared earlier in the survey in a manner similar to that described by Sara and Rebecca: cadenzas in eighteenth-century concerti, Rachmaninoff and Stravinsky's performances of their own works, and Cage, Berio, and Reich's increased interactions and collaborations with performers.

Music before 1800

As mentioned in my initial prompt and as reinforced by your responses, there are any number examples, especially before 1800 when the concept of

16. See, for example, Avoir Byron, "The Test Pressings of Schoenberg Conducting *Pierrot lunaire*: *Sprechstimme* Reconsidered," *Music Theory Online* 12, no. 1 (February 2006); http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.06.12.1/mto.06.12.1.byron.html.

the musical work emerged, where an examination of performance and performers illuminates the musical world in a way that a mere focus on the musical score fails to do. Or, to put it another way, where a study of the score and its multiple components is not the end goal. When teaching a unit on Sixteenth-century madrigals, I teach Laura Macy's article, "Speaking of Sex: Metaphor and Performance in the Italian Madrigal."[17] This is an article that works for majors or non-majors. Although it does contain detailed analyses of the poems and the music, Macy's argument hinges on recognizing the growing distinction between the performer and the listener, the changing social function of the madrigal, and ultimately the way in which the madrigal reflects the developments of court and social dynamics. As with Sara's class on Corelli and Rebecca's on Mozart, Macy's article sheds light on the way that the "music itself" is a manifestation of performers' interactions, expectations, and changes. Especially in the case of Arcadelt's *Il bianco e dolce cigno*, students understand the music-text relationship in a far different way when they would were they to restrict their studies to the score. In other words, the madrigal's score was not just, to quote Steven quoting Taruskin, "a recipe for performance," but rather the performance was a recipe for social and intimate interaction. Here, as with many other examples, my hope is that a broader acknowledgement of how and why certain works were performed and understood (and I mentioned Holsinger's work on Hildegard, Le Guin's work on Boccherini, Taruskin's entire *Text and Act*, or (if I may), Sara's work on Scarlatti as perfect case studies) moves us away from the more limited study of the "textual remain."

The Anthology Performances

I agree with Sara that it would be fascinating to know how certain performances get selected for various textbooks. My utterly uneducated hunch is that copyright restrictions and contractual relationships between publishers may have something to do with it. While I don't expect teachers to discuss performance for every single unit, I would hope that the selection of performance, at the very least, lent themselves to potential conversations about each work, each period, each place, each composer/performer. The multiple examples that everyone gave (Fischer-Dieskau, Robert Levin, Jordi Savall, Tom Beghin, etc.) suggest that every period is open to fascinating and varied conversations. But more to the point, I would be ecstatic if, at the very least,

1. the performers were acknowledged more prominently in textbooks so that students realize that they're not listening to Perotin but to the Hilliard Ensemble's rendition/recreation of the *Magnus liber* and/or

17. *Journal of Musicology* 14, no. 1 (Winter, 1996): 1–34.

2. in the commentary that accompanies the score anthologies, a paragraph or two was devoted to the reasons behind the editors' choice of performers and/or the distinctive features of the performance chosen.

On one hand it's logistically unreasonable to include multiple versions of the same composition. On the other hand, links to online videos or sound recordings would permit students to compare performances themselves. Rebecca has already raised a number of important questions in regard to Rachmaninoff's performance of the G-minor Prelude. And I've found that a comparison can often focus student's listening more intensely and even draw their attention to larger points. As a case in point, I use Gould's recording of Mozart's Rondo (K. 333) and his exaggerated cadenza at the end in order to demonstrate Mozart's hybrid conflation of both public and private styles. Needless to say, this performance can also open a conversation on the idea of authenticity, the effects of neo-classicism on performance, etc.

Why Teach Music History and to Whom?

Finally, there's one obvious elephant in the room so to speak that Steven has begun to acknowledge as he described the nature of music at a larger institution, namely, why do we teach music history, and to whom? And this gets to the heart of this roundtable since our participants teach at very different institutions. Are we talking about apples and oranges as we discuss music history at state schools, conservatories, or liberal arts colleges?

Before I came to Beloit College, a small liberal arts college that has very few majors and where there is no expectation that students continue as performers, I taught at a school of music (Lawrence University). The expectations for my teaching, from my colleagues and students, have been radically different at these two schools. At the conservatory, I felt as though music history was a kind of service department meant to aid students who intended to pursue careers in performance or music education and who needed the necessary music history background to write program notes or pass out of the music history component of graduate school.

At Beloit, by comparison, many of my students cannot even read music and know "Western Art Music" from having watched movies such as *Amadeus* or *Immortal Beloved*. As a result, at Lawrence I made it my mission (like Sara) to challenge future performers to think more critically about their roles as interpreters, as carriers of music history, aesthetics, or ideology. At times I even felt as though I was teaching against them, chipping away at their uncritical hagiographic views and the servile (and therefore passive and over deferential) manner with which they approached their own occupations. And

in this respect, the inclusion of performers as part of the history seems absolutely critical.

By comparison, I've felt at Beloit a greater emphasis to enrich students' musical literacy but also to create overlap between music and the liberal arts as a whole. And because I'm no longer beholden to the expectations of a performing faculty, this change has led to the following questions: What do I need to teach and include? If we wish for students to eventually imagine a broader music-historical world akin to the complex world of which we are a part, is it necessary to start with the canon of "works" and then "deconstruct" it?

I don't necessarily have an answer to these questions and I welcome your thoughts. I also realize that this final discussion seems to be a digression from the focus on performance. However it has seemed that by shifting the emphasis of our studies from textual analysis to historical events, performances, "vignettes," in a manner described above and in which the performer and the listener (the roles most students identify with—much more so than composition), that students are better able to relate, hear, and recognize elements of music history that I find of value. And, by way of an anti-climactic final thought, it strikes me for all the reasons that I've mentioned above, that the elevation of performers (and perhaps the increased humanization of composers and their scores) and/or the changing emphasis from music as a thing to music as an event/experience reinforces this connection with students.

Sara Gross Ceballos

While I see Daniel's point that even the "rudiments" we teach are a series of vignettes, I do sympathize with Steven's desire to maintain some sort of "rudimentary chronology." However, there is great irony in the manner in which I present this chronology in the classroom. PowerPoint slides flash images of historical concert venues, instruments, performers and composers while iTunes and YouTube provide "historically informed performances" that probably tell us more about our own twentieth-first-century need for historicity and authenticity than they do about the past performances they seek to emulate. I have not made it a practice to point out this irony to my students, thinking that it's enough of a struggle to get many of them to retain material and that interruptions to chronology could do more harm than good. But to be perfectly frank, by the time I get these same students in upper-level classes they seem to remember dreadfully little from our time in survey (though careful prodding and encouragement does help). Might allowing these disruptions in chronology help to make the past more memorable by virtue of its contrast to our present?

Already, I find that activities that make use of a "bottom" (performers and listeners) up vs. "top" (composer) down approach helps many students to open up to music history and hold on to certain details well after the class is over. When I teach stylized dances of the French baroque, we discuss contemporary social dance before we all learn the basic postures of French courtly dance and the *pas de minuet*. This helps me to discuss the role of dance as a social and political tool in seventeenth-century France and what it signified in so many genres of French baroque music. I have received reports from students who travel abroad after our class of minuet steps executed in the hallways of Versailles and how much more impressive (oppressive) the palace seemed to them with this experience under their belts. They may not remember the shifting recitative styles of Armide's monologue (a "rudiment" of most music history textbooks) but they remember something more rudimentary—music as a meaningful experience embedded in a historical context over and above music as a score. This ties in, I think, to what Daniel described as his "anti-climactic" final thought about how teaching music history through performance helps students to identify with the past and with our instruction. To me, this is anything but anti-climactic.

Rebecca Plack

I've had several, disparate reactions to the disparate threads weaving through our exchanges, so forgive me if I comment in a few, somewhat unrelated paragraphs.

More on Recording Choices

I was intrigued by Sara's question (in her second response) about the recordings included in the NAWM. Though this isn't something I've had time to delve into yet, I do think it's important to remind students that recordings aren't transparent—that the performance they study influences their impression of "the work." I do think that we tend to lean on "great performers' great performances" in selecting recordings for our courses, but we don't need to.

In my Lieder courses, I absolutely include recordings of Fischer-Dieskau and Gerald Moore. But students listen to these right alongside performances of earlier greats like Herbert Janssen and Michael Raucheisen, or contemporary duos like Nathalie Stutzmann and Inger Södergren. Though they have questions about the early recordings, which prompt fantastic discussions about their performance style and the limits of notation, artists whose recordings were issued 100 years apart co-exist on the syllabus with neither caveats nor explanation. By the end of the course, students have listened to recordings by at least 75 different singers and 50 different pianists. I feel it's my

responsibility to present the material in this way: to make performance integral to the course material.

More on Surveys

Both Daniel and Steven write of the effect that tension between performing faculty and academic faculty has on surveys. But this tension is absolutely not present at the San Francisco Conservatory where I teach. Here, a number of faculty members teach across departments and disciplines: more than one composer teaches theory and music history in addition to private composition students; a couple of studio teachers offer some music history courses; and a musicologist (me) also teaches vocal pedagogy. This kind of cross-pollination inevitably fosters inter-departmental communication—and while we don't agree about everything, the music history department certainly doesn't feel hostage to the performance faculty.

One more thought about surveys: Daniel's second post made me reflect on my own undergraduate experience. Because no music history survey course was offered, I managed to complete a B.A. in Music without *any* exposure to Bach, Beethoven, or Brahms. However, I had opportunities to take some seminars that few undergraduates have: Verdi with Harry Powers, Wagner with John Deathridge, Monteverdi with Thomas Walker, and (my favorite) a course on composers' manuscripts with Margaret Bent. These courses sharpened my curiosity and taught me to *think* about music as no survey would. So I'm eager to see Daniel's fourteen case study syllabus. If we can give students an overview that sticks while giving them something to think about, I'm all for it.

Steven M. Whiting

Since much of Daniel's second paragraph poses a wide variety of questions to me, I should try to answer a few, all the more so since we probably differ more on degree than on essentials. A vignette (as I was using the term) is a short descriptive sketch. Of course tellers of any history resort to them, and (so one hopes) select them as carefully and purposefully as anyone would select telling details in any piece of prose. I may be more of a chronology junkie than Daniel, not because *chronological* means canonical or essential—it's just easier to figure out the relationship between events if one has them in the proper order. I do share his frustration with any such construct as "the music itself."

Musicologists should always be concerned with more than how composers move notes around. Performance in context (social, political, aesthetic) *should* be our concern, whether we're teaching undergraduates in a liberal arts college or budding performers. Musicologists at conservatories

often suspect that they're rendering a mere service that many of their students (and colleagues?) may find a tedious distraction from the imperative of learning how to deliver notes on schedule. We should brush that chip from our shoulders and get on with the subversive business of fostering critical thinking and expanding capacities for wonderment.

By the way, in all this talk of performance, has anyone stressed the importance of "live" music examples as opposed to recordings? That's one benefit of teaching at a conservatory.

Appendix A: Assignments from Sara Gross Ceballos

Alleluia Justus ut palma from Ad organum faciendum

As you read in the Weiss/Taruskin chapter on "The Emergence of Polyphony," early polyphony was largely improvised. In the eleventh century, performers improvised free organum according to set rules about permissible and non-permissible consonance and types of motion. *Alleluia Justus et palma* is an example of this style of free note-against-note organum.
Here are the rules:

- The organal voice should be above the principal voice, though may cross on occasion
- Both voices begin on a unison and end in a unison (or octave)
- Each vertical sonority must be a unison, perfect fourth, perfect fifth, an octave, or (rarely) a perfect eleventh, with thirds and sixths permissible just before a unison or octave cadence
- Contrary motion is preferred with parallel and oblique motion for variety
- Parallel octaves and unisons are to be avoided
- The organal voice should be singable (smooth) and should avoid leaps larger than a fifth
- The range should not extend beyond a tenth above the final
- The only accidentals used are B-flat and B-natural, but both can't be used in close proximity

Now please add an organal voice to the first line of the sequence *Victimae paschali laudes* (on p. 30 in NAWM; the first line sets the text "Victimae paschali laudes immolent Christiani"), obeying all of these rules. You will turn in your organum on a sheet of staff paper on which you write out the principal voice on an empty staff and then add the organal voice *above* it. You will be graded on adherence to the rules and on the attractiveness of your organum.

After composing your organum, I would like you to reflect briefly on your experience in a short paragraph. In particular, I would like you to think about how your experience composing differed from the experience of improvising. Do you think you could have successfully improvised an organal voice? What skills would be necessary to do so? How did the training church singers received in the medieval era prepare them for the improvisation of organum? (You can also refer to improvisatory practices in later styles of music, from concerto cadenzas to jazz.)

Jacques Arcadelt: Il bianco e dolce cigno

Madrigals were most often sung using partbooks, so singers only had their individual parts on the page in front of them. I want you to download your part from 1581 print by Gardane from the following address (also a link on our Moodle page): http://imslp.org/wiki/Il_primo_libro_de%27_madrigali_a_4_voci_(Arcadelt,_Jacob) Looking only at your part from this website and NOT at the NAWM, imagine that you are singing the part designated for your voice type with a group of friends in a sixteenth-century courtly salon. Sing your part along with the recording to get a better handle on the experience (note that canto, alto and tenor all use C clefs and basso an f clef). Or better yet get together with some classmates and sing it through!!!

Judging from your part alone, you cannot anticipate the clever "madrigalisms" that Arcadelt plans for the quartet. Rather, they only become clear in performance. After the evening of singing, you retire to write about your experience to a friend. Can you recount your experience performing this work and describe how and when you understood the witty double meanings of the poetry through its musical representation? (You have taken your partbook home with you and can cite measure numbers to help clarify; you must also be sure to identify your voice part.)

Journal Grading Rubric: I will assess your journals based on the degree to which they match the descriptions below. I grade primarily on the content and evidence of critical and creative thinking. Grades may be raised or lowered to reflect exemplary or problematic writing.

9–10 An outstanding assignment that displays excellence in content, organization and style. Engages thoughtfully and thoroughly with all parts of the prompt; incorporates well-chosen, well-described and well-analyzed examples; raises questions or draws sophisticated connections to other material covered in the readings and/or lecture. Ideas are well-organized and expressed clearly. The journal is appropriately formatted and contains few, if any, mechanical errors.

8 Responds appropriately to all parts of the prompt. Includes examples to illustrate points but descriptions and/or analysis may be too cursory. Does not draw sophisticated connections to other material or reflect an outstanding level of engagement. Alternatively, content is excellent but writing is sloppy.
7 Assignment is complete, but responses are cursory. Examples are not always well chosen or appropriate and/or lack description and/or interpretation. There may be substantial problems with writing or substantial inaccuracies in content.
6 A weak assignment that shows little evidence of engaging thoughtfully with the prompt. Few if any examples are given to support claims. The writing is frequently awkward or confusing.
0–5 Assignment is incomplete or reveals little or no engagement with the material. May include passages that are off topic. Alternatively, there are too many direct quotations from the textbook or anthology, or there are significant issues with content inaccuracies.

Music History 460: Winter 2011: Music and Colonialism in the Age of Exploration: Final Exam

For the take-home final exam, you will write a proposal for a lecture-concert titled "Music in the Age of Exploration: Voyage, Contact, Colonization, and Resonances" to be part of a larger scholarly conference called "Power and Identity in the Age of Exploration" Your proposal must consist of three parts:

Part I: brief introduction to your proposed concert

Part II: a detailed description of your proposed concert including

- Repertoire: you must identify and describe at least one piece or musical event (i.e. fanfare, drumming, madrigal, motet, villancico, entrée, etc.) representing the following subcategories of your concert
  - Voyage: Sir Francis Drake and the first English circumnavigation
  - Contact: Jean de Léry and the Tupinamba of Brazil
  - Colonization: Juan Guttiérez de Padilla at Puebla
  - Resonances: Rameau and *Les Sauvages* on the French stage
- Lecture: you must provide either a script of the lecture components or an overview of what the lecture components will consist of including relevant scholarly materials; the lecture components should introduce or reflect upon chosen works and/or provide a narrative linking the works together.

- Audiovisual materials or other extramusical resources (i.e. actors, props, etc.)

Part III: a justification for the educational value of your lecture-concert and its relevance to the overall theme of the conference.

Use all of the resources at your disposal by drawing from the works and readings on our syllabus to craft the winning (A+) proposal. Good luck!