

Toward a Scholarship of Music History Pedagogy: Historical Context, Current Trends, and Future Issues

THE EDITORS

Perhaps the first question is, Do we really need a *journal* on music history pedagogy?¹ In considering this question, the first issue of a journal devoted to music history teaching provides an opportunity to reflect upon pedagogy's history within American musicology, to consider the current trends in the scholarship of music history teaching, and to propose an agenda for the further development of pedagogy as an area of research and study.

Musicology as practiced in the United States has traditionally not regarded teaching and pedagogy as scholarly pursuits worthy of professional consideration. In his 1941 *Introduction to Musicology*, Glen Haydon lists pedagogy as an "auxiliary science" and devotes a chapter to "Musical Pedagogy," by which he meant music education.² Subsequently, most texts which have helped to frame or define musicology as a profession in the U.S. lack any reference to the idea that an important aspect of a musicologist's job is to teach music history,³ with the rare exception of Anne V. Hallmark's "Teaching Music History in

1. To borrow from the opening essay of *The Musical Quarterly*, "Perhaps the first question is, Do we really need the word 'musicology?'" Waldo S. Pratt, "On Behalf of Musicology," *The Musical Quarterly* 1, no. 1 (January 1915): 1.

2. "Musical pedagogy, or music education, concerns the processes through which musical knowledge, skill, and insight are acquired." His chapter includes discussions of such diverse topics as psychology, counterpoint, and teacher training. Glen Haydon, *Introduction to Musicology*, The Prentice-Hall Music Series (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1941), 186–215.

3. Among these texts may be cited Frank Ll. Harrison, Mantle Hood, and Claude V. Palisca, eds., *Musicology*, Humanistic Scholarship in America (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963); Barry S. Brook, Edward O. D. Downes, and Sherman van Solkema, eds., *Perspectives in Musicology* (New York: Norton, 1971); Joseph Kerman, *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985); Alastair Williams, *Constructing Musicology* (Aldershot, Hants and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001); and Vincent Duckles, et al., "Musicology," in *Grove Music Online*. *Oxford Music Online*, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/46710> (accessed February 12, 2010).

2 *Journal of Music History Pedagogy*

Different Environments,” in the collection *Musicology in the 1980s: Methods, Goals, Opportunities*.⁴

Although teaching need not be a part of the work day for musicologists who are independent scholars or researchers holding grants, the simple fact is that most music historians will spend much of their professional lives teaching music history to others, most often in a college or university setting. Teaching is an activity that is central to the work of most musicologists, and, by extension, teaching is central to the work of musicology. Few beginning musicologists have an opportunity to study pedagogy in their graduate work, as the vast majority of PhD programs in musicology in the U.S. do not offer classes on pedagogy.⁵ The ability to succeed in a university position is increasingly dependent on good teaching in addition to a strong publication record. Musicologists are often asked to teach courses outside of our fields of research in which we have little or no scholarly expertise. In the same way, teaching music history is also the duty of many musicians who do not have extensive training in music history, but who are assigned to teach courses on music history, music appreciation, popular music, or world music.

While music historians currently enjoy a plethora of journals devoted to almost every taste and interest in scholarship, we have few outlets for reading research and reviews devoted to issues of teaching and pedagogy. Publications intended for teachers in primary and secondary schools, such as the *Music Educators Journal*, do not include articles applicable to college-level music history teaching. The *College Music Symposium* includes articles on all aspects of college-level pedagogy, but those devoted to music history teaching appear only sporadically. Individual journals on specific areas of musicology have sometimes published articles on the pedagogy of their area, such as Marcia J. Citron’s “Feminist Waves and Classical Music: Pedagogy, Performance, Research” in *Women and Music: A Journal of Gender and Culture* (2004) or the issue devoted to pedagogy of the *Journal of Popular Music Studies* (2009), but these articles appear infrequently.

In addition to the articles that have appeared in currently published journals, there is a growing interest in pedagogy as seen in published essay collec-

4. Anne V. Hallmark, “Teaching Music History in Different Environments” in *Musicology in the 1980s: Methods, Goals, Opportunities*, edited by D. Kern Holoman and Claude V. Palisca (New York: Da Capo Press, 1982), 131–44.

5. In a recent survey of over 50 PhD-granting programs in musicology, of the 36 programs that responded only eight stated that their program had a pedagogy class. C. Matthew Balensuela, “Report of the AMS Pedagogy Study Group and DePauw University Musicology Pedagogy Survey,” presented to the AMS Pedagogy Study Group, Nashville, TN, November 8, 2008.

tions such as *Teaching Music History* (edited by Mary Natvig)⁶ and *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (edited by James Briscoe).⁷ There are also an increasing number of conferences and workshops on music history teaching such as those organized by the College Music Society and the annual Teaching Music History Day sponsored by the Pedagogy Study Group of the American Musicological Society. Musicologists are increasingly interested in scholarship on good teaching and the editors believe there is need in the discipline for a regularly published journal of both original research and reviews of textbooks and teaching materials related to music history pedagogy.

The *Journal of Music History Pedagogy* will be a forum in which teachers of music history of all levels (music appreciation, history survey, and graduate seminars) and disciplines (western, non-western, concert and popular musics) can find articles which will challenge and develop our own teaching philosophies, explore methodologies for specific courses, and review appropriate teaching materials. The editors believe that good teaching can be discussed and studied with the same incisive thinking, scholarly rigor, and individual insight that are the basis of all sound scholarship in music. We hold no single viewpoint on what constitutes good music history teaching and seek to promote all types of scholarship on music history pedagogy that are well-researched, objective, and challenging. We encourage communications from readers of the *Journal* and will devote extensive space to continuing discussion on articles in following issues as submissions warrant. The *Journal* is also receptive to proposals for special issues from readers, particularly if accompanied by recommended contributors on the subject.

The success of the *Journal of Music History Pedagogy* will rest on those who care about good teaching in music history, who will read the articles and reviews in it, and who will also contribute their own best work to it. The editors are committed to assist the growing interest in music history teaching in the pages of the *Journal*.

6. Mary Natvig, ed., *Teaching Music History* (Aldershot, Hants and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002).

7. James Briscoe, ed., *Vitalizing Music History Teaching*, Monographs and Bibliographies in American Music 20 (Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon Press, 2010).

Classroom Discussion and the Community of Music Majors

JAMES A. DAVIS

Modern theories of teaching and learning recommend that students actively participate in their own education. For the music history teacher this usually means some form of in-class discussion. Yet generating meaningful discussions can be problematic, and many instructors lament the difficulties they experience when attempting to instigate and sustain discussions in their classes for music majors. Viewing the community in which these young musicians live and learn through the lens of ethnomusicology helps to explain how music majors perceive their role in the classroom, which in turn sheds light on why they may or may not engage in classroom discourse. An awareness of the social and professional dynamics surrounding music majors can help instructors handle student responses in a way that promotes engaging discussion in the music history classroom.

Linguistic Models of Classroom Discussion

Studies indicate that active, cognitive engagement, as opposed to passive reception, can increase the comprehension and retention of materials while promoting critical thinking and developing logical and rhetorical skills through social interaction.¹ The verbal exchange of ideas between students, and between students and teachers, is one of the most common and effective ways for creating an interactive classroom experience. Certainly there are many additional ways to foster student participation in the music history classroom, such as brief in-class writing assignments, quizzes with immediate

I am grateful to my colleague Christian Bernhard for his valuable comments and contributions to this essay.

1. Charles C. Bonwell and Tracey E. Sutherland, "The Active Learning Continuum: Choosing Activities to Engage Students in the Classroom," in *Using Active Learning in College Classes: A Range of Options for Faculty*, eds. Tracey E. Sutherland and Charles C. Bonwell (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996), 3–16; and Richard E. Mayer, "Should There be a Three-Strikes Rule Against Pure Discovery Learning?" *American Psychologist* 59, no. 1 (January 2004): 14–19.

assessment and feedback, or student presentations.² Yet discussion remains one of the most widespread and viable collaborative activities, especially in the traditional mid-size to large lecture setting to which most music history teachers are consigned. Not surprisingly, discussion, debate, and other such interactive or participatory situations are often popular with students.³ Why then are there sometimes problems generating discussion?

Understanding the basic linguistic structure of guided verbal exchanges between teachers and students is a useful first step when examining where and how such attempts may be failing. For example, the discursive model Jay Lemke titled triadic dialogue has proven to be a useful means of separating the mechanical parts of classroom discussion while exposing potential weaknesses behind each part.⁴ Triadic dialogue consists of three primary components: initiation, response, and evaluation (IRE) or follow-up (IRF). Generally speaking, initiation consists of the teacher asking a question, and the response is the student's answer. In the IRE model the third stage is an evaluation of the student's response and a correction if necessary; in IRF the student's answer is followed by some action that expands upon the student's response or moves into a new direction.

Viewing student-teacher exchanges through such a basic framework allows instructors to examine and critique each part of a discussion on its own terms as well as how each step influences the others. The first part, initiation or questioning, sets the stage for the quality and duration of any subsequent exchange. Using Barbara Gross Davis' terminology, there can be exploratory

2. David G. Brown and Curtis W. Ellison, "What is Active Learning?" in *The Seven Principles in Action: Improving Undergraduate Education*, ed. Susan Rickey Hatfield (Bolton, MA: Anker, 1995), 39–54; and Peter J. Frederick, "Student Involvement: Active Learning in Large Classes," in *Teaching Large Classes Well*, ed. Susan Rickey Hatfield (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987), 45–56. For a number of useful peer learning scenarios for the music history classroom, see J. Peter Burkholder, "Peer Learning in Music History Courses," in *Teaching Music History*, ed. Mary Natvig (Aldershot, Hants and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002), 205–23; see also Martha Snead Holloway, "The Use of Cooperative Action Learning to Increase Music Appreciation Students' Listening Skills," *College Music Symposium* 44 (2004): 83–93.

3. Marsha Barber, "Reassessing Pedagogy in a Fast Forward Age," *The International Journal of Learning* 13, no. 9 (2007): 143–50.

4. Jay L. Lemke, *Using Language in the Classroom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989). See also Gordon Wells, *Dialogic Inquiry: Towards a Sociocultural Practice and Theory of Education* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 167–208; and Hossein Nassaji and Gordon Wells, "What's the Use of 'Triadic Dialogue'? An Investigation of Teacher-Student Interaction," *Applied Linguistics* 21, no. 3 (September 2000): 376–406. The two models of triadic dialogue are examined in John M. Sinclair and Malcolm Coulthard, *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), and Hugh Mehan, *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979).

questions (dealing with factual information), hypothetical questions, summary questions, and more.⁵ Different types of questions will elicit different types of answers that may or may not be conducive to subsequent discussion, regardless of the quality or content of the student's response. In this sense the IRE model using a factual question does not promote ongoing discussion, as the answer and subsequent evaluation (even if correct) can end a train of thought.

In any class it is necessary that the correct type of question be asked when searching for certain types of responses. This can be deceptively challenging for the music history teacher, as seemingly straightforward questions often contain levels of complexity not found when working in other disciplines. The inescapable aesthetic nature of musicological materials can require processing or clarification prior to answering what in some cases might seem a simple question.⁶ The ambiguity of musical content likewise complicates the discourse; a student in an English literature course has the comparative lucidity of the written text to fall back on, whereas the music major must often turn to the more indistinct score or recording when formulating a response.

Even if a suitable question is presented (one that encourages a relatively easy answer worthy of follow-up) there is no guarantee that an answer will be offered, or that discussion will ensue. There are recommended techniques for encouraging students to offer their answers or opinions, such as waiting an appropriate amount of time, or repeating or rephrasing the question.⁷ Yet successfully soliciting answers from students depends on what follows their response as much as the question that preceded it. How students believe their answers will be received by the teacher and their peers is just as important as whether or not they believe that they have the correct or appropriate response. How a teacher responds to a student's answer—including not only the choice of words (supportive vs. stifling), but even the body language, facial expressions, and tone of voice—is critical to generating immediate discussion, let

5. Barbara Gross Davis, *Tools for Teaching* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993), 83–84. See also Thomas P. Kasulis, "Questioning," in *The Art and Craft of Teaching*, ed. Margaret M. Gullette (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), 38–48; and Lewis C. Goffe and Nancy H. Deane, "Questioning Our Questions," *College Composition and Communication* 25, no. 4 (October 1974): 284–91.

6. James A. Davis, "Aesthetic Questions and Questions of Aesthetics in the Music History Classroom," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 35, no. 3 (Fall 2001): 87–94.

7. There are numerous publications that offer basic advice to teachers for starting and maintaining discussion in the classroom, such as Joseph Lowman, *Mastering the Techniques of Teaching* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995), Chapter 6; and Wilbert J. McKeachie and Marilla Svinicki, *McKeachie's Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2006), Chapter 5.

alone ensuring that questions will be answered in later situations.⁸ In fact, if the later stages of triadic dialogue are not handled carefully, the process becomes teacher-centered as opposed to student-centered and can actually be inhibitive as opposed to inspiring. An interactive yet overly authoritative presentation may successfully invite responses but then reject them when the answer is wrong without leaving room for dialogue.⁹

Teachers need to be conscious of their behavior in relation to the students' internal and external process of answering if they hope to generate discussion. For those facing a roomful of music majors, this should include evaluating whether the classroom environment is supportive and advantageous for musical dialogue. In addition, music history teachers need to be aware of the potentially complex nature of the answers solicited, or at least the complexities as perceived by the students. To appreciate the full scope of these issues requires a better understanding of the social organization of the music history classroom, and by default, the world of the music major.

The School of Music and Communal Identity

Scholars of teaching and learning have spoken of the benefits that come from creating a community of learners within the classroom.¹⁰ Such an environment endorses learning as constructed through cooperative and interactive situations where the students' previous knowledge and experiences are brought

8. "[F]indings suggest a strong relationship between participation and the following teaching techniques: praise, asking questions, probing for elaboration of student contributions, accepting answers, repeating answers, using student names, and correcting wrong answers." Claudia E. Nunn, "Discussion in the College Classroom: Triangulating Observational and Survey Results," *The Journal of Higher Education* 67, no. 3 (May 1996): 259.

9. Christine Chin, "Classroom Interaction in Science: Teacher Questioning and Feedback to Students' Responses," *International Journal of Science Education* 28, no. 11 (September 2006): 1315–46. See also the discussion of teacher "interventions" in Eduardo Mortimer and Phil Scott, "Analysing Discourse in the Science Classroom," in *Improving Science Education: The Contribution of Research*, eds. Robin Millar, et al. (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2000), 131–33.

10. Ann L. Brown and Joseph C. Campione, "Interactive Learning Environments and the Teaching of Science and Mathematics," in *Toward a Scientific Practice of Science Education*, eds. Marjorie Gardner, et al. (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1990), 111–39; Ann L. Brown and Joseph Campione, "Guided Discovery in a Community of Learners," in *Classroom Lessons: Integrating Cognitive Theory and Classroom Practice*, ed. Kate McGilly (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1994), 229–70. See also Miriam Gamoran Sherin, Edith Prentice Mendez, and David A. Louis, "A Discipline Apart: the Challenges of 'Fostering a Community of Learners' in a Mathematics Classroom," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 36, no. 2 (2004): 207–32; and Lee S. Shulman, "Communities of Learners and Communities of Teachers," in *The Wisdom of Practice: Essays on Teaching, Learning, and Learning to Teach*, ed. Suzanne M. Wilson (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004), 485–500.

into play. A supportive community of learners can show students how their beliefs fit within their immediate social structure, increasing their respect for the diversity of opinions held by their peers. As the name implies, the community of learners not only pushes the concept of the student as an active participant in their own education, it implies a measure of equality, cooperation, and collegiality in the classroom. The notion of a community of learners in higher education is multilayered. While the immediate application is within the classroom, most colleges and universities would like to see the entire institution functioning as a community of learners, involving faculty members as well as students, and ranging beyond the walls of the classroom.

Considering the music history classroom as a conventional community of learners can be beneficial to some degree, yet such an approach also raises issues not found in other teaching situations. Music majors can be part of a classroom community, and they are of course members of the larger community of learners at the school where they are enrolled. In addition to these traditional communities, however, music majors are part of another community, one that predates—and for many of them outranks—their membership in any other group. Music majors see themselves, and are encouraged to see themselves, as musicians first and foremost. The imagined community of musicians has unique social guidelines and expectations, and these defining characteristics can have a direct impact on the learning experience. For this reason the social environment in which music majors live and learn is particularly important to music history teachers.

Bruno Nettl's ethnographic study *Heartland Excursions* provides valuable insights into the social organization of a school of music. Examining the school of music as "a religious system or a social system," Nettl shows how this "society of musicians" maintains rituals and beliefs that promote a distinct community.¹¹ There are classes of members within this community, including students, teachers, and administrators, with subordinate classes segregated by activity (applied vs. academic studies), performing medium (singers vs. instrumentalists), or even stylistic preference. Nettl's summary of this unique social structure is worth quoting in full:

The complex, and perhaps Byzantine, social and sociomusical organization of music schools results from a combination of factors; the transfer of the industrial model of corporations and markets to an educational environment; the role of music in Western and particularly American society, again transferred to the academic framework; the symbolic roles of various instruments, of singing and conducting and their relationship to the roles of various groups in society; the hegemony of large musical ensembles as musical metaphors of large, successful organizations in which each member plays a specialized part; the imposition of the taxonomy of races and

11. Bruno Nettl, *Heartland Excursions: Ethnomusicological Reflections on Schools of Music* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1995), 5.

genders on the musical and educational scene; the concept of talent and its presumption from a musician's association with others, living or dead; the concept of genius, associated with a pantheon of composers no longer living; and the willingness of musicians in art music society to play with relationships reminiscent of political and social processes that might not be readily accepted in other domains of the culture of modern real-life America.¹²

So many distinctive social conditions create an exclusive environment that shapes how music majors view themselves, their colleagues, and their education. There is probably no other discipline on a college campus that both consciously and unconsciously fosters this kind of social cohesion between majors with a consequential segregation from other majors on campus. The means and motivations behind this socialization impact the behavior of music students in the classroom, and music history teachers need to consider this environment if they hope to establish open and productive discussions.¹³

Central to a music major's communal identity is musicianship. Whereas other fields take discipline-specific ability as a goal of the educational process, the music major is expected to possess certain skills and abilities before entering the curriculum. It is assumed they possess musical talent, and this talent is what establishes their membership in the society of musicians.¹⁴ This is significantly different from other students on campus. Music majors are not just members of a group that has been formed to learn something new; they have come together to expand their knowledge and abilities with other members of a preexisting group. Musical aptitude binds this group and is the defining characteristic of its members. Any perceived assault on their appearance as musicians is a threat to both their personal and communal identities.

12. Nettl, *Heartland Excursions*, 80–81. While this essay focuses on one effect of this socialization, it would be useful to examine each of these characteristics to see how they impact the music history classroom. See also the useful distinction between “identities in music” and “music in identities” found in David J. Hargreaves, Dorothy Miell, and Raymond A. R. MacDonald, “What Are Musical Identities, and Why Are They Important?” in Raymond A. R. MacDonald, Dorothy Miell, and David J. Hargreaves, *Musical Identities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 2, 12–15.

13. Subcultural values and norms influence a willingness to participate in a discussion as well as the directions a discussion can take; see Stanley E. Jones, Dean C. Barnlund, and Franklyn Saul Haiman, *The Dynamics of Discussion: Communication in Small Groups* (New York: Harper and Row, 1980), 92–113. See also the discussion of “perceived personal control” in Raymond P. Perry, “Perceived Control in College Students: Implications for Instruction in Higher Education,” in *Effective Teaching in Higher Education: Research and Practice*, eds. Raymond P. Perry and John C. Smart, (New York: Agathon Press, 1997), 11–60.

14. This parallels the culture of talent that Henry Kingsbury discussed in *Music, Talent, and Performance: A Conservatory Cultural System* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988), 59–84. See also Susan A. O'Neill, “The Self-Identity of Young Musicians,” in MacDonald, et. al., *Musical Identities*, 79–96.

Being a music major is a way of life, a blending of learning and doing, of art and craft, of vocation and avocation.¹⁵ Not only is there an expectation that music students function within their roles as members of a school (as “college students”), they are also expected to perform as neophyte or apprentice musicians. This skill- or talent-based identity merges characteristics of both a professional and educational community. Each member of the organization has a job with specific responsibilities, and the entire group is working towards a specific goal. Successful participation in this organization is a means of reifying membership in the group, whereas failure to perform could mean banishment from the group.¹⁶ Community membership is a complicated and perpetually evolving state for music majors. They must satisfy the demands of their curriculum in their role as student; they are working within the adolescent social realm of their peers, with all the complications that can entail; and they are continually proving their right to be members of the community of musicians. Put together, these factors go along way towards explaining why discussion in the music history classroom can wax and wane.

Before offering an answer to a teacher’s question or joining in an emerging debate, any student will be extremely self-conscious of how they are perceived by their peers. Being wrong, or revealing ignorance, is an intimidating experience. While this is true of most teaching situations, the problem is exacerbated in the music history classroom. For the music major it goes far beyond appearing stupid in front of your peers. Making a mistake when replying to a music-based question could indicate a lack of musicianship, the key to a student’s membership in the exclusive clique of the music school. This hazard is amplified by the potentially incestuous environment in which music majors live and work. No other facility on campus can boast of so much activity for so many hours a day as the music building. Students all but live in the practice rooms, rehearsal halls, and classrooms, where the same small corps of classmates surrounds them both socially and academically. Music majors will see the same people in their theory and history classes, ensemble rehearsals, even during breaks between classes. This environmental intimacy is quite different from what the average liberal arts major experiences, where less time is spent in one location or with those in their major. Moreover, music faculty members are part of this concentrated network, and it is likely that most

15. Estelle R. Jorgensen, *The Art of Teaching Music* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008), 95–9, 103–6.

16. Robert Weaver and Jiang Qi, “Classroom Organization and Participation: College Students’ Perceptions,” *The Journal of Higher Education* 76, no. 5 (September-October 2005): 570–601. In this sense the school of music is more akin to a “community of practice”—a form of social learning that emphasizes shared goals—than a community of learners; see Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger, *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

music students know and converse with more of their faculty members than majors in other liberal arts degrees. As a result, a “wrong answer” for the music major is not something that will evaporate at the end of the class period. A poor performance in the classroom, just like a poor performance on stage, is something students will carry with them through the day (if not longer), with the potential to impact their interpersonal relations with both students and faculty members.

In addition, classroom discussion can be seen as challenging (or even threatening) to the music major due to the intrinsically personal nature of the subject under study and the often unavoidable aesthetic evaluation that such answers demand. While many topics placed before students in the history classroom have technical aspects that can be handled objectively, the study of music most always includes some aesthetic component. In this way the study of music falls somewhere between learning an art and a craft. An interactive setting could be especially beneficial for this reason, as the aesthetic side can provide an ideal point of departure for discussion. Yet at the same time the subjective nature of the topic may cause students to hesitate.¹⁷ Offering aesthetic responses or justification reveals a personal value that risks further exposure in front of one’s peers. Commenting on a piece of music is commenting on yourself through your tastes; a music major describing a piece of music is exposing him- or herself personally and professionally. A similar situation can be found in the English classroom, where students can bond emotionally with what they are reading, requiring some delicacy on the part of the teacher when framing any questions so as not to be taken as judgmental or discourteous by the student. For example, Mark Gellis discusses the “Master Questions” approach he uses in his English classes. Useful for either written assignments or in-class discussion, he addresses technical questions of plot, style, genre, as well as more interpretive questions of rhetoric, race, gender, culture, and morality, all the while recognizing the student’s “ownership” of the text.¹⁸ While musicologists can learn much from their colleagues across campus in these situations, such approaches require modification to suit the comparative ambiguity of the material under study along with the music major’s professional dedication to the subject.

17. It is worth recalling Joseph Kerman’s observation that we are all engaged in criticism despite any claims of objectivity; *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986).

18. Mark Gellis, “Master Questions and the Teaching of Literature,” in *Inquiry and the Literary Text: Constructing Discussions in the English Classroom*, ed. James Holden and John S. Schmit (Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 2002), 15–35. For an interesting tactic from the history classroom see David Frye, “An Alternative Approach to the Discussion Class,” *The History Teacher* 27, no. 2 (February 1994): 167–75.

For all of these reasons, responding to student comments in music history classes can require a measure of diplomacy not needed in other classes. For example, a common technique for encouraging discussion is to follow a student's answer with a question. In the music history lecture this could backfire; if the student is personally, professionally, or aesthetically invested in their answer, then they might hear the teacher as disputing their answer as opposed to accepting and building upon their answer. The teacher may inadvertently cause the student to feel dismissed rather than challenged, which could lead this student (and those listening) to stop speaking in class.

Class Discussion in the School of Music Community

Failing to provide a supportive response to students' comments can create an environment in which students no longer feel personally or socially comfortable, which in turn diminishes their willingness to join in discussion and derive the full benefits from the educational experience.¹⁹ Various scholars of teaching and learning have proposed methodologies or mindsets that can help instructors create and maintain an atmosphere favorable to student participation. Estelle Jorgensen noted that there are two "interconnected principles," justice and mercy, that underlie her approach to evaluating student performance: "justice necessitates dispassionately and carefully weighing and appraising the evidence; mercy requires kindness in remembering how hard-won are human accomplishments and how difficult are the circumstances in which people must sometimes labor."²⁰ In a similar vein Kevin J. Porter drew from philosopher Donald Davidson for the role of charity in teacher-student interactions. For this framework Porter suggested a pedagogy of charity ("which assumes that students are rational beings with mostly true and coherent beliefs") as opposed to a pedagogy of severity ("Shutting down of dialogic possibilities, assigning labels and making corrections instead of asking questions and searching for new answers...").²¹ Both of these methods advocate giving students the benefit of the doubt by respecting the background each student brings to class, acknowledging the effort it took to get where they are, then rewarding attempts to contribute. A similar approach can help music

19. Holly E. Long and Jeffrey T. Coldren, "Interpersonal Influences in Large Lecture-Based Classes: A Socioinstructional Perspective," *College Teaching* 54, no. 2 (2006): 237–43; and Lisa Tsui, "Fostering Critical Thinking through Effective Pedagogy: Evidence from Four Institutional Case Studies," *The Journal of Higher Education* 73, no. 6 (November-December 2002): 740–63.

20. Jorgensen, *Art of Teaching*, 63.

21. Kevin J. Porter, "A Pedagogy of Charity: Donald Davidson and the Student-Negotiated Composition Classroom," *College Composition and Communication* 52, no. 4 (June 2001): 576.

history teachers to respect the diverse musical backgrounds found in their classrooms while recognizing the professional and communal pressure that music majors face. Such an approach can make young musicians feel safer; even if a student offers an answer that must be treated as incorrect, the right presentation can still promote a dialogic standard by separating the answer from the answerer. A carefully handled response makes it clear that the person answering is not diminished even though their answer may be misguided, and also that their musicianship is not being called into doubt.

There are other discipline-specific issues that can influence how answers are handled in the music history classroom. Most young musicians have been studying their instruments or voices for some time prior to entering college. Through years of private lessons and ensemble rehearsals they have evolved distinctive learning styles that can impact the nature of discourse in the classroom. For example, music students tend towards perfectionism more than their colleagues in other disciplines. So many young performers have been drilled into believing that they must put the right notes in the right place to be good musicians. This attitude can carry over to a history lecture, where students now assume that there is only one right answer and that a guess or an opinion is not valuable.

A room full of music majors is also unique for the differences they manifest as well as the similarities they share. While any class will have students of diverse backgrounds and learning styles, a room full of music majors also has specialized experiences, vocabularies, concepts, personalities, and motivations, even though they theoretically operate within the same discipline. As Nettl showed, differences can be based on instrument of choice, musical style preferred, career track, and more. A brass player with marching band experience will have a different perspective on the nature of performance compared to a string player who never had to perform outside in subzero weather. A jazz pianist and a concert pianist may have significantly different concepts as to what “practicing” or “rehearsing” entail. In cases such as this, the difference of perspective might subtly influence the way a question is heard or how an answer might be framed. Modes of discourse are central to community identity.²² While musicians share many basic terms and vocabularies, there are unique concepts, experiences, and perspectives that separate instrumentalists from vocalists, music education majors from composition majors, or jazz players from orchestral performers. A question given to a performance major (who specializes in vocal jazz) and a music education major (who plays cello) may elicit the same basic answer even though the formulation of that answer may sound strikingly different.

22. James Paul Gee, *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses* (London: Taylor and Francis, 1996).

History teachers would do well to consider this multiplicity of perspectives among music majors when seeking ways to provide a better forum for discussion.²³ Any particular idiosyncrasies inherent in young musicians may stifle discussion in certain situations. A trumpet player may have an answer to a question about opera, but feel that a vocalist knows more about such things and is therefore better suited to answer. In situations where conversation lags, it may be that many music majors don't lack for an answer; they may simply believe that they do not have the best answer when compared to their peers from other sub-disciplines. In the competitive environment of a music department, being close is not the same as being right, and such an attitude may be enough to hinder student expression. Clarifying the non-technical or observatory nature of certain questions, and stressing the usefulness of comments from outside of a particular musical orientation, may be necessary to break this mindset. In addition, instructors need to remember that they also have certain biases due to their particular musical backgrounds. Musicologists are a product of the same environment in which their students are working, and it may be that they are unwittingly phrasing their questions or hearing student answers through the filter of their own musical experiences.²⁴

Conclusion

There are many factors to consider when instigating discussion in a classroom. Questions should be chosen that promote continuation as opposed to closure; answers should be handled respectfully and considered carefully; and a follow-up question or comment should take from the previous exchange and move forward in an unambiguous and logical progression. When working with music majors in the history classroom, there are additional factors to be considered. The social and professional dynamics at work in the school of music require that special thought be given to fielding answers by majors. When discussion is not forthcoming, music history teachers should remember the unique apprehension their students may be experiencing. Music majors see themselves as musicians first. Offering an incorrect or misguided response could draw their musicianship into doubt, something that could undermine

23. Colleen M. Conway and Thomas M. Hodgman, *Teaching Music in Higher Education* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), Chapter 3; and Jane W. Davidson, "The Solo Performer's Identity," in MacDonald, et. al., *Musical Identities*, 97–113. See also the essays by Eunmi Shim and Melinda Russell in *Community of Music: An Ethnographic Seminar in Champaign-Urbana*, ed. Tamara Elena Livingston-Isenhour, et al. (Champaign, IL: Elephant and Cat, 1993), 107–19, 159–74.

24. A provocative consideration of some external influences on teacher performance can be found in Gary Spruce, "Music Assessment and the Hegemony of Musical Heritage," in *Issues in Music Teaching*, eds. Chris Philpott and Charles Plummeridge (London: Routledge, 2001), 118–30.

their membership in the community of musicians that is so critical to their identity. For the music major, it may seem better to remain silent than to risk being ostracized from their peers. To overcome this, teachers must show, in both their choice of words and their demeanor, that it is safe for students to answer and that musical opinions are valued in addition to “correct” answers. In addition, instructors should be aware of the subtle diversity found within their specialized students and be willing to accept and make use of different experiential perspectives.

The same can be said of the sensitive nature of aesthetic responses that dominate the music history classroom. Care should be taken to ensure that students do not feel judged when offering an aesthetic response and that their musical tastes can be investigated without threatening their musicianship. Instructors need to be sensitive to the aesthetic nature of their questions and the students’ answers, and clarify the distinction between being right and wrong versus offering a subjective opinion. At the same time teachers must be aware of their own musical backgrounds to be sure that they are not biasing any discussion with their own personal history.

It should be added that the concerns mentioned here are not something that need to dominate a teacher’s thoughts for the duration of the course. Such a pedagogical approach functions well within the notion of instructional scaffolding, wherein prototypical materials or interpersonal support is given to students when first learning new skills or concepts. Students learn from modeling themselves on the expertise presented; these supports are gradually removed as students gain experience and confidence, eventually continuing the process on their own.²⁵ Classroom discussion is like the proverbial snowball rolling downhill in that once a pattern of discourse is established it tends to become self-sustaining. It only takes a few successful exchanges before a discussion is underway and the teacher can step back to assume the role of moderator. After a few classes with successful discussion the students become comfortable, even expectant, of such interactions and instructors may not need to be overly concerned about these issues. If anything, the teacher may need to transfer their focus to the students’ choice of questions, and how students handle each other’s answers. At that point the teacher will have achieved a true community of learners, where all participants are refining their ideas and broadening their horizons through respectful, productive communication.

25. For one discussion of instructional scaffolding, see Bruce Sherin, Brian J. Reiser, and Daniel Edelson, “Scaffolding Analysis: Extending the Scaffolding Metaphor to Learning Artifacts,” *Journal of the Learning Sciences* 13, no. 3 (2004): 387–421.

Toward Jazz's "Official" History: The Debates and Discourses of Jazz History Textbooks

KENNETH E. PROUTY

The emergence of the "new jazz studies" over the last decade has seen an increasingly pointed critique of the historiography of the music, and of the construction of a canonical history of jazz in particular. While the "new jazz studies" does not have a definitive starting point, many attribute it to the emergence of Krin Gabbard's 1995 *Jazz Among the Discourses*, which in the words of one reviewer, represented a "compelling critique of the modernist [jazz] canon."¹ Indeed, Gabbard himself lays out such a critique early in his introduction to the volume, arguing that the blame for the "jazz canon" lies with a desire to legitimize jazz by classicizing it:

All jazz writers are richly aware of the various strains of prejudice that place classical music in a loftier position in the cultural hierarchy. A great deal of jazz writing implicitly or explicitly expresses the demand that jazz musicians be given the same legitimacy as practitioners of the canonical arts.²

Yet for all the hand wringing about the canonical nature of jazz's conventional history, there is very little discussion within "new jazz studies" about the *teaching* of jazz history, aside from the obvious implication that it has followed a largely canonical trajectory. While numerous studies point to the flaws in the canonical approach to jazz, seldom do the same authors advance a strategy for not using it. Anti-canonical arguments generally tend to point to what is missing from the canon—a certain artist, an underrepresented group, a particular sub-style—rather than how to exist without it.

This article is adapted from an expanded discussion of jazz historiography and community in my forthcoming book, *Knowing Jazz: Community, Pedagogy and Canon in the Information Age*, from the University Press of Mississippi. I am grateful to Molly Ryan for her editorial assistance.

1. Ingrid Monson, "Review," *American Music* 15, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 110.

2. Krin Gabbard, "Introduction: The Canon and Its Consequences," in *Jazz Among the Discourses*, ed. Krin Gabbard (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995), 2.

In contrast to the mostly non-musicological bent of the practitioners of “new jazz studies” in Gabbard’s book,³ musicologist Scott DeVeaux’s influential essay “Constructing the Jazz Tradition” links the problems of jazz canon more directly to the conventions of academic history courses and their related publications. While references to the conventional academic “jazz studies”⁴ in Gabbard’s edition are generally oblique,⁵ DeVeaux tackles the issue more directly:

To judge from textbooks aimed at the college market, something like an official history of jazz has taken hold in recent years.... from textbook to textbook, there is substantive agreement on the defining features of each style, the pantheon of great innovators, and the canon of recorded masterpieces.⁶

DeVeaux himself does not critique specific textbooks directly, advancing instead a broad critique of jazz historiography and its canonical tendencies.⁷ Yet textbooks are, as DeVeaux suggests, where the canonical narratives of jazz are on full display, and where they exert a great deal of influence on students and teachers of jazz history. In this essay I will discuss some of the main trends and debates surrounding the emergence of jazz history texts, in particular

3. The late Mark Tucker, himself a musicologically trained jazz scholar, picked up on this point in his review of this work, as well as Gabbard’s companion edition *Representing Jazz*, lamenting the lack of inclusion of musicological perspectives (save for Robert Walser’s essay on Miles Davis in the former). Tucker may himself have popularized the term “new jazz studies” in his essay, comparing it (though not entirely favorably) to the “new musicology” of the early 1990s. See Mark Tucker, “Review,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 51, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 131–48.

4. The term “jazz studies” was, and still is to a large degree, used in American academia to refer specifically to academic jazz performance programs in colleges and universities. When and where the first such use of the term occurred is not clear, but it was in common usage by the mid 1970s, as evidence to Walter Barr’s dissertation, “The Jazz Studies Curriculum,” (PhD diss., Arizona State University, 1974), a study that proved very influential on the establishment of NASM standards in the area. Most current music schools, when they offer jazz majors, confer music degrees in “jazz studies.” Occasionally, such majors might be named as “jazz and contemporary music” or some similar designation, but the term “jazz studies” is still the preferred title for such programs.

5. In fact, Gabbard’s frequent use of this term to refer to an emerging interdisciplinary challenge to the jazz canon is confusing in light of its accepted use in academia. Gabbard makes no mention of the fact that the term was, in effect, already “claimed” to refer to jazz performance programs, and his few scattered references to such programs cloud the issue even more.

6. Scott DeVeaux, “Constructing the Jazz Tradition: Jazz Historiography,” *Black American Literature Forum* 25, no. 3 (Autumn 1991): 525.

7. Despite this, it is not all that difficult to extrapolate that DeVeaux is referring mainly to Frank Tirro’s *Jazz: A History* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1977) and Mark Gridley, *Jazz Styles: History and Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1978), which were, by 1991, firmly established textbooks among teachers of jazz history.

those intended for the "college market" (as opposed to general trade books or scholarly monographs). I suggest that while DeVeaux's argument is essentially correct, the specific nature of such published works reveals a dialectic of attachment to and discomfort with the jazz canon that speaks to the larger issues of how jazz history is taught, or should be taught, in an academic setting. Authors of textbooks must negotiate their relationships to the canon, acknowledging both its flaws and its importance in establishing a framework for the teaching of history. The emergence of a literature devoted to the teaching of jazz history since the late 1970s must be contextualized both within the hegemony of canonical, classically-based approaches to history in musical academia, and the sustained critique of such perspectives in contemporary jazz scholarship.

Setting the Stage: Marshall Stearns, Paul Tanner and the Teaching of the Jazz Canon

Marshall Stearns's *The Story of Jazz*⁸ was arguably the first attempt to create a unified, coherent jazz narrative that tied together the different stylistic trends which had emerged to that point (the mid 1950s). That Stearns took great pains to avoid coming down on any particular side of the fierce critical wars of the 1940s is evident. The result was what John Gennari has labeled a "liberal consensus view" of jazz's development,⁹ a stylistic and critical big tent in which all movements in jazz could be easily explained in relation to each other. Departing from the polemical approaches of Rudi Blesh, Sidney Finkelstein, and others,¹⁰ Stearns's jazz history advanced a common cause of jazz, one that was becoming increasingly vital in the face of a new, rising threat—rock and roll.

For Stearns, the legitimating value of jazz lay in this broad developmental course which paralleled that of the western canon. Like classical music, jazz history was one that could be traced through a logical progression of stylistic development; *this* was why jazz had to be taken seriously. Jazz was said to exist, and must be understood, as a fully formed art with its own path. Perhaps that is Stearns's greatest legacy as an historian, the portrayal of jazz as an art form whose legitimacy is confirmed by the similarity of its trajectory

8. Marshall Stearns, *The Story of Jazz* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1956).

9. John Gennari, *Blowing Hot and Cool: Jazz and its Critics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 152.

10. See Rudi Blesh, *Shining Trumpets: A History of Jazz* (New York: Knopf, 1946); Sidney Finkelstein, *Jazz: A Peoples' Music* (New York: Citadel Press, 1948). Though Blesh completely ignores contemporary developments (intentionally so), his book is among the first to use the term "history of jazz" so explicitly.

with those of other established art forms. It is this broad view of jazz that has shaped the core of legitimating arguments about jazz nearly since its inception, positioning jazz as “America’s Classical Music.” Stearns merely formalized it and gave it academic grounding. Ironically, his identity as a non-music scholar may have given *more* credence to this idea; if a Yale educated scholar of Chaucer could find artistic value in jazz, then maybe it really *did* have value. In the same way that early jazz educators created methods of instruction that “spoke the language” of musical academia, so did Stearns “speak the language” of historical canon, and his ability to apply it to jazz is his most important legacy.

That Stearns’s work provided a foundation for modern jazz historiography is clear; general history texts written since *The Story of Jazz* track remarkably close to his narrative. What is less apparent is the degree to which his work is based in earlier scholarship. Gennari argues that Stearns was notable for his refusing to take sides in the critical debates that characterized jazz in the previous decade.¹¹ But that does not mean that he did not draw upon arguments that were made in these critical discourses. As a developing scholar at Yale, Stearns was influenced by figures in a number of fields, establishing what is best described as an interdisciplinary approach to jazz history. As William Kenney notes, Stearns “consulted with” a number of academics during his graduate years at Yale, gaining some expertise in anthropology, sociology and musicology from faculty members in different areas.¹² And with this eclectic approach, not dogmatically tied to musicology, criticism or his own chosen academic career in English, Stearns was able to pull together numerous perspectives to form a consensus narrative. In his discussion of African influences, Stearns echoes much the work of Blesh and his revivalist peers, though without the primitivist trappings.¹³ But modern developments also form part of his story. The core narrative that links older and newer approaches to the music tracks remarkably close to that of Barry Ulanov’s 1952 *History of Jazz in America*,¹⁴ with perhaps less emphasis on modern developments, but generally covering the same territory. In short, Stearns does not reinvent the wheel—he just makes it spin better. By advocating for an inclusive view of jazz, Stearns may be arguing that jazz, in facing an increasingly bleak commercial future with the rise of rock and roll, cannot afford the kinds of divisive debates that took place in the 1940s. Of course, such debates would emerge again with the development an experimental, avant-garde

11. Gennari, *Blowing Hot and Cool*, 152.

12. William Kenney, *Recorded Music in American Life: The Phonograph and Popular Memory, 1890–1945* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 16.

13. For a more detailed discussion of primitivism in early jazz criticism, see Ted Gioia, “Jazz and the Primitivist Myth,” *The Musical Quarterly* 73, no. 1 (1989): 130–43.

14. Barry Ulanov, *A History of Jazz in America* (New York: Viking Press, 1952).

approach to jazz at nearly the same time *The Story of Jazz* was hitting the bookshelf.

Though Stearns was himself a pioneer in the teaching of college-level jazz history, creating a renowned series of courses at NYU and the New School, his text does not seem to be specifically intended to be used in a classroom setting. If anything, it would seem that the opposite was true; Stearns's text flowed from his classroom experiences.¹⁵ Paul Tanner, a jazz trombonist with Glenn Miller and later professor at UCLA, would produce (along with Maurice Gerow) *A Study of Jazz* in 1964,¹⁶ what could be rightly seen as the first textbook produced specifically for a collegiate classroom audience. Tanner's jazz history classes at UCLA were the stuff of legend since their inception in 1958, a staple on campus for many years that regularly drew hundreds of students per session. The narrative of Tanner and Gerow's text follows that of Stearns very closely, breaking up the subject into similar style-defined sections (though Tanner and Gerow give more extensive coverage to later developments, as might be expected). Speaking directly to the use of Stearns's book as a classroom tool, Tanner writes:

The Stearns book was more popular before there were others on the market. The consensus of opinion is that Stearns did excellent research, especially in the prejazz area, although he did lack understanding of more modern idioms.¹⁷

Stearns's untimely death in 1966 precluded any further revision to the narrative to include or expand on these more modern idioms, thus limiting its applicability as a classroom text for future generations of students and teachers. Tanner's book thus serves as an important step in the move from jazz history as a critical and scholarly pursuit into one where applicability for pedagogy is of prime concern. With the canon more or less established by the

15. Syllabi for Stearns's lectures are widely available, and demonstrate an organizational scheme that is remarkably similar to many conventional jazz history syllabi today. For one example, see Marshall Stearns, "Jazz in the Classroom," in *Keeping Time: Readings in Jazz History*, ed. Robert Walser (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 195–98.

16. Paul Tanner and Maurice Gerow, *A Study in Jazz* (Dubuque, IA: W. C. Browne, 1964).

17. Paul Tanner, "Jazz Goes to College" *Music Educators Journal* 57, no. 7 (March 1971): 106. Tanner notes in this essay that five texts seemed to dominate the market at the time, those by Stearns, Schuller (*Early Jazz: Its Roots and Early Development*), Andre Hodier (*Jazz: Its Evolution and Essence*), Joachim Berendt (*Jazz Book*), and his own text with Gerow. Two observations are in order regarding this passage. First, Tanner provides no specific documentation for this assertion, nor explanation of any sample or survey size. It may well have been an informal poll of colleagues. Second, he points out flaws in each of these texts, including, remarkably, his own (noting that the included musical examples might "frighten" some people—he is not clear as to whether he refers to students or teachers).

1970s, writers of general jazz histories could now begin to interpret it for use in the classroom.¹⁸

The Battle Over Textbooks: Frank Tirro and the “Jazz Grout”

Following on the heels of these works, the introduction of newly minted texts in the late 1970s would profoundly affect jazz’s historiographic discourse. The introduction of Frank Tirro’s *Jazz: A History*¹⁹ was no insignificant event in the emerging field of jazz scholarship. Jazz studies had been, to this point, without a musicologically-based general study of jazz history, and Tirro, a professor of music at Duke (he would later move to Yale), sought to fill that void. Much of the anticipation of (and subsequent reception to) Tirro’s text was likely due to its publisher. W. W. Norton was (and still is) regarded as one of the industry leaders in the production of academic textbooks in music. Norton is perhaps best known in musicology for its publication of Donald Jay Grout’s 800-pound gorilla of musical canon, *A History of Western Music*,²⁰ for decades the central text in the teaching of music history in undergraduate music programs across the United States. Known (sometimes with derision) simply as “Grout,” this text has been a stalwart of music curricula across the U.S. since its first appearance in 1960. Even after Grout’s death in 1987, Norton has continued to produce this seminal text, first under the guidance of Claude V. Palisca, and currently in association with J. Peter Burkholder. While individual teachers and students may take issue with certain themes and conclusions the authors have reached, no one can deny the enormous influence of the text, nor its role in codifying and solidifying the historical canon in musical academia.

For many who anticipated its arrival, Tirro’s *Jazz* could potentially provide the still nascent field of jazz studies with a similar unifying, codifying historical text around which to rally, a “jazz Grout” as one of my former professors

18. Not all general jazz history books are explicitly marketed as textbooks, of course. In his review of jazz history texts, Paul Tanner notes that many books (he refers specifically to those by Stearns and Schuller) are not well suited to the classroom. More recently, historical texts by Ted Gioia and Alyn Shipton have presented detailed, thorough assessments of jazz history, and have in some ways provided alternatives to the canonical narratives which dominate the textbook market. Shipton’s exhaustive work is notable for its attention to jazz outside the U.S. (which is perhaps understandable given that Shipton is British), while Gioia’s work is more conventional in approach, though it is (like Shipton’s book) exceptionally thoughtful and well written, and fairly detailed. Both books have seen somewhat limited adoption as classroom texts.

19. Frank Tirro, *Jazz: A History* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1977).

20. Donald Jay Grout, *A History of Western Music* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1960); the most recent edition is J. Peter Burkholder, Donald J. Grout, and Claude V. Palisca, *A History of Western Music*, 8th ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 2009).

called it. Like Grout, Tirro was a dyed-in-the-wool historical musicologist. And, like Grout, he was primarily (at least as academic training is concerned) a specialist in the western canon.²¹ Thus, Tirro's background might have given his efforts more intellectual heft, as now "real" musicologists (as opposed to interdisciplinary scholars such as Stearns, musician-teachers such as Tanner, jack-of-all-trades scholars such as Gunther Schuller, or critics like Leonard Feather or Barry Ulanov) were beginning to turn their attention to jazz studies, and not simply to attack it. Tirro explains, in the preface to *Jazz: A History*, the need for such a text, and how his work, arising from musicology, filled a particular void in jazz writing:

The history of jazz is a fascinating subject, and a variety of writers—musicians, scholars, enthusiasts, journalists—have treated it with love and respect. Of all the works presently available, however, no single volume offers the reader an analysis and interpretation of jazz, both historical and musical, which incorporates recent research from allied fields—sociology, cultural anthropology, and American history—as well as from music history and theory.²²

He also notes some of the difficulties faced by historians in confronting the vastness of the topic of jazz history, as well as its implications for creating a canon in jazz history:

Historians try to be objective, but this writer was ultimately forced to include and emphasize those aspects of the historical development which seemed to him to be the most important, most representative, and most germane to present-day readers.²³

Tirro's comments point to a tension between bias and objectivity that often shades historical study; he *wants* to be objective, but there are certain accommodations that have to be made to make the study manageable. This is a fair point, but there is one problem—many of Tirro's choices, those that seem to simply strike *him* as important, are the same choices made by previous scholars. In other words, he's "choosing" what is already established in the canon. It is entirely possible that Tirro might independently arrive at the conclusion that his selections of artists, recordings and stylistic delineation are indeed important, but I am skeptical, if for no other reason than for the fact that he makes extensive use of the *Smithsonian Collection of Classic Jazz (SCCJ)* throughout his narrative.²⁴ He did not need to choose who was important; the

21. For example see Frank Tirro, "Giovanni Spataro's Choirbooks in the Archive of San Petronio in Bologna," PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1974.

22. Tirro, *Jazz: A History*, xvii.

23. Tirro, *Jazz: A History*, xvii.

24. It is worth taking some time to consider the appearance of the *SCCJ* and its impact on the development of the jazz history canon. First published in 1973, and later revised, this set, assembled by Martin Williams, has been one of the primary forces behind the creation of a recorded jazz canon. The first significant jazz anthology on record, the *SCCJ* has been the

very reliance on this collection made the choice moot. Still, it is interesting that such a canonically focused work would include this type of qualifier, the “I really struggled with these choices about whom to discuss” type of argument, all the while emphasizing those who are in the canon. Thus, Tirro places his work within an implicit debate about the jazz canon, and he sets his own bar for scholarship relatively high. It is his expressed intent to make his own work distinct from previously published histories of jazz via an explicitly *musicological* approach. To say that this project seems ambitious might be an understatement, and it seems clear that Tirro’s intent is to produce, at some level, the “jazz Grout,” a textbook that would, it was hoped, finally give jazz historians a work of substantial depth and scholarship that would provide a unifying historical narrative. This was, to be sure, an ambitious project—one that had the potential to re-shape the teaching of jazz history in American academia.

Unfortunately for Tirro, the reaction to his textbook was far from enthusiastic, especially among the handful of figures who by the late 1970s were beginning to establish enclaves of jazz scholarship within music departments nationwide. In a crushing review of the book in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Lawrence Gushee attacked Tirro’s book on a number of fronts. Gushee, like Tirro, possessed impressive credentials in musicology, receiving his PhD from Yale (before Tirro’s tenure there) where he was (again like Tirro) a specialist in early music.²⁵ Acknowledging Norton’s “unique rela-

subject of both praise and scorn among critics and scholars, and it is difficult to overstate its importance in the development of jazz history texts at least to the 1990s. Many reviewers point to the collection’s immediate applications for jazz history teachers. John C. Nelson notes, “if you are teaching a jazz history or jazz theory course...this is one album no [jazz] collection should be without.” (John C. Nelson, “The Smithsonian Collection of Classic Jazz: A Review” *Black Music Research Journal* 1 [1980]: 112.) And while Krin Gabbard has been deeply critical of the canonizing effect of collections such as the SCCJ, even he acknowledges that it was perhaps the “only major listening text for an introductory course in jazz history. Many critics have second guessed Martin Williams’s choices for what ought to be included in the set of recordings, but as of early 1995 no one has undertaken to replace it with a comparable anthology of favored recordings.” (Gabbard, *Discourses*, 13.) Others, however, have been less positive. David Schiff expresses the attitudes of many in pointing out problems with Williams’s “conscious and unconscious prejudices” in his selection of music for inclusion, the overwhelmingly male roster of artists, and the problem of “its very excellence.” (David Schiff, “Riffing the Canon,” *Notes* 64, no. 2 [December 2007]: 220.) With respect to the last point, Schiff argues that the anthology’s emphasis on the exemplary “took the lumps and bumps and uncertainties out of jazz history—a field marked almost from the beginning with passionate disputes between its followers, all now neatly resolved and forgotten.” (Schiff, “Riffing the Canon,” 220.)

25. Whereas Tirro’s dissertation was a study of a renaissance musical source, Gushee’s was a critical edition of an early music theory text; see Lawrence A. Gushee, “The *Musica disciplina* of Aurelian of Réomé: A Critical Text and Commentary,” PhD diss., Yale University, 1963.

tionship to American musicological scholarship," an obvious nod to Grout, Gushee suggests that the "implicit promise held out by such a conjunction is, in my opinion, not fulfilled."²⁶ Highlighting what he contends are mistakes of fact, interpretation and editing, Gushee is unsparing in his criticism, pointing out specific problems such as the lack of critical perspective, inaccuracies with transcriptions used in the text, inadequate fact-checking, and erroneous documentation. Gushee begins the concluding section of his review by saying:

To sum up: I find *Jazz: A History* an enormous disappointment, particularly because for the past ten years at least there have been appearing more specialized works which are superior in standards of scholarship and clear expression. It may be that, notwithstanding the buzzing swarm of incorrect or imprecisely stated facts and the contradictions and ambivalence of Tirro's broader historical or sociological interpretations, *Jazz: A History* will be found to be a "serviceable" textbook. For myself, I do not believe that compromises of this sort benefit education or public understanding at any level.²⁷

That Gushee would suggest that some teachers (which presumably would not include himself) might find the book "serviceable" in their classrooms conjures up the phrase "close enough for jazz," an oft-heard colloquialism within musical academia, even within jazz studies itself, though in an ironic fashion. What is at issue here, I suggest, is not simply a literary critique. Gushee seems genuinely concerned that a text such as Tirro's, coming from a publisher like Norton, might actually do damage to the cause of jazz studies in the long run. First impressions are important, and if this is the "best" that jazz musicology can produce, then the discipline may have a serious problem.

Tirro himself addressed these criticisms in a published response in the same journal (which was presumably solicited by the editors, as is often the case with such scathing reviews). He challenges some of Gushee's specific points, such as Tirro's use of the word "agrarian" as a demographic descriptor for 1870s America, or differences in the appearance of the text and trade editions (which Tirro argues demonstrates carelessness on the part of Gushee in reviewing the different editions), and also addresses Gushee's criticisms of his use of transcriptions. Most notably, he directly challenges Gushee's musicological bona fides, suggesting that Gushee's writing is characterized by "journalistic prose [that] can be entertaining and may be appropriate for newspaper record reviews and record jacket blurbs."²⁸ Late in the letter, Tirro writes:

26. Lawrence Gushee, "Review," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 31, no. 3 (Autumn 1978): 535.

27. Gushee, "Review," 539–40.

28. Frank Tirro, "To the Editor of the *Journal*," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 32, no. 3 (Autumn 1979): 596.

He [Gushee], together with Martin Williams and his associates, represents a school of thought and writing which has dominated American jazz criticism for several decades.... My book calls into question many of their published notions and even raises doubt about their expertise; it challenges them to write in a different way.²⁹

The “different way” of which Tirro speaks would seem to be, from his perspective, a more thorough musicological approach that is not based in what he sees as an inferior mode of writing and research, which is ironic given his book’s emphasis on using recordings from Williams’s *Smithsonian Collection of Classic Jazz*.

Gushee was not alone in his negative response to *Jazz: A History*. In the “other” major musicological journal, *The Musical Quarterly*, James Dapogny calls *Jazz: A History* “a seriously flawed work, with many errors of fact and, on a different level, problems of conception and depth of penetration of the subject.”³⁰ In another review in *Black Perspective in Music*, Lewis Porter also harshly criticized Tirro. Writing in a review that also included discussions of new texts on jazz by Leroy Ostransky, Jerry Coker, and Mark Gridley (resulting a sort of “state of late 1970s jazz scholarship”), Porter argues that Tirro’s misinterpretations of King Oliver’s “Dippermouth Blues” solo suggests that “[He] is not adequately familiar with one of the most celebrated solos in all of jazz.”³¹ Porter’s assertion that “Such errors...do not belong in published works and would not be tolerated in comparable works in, say, the classical-music field,”³² lend credence to the perception that scholarly works in jazz were perhaps not taken as seriously by some in musicology. He continues, “We who know the music well enough to realize its worth have a responsibility to help the field by producing work that is as flawless as possible.”³³ This last sentence is telling, with Porter setting himself and other like-minded jazz scholars “who know the music” apart from Tirro, who by implication does not.³⁴

It might be easy to simply dismiss these debates as intellectual posturing or professional infighting, but there are serious issues at stake in the development of a musicologically-based jazz scholarship at this point in time. The late 1970s was a period in which jazz was in decline, at least in terms of public

29. Tirro, “To the Editor,” 597.

30. James Dapogny, “Review of Books,” *The Musical Quarterly* 64, no. 3 (July 1978): 407.

31. Lewis Porter, “Book Reviews,” *Black Perspective in Music* 6, no. 2 (Autumn 1978): 234.

32. Porter, “Book Reviews,” 234.

33. Porter, “Book Reviews,” 237.

34. In another negative review, Martin Williams writes that “On page after page, the book contains the most elementary mistakes of date and fact.” Such negative treatment was an especially cruel blow, as so much of Tirro’s text had been based on Williams’s *Smithsonian Collection*, that most canonical set of recordings whose influence pervades jazz studies to this day. See Martin Williams, “Reaction to *Jazz: A History*,” *Music Educators Journal* 65, no. 8 (April 1979): 15.

reception of the music, and, depending on whose perspective you align with, in decline artistically as well. The perception was, for many, that jazz was dying, or was already dead, as Miles Davis famously declared.³⁵ The appearance of jazz-rock fusion represented for many a degradation of the jazz tradition, a "selling out" to commercial interests, and likely spurred on a sentiment that "real" jazz needed to be preserved. Jazz, it was thought, was becoming a thing of the past, and an accurate record of its most important practitioners and developments was crucial to its preservation. While we can see in retrospect that jazz was not about to become extinct, it is not difficult to imagine in the mid 1970s why such a perspective might be widespread. Jazz had recently lost arguably its two biggest names, Armstrong and Ellington, and had been thoroughly displaced by rock, soul, and disco as Americans' popular music of choice. Historical efforts in jazz were aimed at preserving the legacy of the music (nowhere in any of the critical reviews do the authors chastise Tirro for neglecting to mention current developments), and few could have foreseen the renaissance of mainstream jazz in the 1980s. These debates would shape the legacy of jazz in what probably looked increasingly like a post-jazz world, and they are crucial to the development of a focused, musicologically sound approach to the music's preservation.³⁶

The Market Expands

Given the relatively limited number of jazz history texts that were in existence at the time of DeVaux's historiographic essay, it is not terribly difficult to establish just which ones he is referring to. DeVaux actually talks very little about the main college textbooks of the time, despite his invoking them to set up his discussion of the canonical narrative of jazz history. Besides Tirro's book, two other college-level publications dominated the market by the end of the 1980s: Mark Gridley's *Jazz Styles: History and Analysis* (Prentice Hall),³⁷

35. This statement has been attributed to Davis in several different contexts. The PBS series *Jazz* by Ken Burns quotes Davis as saying, in 1975, "Jazz is dead, the music of the museum." Davis was also quoted as saying this in relation to Wynton Marsalis, telling an interviewer in 1986 that "The past is dead. *Jazz is dead.*" (Emphasis in original.) See Nick Kent, "Lightening Up with the Prince of Darkness," in *Miles on Miles: Interviews and Encounters with Miles Davis*, edited by Paul Maher, Jr. and Michael K. Dorr (Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 2009), 260.

36. W. W. Norton published a second edition of *Jazz: A History* in 1992. Tirro very briefly and indirectly addressed the criticisms of his work, writing in a new introduction that he had "rethought" many views espoused in the first edition. "Most remain firm," he states, but "a few have been modified." (xix) This second edition was the last version of Tirro's text to date.

37. Mark Gridley, *Jazz Styles: History and Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1978); the 10th edition of the full text was published in 2010 and the 6th edition of the abridged *Concise Guide to Jazz*, was also published in 2010. All following quotations from the text are taken from the first edition.

and Donald Megill and Richard Demory's *Introduction to Jazz History* (Prentice Hall).³⁸ But what in these texts constitutes the "official history" of which DeVeaux writes?

Gridley's book is arguably the most widely used jazz history and appreciation text on the academic market, and its longevity is evidenced by the fact that it has recently seen the release of a tenth edition. Gridley, a jazz musician and professor of psychology (i.e., not a musicologist or historian by training or profession as opposed to Tirro and Gushee) at Heidelberg College in Ohio, presents an overview of jazz history that focuses exclusively upon characteristics of different styles and genres, rather than on historical or personal narrative. Little attention is paid to the contextual development of jazz styles, or to the ways in which jazz reflected issues of identity or historical circumstance. One of the most notable features of Gridley's text is his emphasis on breaking down selected listening examples, in which Gridley guides the listener through a selected set of recorded examples that are, like Tirro's book, were keyed largely to examples drawn from the *SCCJ* (at least in earlier editions). In finding a place for his own work in the emerging literature, Gridley is both pragmatic and philosophical. On the one hand, he casts his work as eminently usable; the first words of his preface note that he intends the book to be "a guide to appreciating jazz as well as an introduction to most styles which have been documented on records."³⁹ As a text intended for "high school through adult level readers,"⁴⁰ who are not music specialists, Gridley seems to be striving to reach perhaps a wider audience than Tirro, and one that is perhaps less knowledgeable about music; this is not a "jazz Grout" to be sure. Nevertheless, his book was widely adopted by teachers of jazz history courses throughout the United States, as he notes in his introductions to later editions.

Gridley speaks to the nature of jazz education and scholarship in the late 1970s by noting that the "American colleges and government have shown increasing interest in jazz" during this period, and that his book is "part of that development," arising from his own work teaching jazz history.⁴¹ Speaking to the ideas of canon and the historical development of jazz generally, Gridley writes:

Although it is very difficult to generalize about music, certain recognized styles, such as swing, bop, and West Coast, can be described. Some of the following chapters are devoted to important musicians like Duke Ellington and John Coltrane. These chapters are not biographies. They are descriptions of styles as important as those

38. Donald Megill and Richard Demory, *Introduction to Jazz History* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984); the 6th edition was published in 2004.

39. Gridley, *Jazz Styles*, vii.

40. Gridley, *Jazz Styles*, vii.

41. Gridley, *Jazz Styles*, 4.

named for such "chronological" eras as swing and bop. It just happened that certain important styles became attached more to musician names than to era names....

Much of the text is organized chronologically. Although I do not think a knowledge of jazz history is essential to the appreciation of jazz, an historical approach provides the most expedient means of organizing a wide range of diverse styles.... Many players fail to fit precisely in any single style. But a particular performer's playing often will have enough in common with a given style to justify mentioning him in the discussion which treats the style....

Although styles tend to flow one from another, jazz history cannot be accurately described as a single stream, evolving from Dixieland to swing to bop, and so forth.⁴²

Gridley thus outlines both the problems and advantages of canon. While a single historical narrative cannot explain all developments in jazz, it can still provide a useful, even necessary framework for conceptualizing its evolution. If Gridley's comments here seem contradictory, they probably are; they are a reflection of the relationship between the establishment of canon and its application in actual classroom settings. When Gridley's text first appeared in 1978, it was reviewed by Lewis Porter in the same essay as his blistering attack on the work of Frank Tirro. Fortunately for Gridley, his work fares much better than the other texts considered in the essay; Porter calls it "admirably complete and well-organized." In summing up his assessment of Gridley's work, Porter writes that the book "may be the best all-around text on the market, and it certainly contains the best history of jazz since 1950."⁴³ Yet Porter himself would seem to have some sense of lingering dissatisfaction with the state of textbook publishing in jazz history, a point I shall return to later.

Gridley's text certainly represents a different approach than that of Tirro, whose intent to create a comprehensive historical narrative is clear. For Gridley, the experience of jazz for students is one that is based squarely on stylistic analysis derived from directed listening. The various editions of his text are well known for the inclusion of lists of significant musicians, representing both specific genres and more nebulously defined classifications. One list, for example, offers us "A Few of the many Hard Bop Style Musicians," though Gridley's definition of "few" is open to debate—there are over 100 musicians on this particular list, sub-categorized by instrument. Other lists include "A Few of the Many Trumpeters Influenced by Miles Davis," "Some of the Many Musicians Who Have Improvised Without Preset Chord Progressions," or "A Few of the Many Musicians Who Have Been Important to Basie." Like his lists, Gridley's narrative of style is based on clearly defined stylistic criteria, which he makes plain in each chapter, and often re-emphasizes in the form of inset boxes which compare styles or musicians (cool vs. hard bop, or the

42. Gridley, *Jazz Styles*, 4–5.

43. Porter, "Book Review," 237.

trombone playing of J. J. Johnson vs. Curtis Fuller, for example). This type of factual detail as presented in the book is, in some cases, overwhelming—is it realistic that any student would remember all of the musicians in one of Gridley’s lists? But that is probably not the point; such information is intended to give the student a starting point, rather than the final word on the topic. Still, the lack of attention to social and historical context in Gridley’s work is remarkable, especially considering its wide adoption as a standard text in the field. Even in more recent editions, this narrative of name, style and sound is remarkably similar to its first manifestation.

Tirro’s and Gridley’s works might be seen to reflect two very different approaches to the study of jazz history in the late 1970s. Tirro’s approach is encyclopedic, reflective of the types of detailed, dense study that characterized musicology of the time. Aimed at faculty members and their students, the text would likely be considered inappropriate for general audiences. In contrast, Gridley’s book is less of an exercise in “musicology” per se, but rather an attempt to create a comprehensive approach for the more casual listener, one who might be enrolled in a basic jazz appreciation course. His incorporation of listening guides, particularly in subsequent editions, speaks to this idea. Gridley’s listening guides not only direct students to what they are listening to (i.e., the great masterworks of the canon), but what to listen *for* (i.e., why they *belong* in the canon).

As jazz gained an increasingly important place in academia in the late 1970s, the disparity between two potential audiences, those comprised of specialists studying music (or even jazz studies specifically) and the general audience whose exposure to jazz might be more limited, was becoming more apparent. Jazz studies programs, as well as courses aimed at specialized jazz studies majors, increased dramatically during this period. Tirro’s text seems aimed clearly at the former, while Gridley makes a play for a longstanding audience for jazz appreciation, following in the tradition of authors such as Paul Tanner, whose book *Jazz* was itself developed for the author’s own large jazz appreciation lectures at UCLA. But despite differences in approach, writing, and their target audiences, both of these texts make many of the same assumptions about canon, the importance of artists deemed to be significant, and the stylistic delineations that have driven much of the conventional jazz narrative. For each, canon is seemingly negotiated, as both men’s statements indicate. And yet, both men seem to follow narratives that are eminently canonical in structure.

Of course, the economic realities of academia also meant that in many cases, there was *not* a distinction between specialist-oriented and general-interest jazz courses (in fact, this remains the case in many situations). Appearing several years after the initial publication of Gridley’s text, Megill and Demory’s *Introduction to the History of Jazz* is less comprehensive than Tirro’s

text, but more overtly historical than Gridley's, and certainly more attuned to placing jazz within the context of significant events in American culture. The authors purport to employ an even-handed, non-canonical approach to the subject, stating in the Preface that "we cannot say one performer is more important than another, and have had a difficult time choosing which performers to discuss."⁴⁴ This is a perplexing comment, as the writing of any historical text either necessitates such choices, or relies simply on a pre-existing narrative. What is important here, however, is the statement itself—the authors are expressing a discomfort with canon, trying to present what they are doing as an alternative to it. For them, at least as far as this statement is concerned, jazz history is a messy, confused topic that is open to debate and interpretation. Yet a scan of the table of contents belies this sentiment, as sections are devoted to discussions of Armstrong, Morton, Ellington, Parker, Monk, Davis, Coltrane, and other canonically established musicians whose work is seemingly deemed more important than that of other players. In fact, there is little in the text that does not support the "official history" of which DeVeaux writes; the book could be seen as a major source of that narrative.⁴⁵

Take, for example, the discussion of early genres. Megill and Demory, like most other authors, treat blues, work songs, and other forms pre-dating jazz as contributing to its early development. But these genres are often treated in an ahistorical manner, as if all blues were some how "pre-jazz." Blues is positioned here as a pre-cursor to jazz despite the fact the many of the blues genres discussed were, in fact, contemporary to or later than early jazz groups. The discussion of "work songs" is similarly placed in an antecedent position in the text, but the section's focus on the music of Leadbelly as an exemplar of the tradition, whose popularity occurred only after jazz had been well established, undercuts the flow of an historical narrative; so does the reliance on Robert Johnson as the epitome of the country blues as he, like Leadbelly, achieved his greatest recognition only after the popularization of swing in the mid 1930s.⁴⁶ Whatever Johnson's contributions were to popular music and jazz, he certainly was not personally influential on the development of early jazz in New Orleans. In the discussion of "City Blues," Megill and Demory likewise present a conventional evolutionary narrative, stating that "City blues replaced the intimacy of country blues with a refinement and sophistication

44. Megill and Demory, *Introduction to Jazz History*, vii.

45. And it was, of course, widely available by the time DeVeaux's essay was written.

46. Johnson has been the subject of a good deal of revisionist scholarship in recent years, most notably through the work of Elijah Wald, who argues in *Escaping the Delta: Robert Johnson and the Invention of the Blues* (New York: Amistad, 2004) that the narrative of Johnson's influence was constructed in the 1960s as more and more white rock musicians "discovered" his music.

that held audiences and played on their feelings.”⁴⁷ This neglects the fact that the first country blues recordings appeared only after the early “classic” recordings of Mamie Smith and others, and were in many ways a response to them.⁴⁸

Discussions of jazz genres themselves are also problematic in their simplicity of narrative. In the chapter on bebop, Megill and Demory begin:

Only rarely has a musical era paralleled the career of one individual. Bebop was one of those rarities. It is linked to Charlie Parker, who presided at its beginning and rise to preeminence.⁴⁹

There are several problems with this account, most notably that Parker did not “[preside] at its beginning;” there were many early leaders of the movement, such as Dizzy Gillespie, Charlie Christian, Thelonious Monk, Kenny Clarke, Coleman Hawkins, and a host of others.⁵⁰ A statement like this is particularly awkward in light of the authors’ assertion that “we cannot say one performer is more important than another.” Here, they are clearly saying Parker is more important than, say, Dizzy Gillespie, whose photo graces the first page of the chapter on bebop, but whose contributions to the genre are barely mentioned in it (only Parker and Monk are discussed in depth). Equally little attention is given to the social and cultural milieu which helped give rise to jazz; the unique musical and social climates of New Orleans, the importance of World War II to the changing jazz scene in the 1940s, or the fostering of political consciousness among many free jazz musicians of the 1960s. These are glaring omissions for a book that seeks to explore a genre whose practitioners “have been influenced by social and historical forces peculiar to America.”⁵¹ The failure to properly contextualize jazz’s development, either through misplaced discussions of pre-jazz genres (as in the discussion of blues) or a failure to follow through on a pledge to provide thorough discussions of historical environment (as with bebop) leaves us with a text that makes a specious claim to questioning the canon. While the authors note both the difficulty of choosing which artists to discuss and the problems inherent in contextualizing the music within the social and cultural environment of the day, the book reflects neither of these things.

47. Megill and Demory, *Introduction to the History of Jazz*, 19–20.

48. See Wald, as well as Charles Keil, “People’s Music Comparatively: Style and Stereotype, Class and Hegemony,” *Dialectical Anthropology* 10, no. 1–2 (July 1985): 119–30 for more detailed discussions of these issues.

49. Megill and Demory, *Introduction*, 119.

50. See DeVaux’s *Birth of Bebop: A Social and Musical History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997) for further discussion.

51. Megill and Demory, *Introduction*, vii.

This is not simply a matter of pointing out flaws in a source—these issues have profound implications for the historiography of jazz as it is evolving toward a solidified, unified narrative of the music's development. No one can seriously question the influence of blues in jazz (take for instance any of the literally hundreds of blues-based jazz recordings from throughout the genre's history). But its treatment in such narratives, while supporting a canonical version of jazz's pre-history, misses critical points in the relationship *between* blues and jazz. What is important to remember is that blues is a both *an influence on jazz* and *a parallel tradition to jazz*, and the two genres have been mutually reinforcing throughout their histories. As much as blues "gave" jazz certain melodic inflections and formal structure, jazz "gave" blues certain modes of performance practice; the classic (city) blues of the 1920s owes a profound debt to jazz, as evidenced by the frequent employment of jazz musicians on record dates by blues singers. What is most troubling about the way in which a history such as the one advanced by Megill and Demory is that such critical perspectives are not offered to the student. The specific connections between blues and jazz are never really explored, and readers are left with a sense that blues, because it comes before New Orleans in the text, is an "earlier" form. The lack of a critique of such canonical perspectives can be seen in many such texts, but is all the more striking given the authors' claims to an alternate way of understanding the genre.

Taken together, these texts present a consistent narrative structure for the history of jazz. In these works, jazz history is seen as a logical, flowing developmental narrative, in which stylistic trends are organized within the framework of decade-defined periods (i.e., early jazz in the 1920s, swing in the 1930s, bebop in the 1940s, and so forth). This basic historical narrative has become arguably the most commonly used method of organizing jazz's history into more manageable units.

Critiquing the Canon, or Canonizing the Critique?

In Lewis Porter's review of Tirro's and Gridley's texts, the juxtaposition of these two sources is notable in that as bad as he believes Tirro's book to be, his praise of Gridley's book seems to indicate that this might be the jazz history book that will carry the field into academic acceptance. To a large degree, he was right, as the widespread adoption of Gridley's book probably did much to help solidify both the emerging academic jazz canon, and the ability of potential jazz history teachers to prepare clear, cogent course materials. In fact, Gridley himself became something of an authority on the pedagogy of jazz history during the 1980s, publishing a guide for potential jazz history instructors

called *How to Teach Jazz History* in 1984.⁵² This spiral-bound book offers a wealth of specific pedagogical advice on the ins and outs of classroom teaching that is clearly aimed at potential jazz history teachers who have never been in front of a large group of students in a classroom lecture. What is notably absent from Gridley's "how to" guide is any discussion of how teachers make the decisions about precisely what to teach, about how to approach the canon. In some sense, this is moot, as Gridley undoubtedly designed *How to Teach Jazz History* to be adopted by teachers who were already using his own *Jazz Styles* text (which by 1984 was already in a second edition). His brief chapter on "Breaking Jazz History into Comprehensible Pieces" is concerned not with the division of jazz history into stylistic segments, or advice on how to approach the canon, but with developing listening skills and a vocabulary to talk about music.

Despite his glowing review of Gridley's book, Lewis Porter seems ultimately to have been unsatisfied with the choices given to him as a teacher by the textbook market, because in 1993 he and colleague Michael Ullman produced yet another jazz history book, *Jazz: From Its Origins to the Present*. In the Preface, Porter and Ullman write:

We began this book in 1982 in response to what we—as fans, educators, authors, and, in Porter's case, a sometime performer—saw as a need for a literate, accurate, and up-to-date one-volume history of jazz and its major figures. We wanted that book to be musically sophisticated, inclusive, and unbiased..., but more importantly, to give a fair representation of the music that had the greatest impact on musicians and on the general public. When faced with a choice between an obscure personal favorite and a historically significant piece, we have opted for the latter.⁵³

There are several points we should consider in reading this passage. In 1982, the texts on the market included those by Stearns, Tanner, Tirro and Gridley,

52. Mark Gridley, *How to Teach Jazz History* (Manhattan, Kansas: National Association of Jazz Educators, 1984). Gridley's prominence as an authority on teaching jazz history is ironic in light of his background in psychology, rather than musicology. Given jazz history's penchant for attracting "interdisciplinary" scholars (recall that Marshall Stearns was a professor of English, coming to jazz through his work as a record collector and columnist), it should not be entirely surprising. This makes the Tirro/Gushee debate even more pressing, as musicologists had to contend not only with issues of disciplinary approach and method, but with the predominance of non-musicological perspectives in the teaching of jazz history. Gridley's anointing as the best representative of jazz history pedagogy by the National Association of Jazz Educators (a society which lasted from 1968 to 2008, and through which Gridley's handbook was published) underscores the lack of serious musicological perspectives in emerging jazz studies programs.

53. Lewis Porter and Michael Ullman, *Jazz: From Its Origins to the Present* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1993), vii.

among others, as well as the first volume of Schuller's histories.⁵⁴ The use of the word "response" suggests that Porter and Ullman are consciously constructing their work to address what they see as shortcomings in the existing literature. Porter's issues with Tirro are, of course, well documented, as is his praise of Gridley's text. Megill and Demory's text would appear a few years later, and its appearance certainly informed their approach as well. But what is most notable about this statement is in the latter part where Porter and Ullman engage the canon directly, rather than critique it, and stake out their own interpretive territory relative to its pervasiveness. Wanting to appear "unbiased" suggests that the authors find bias in other materials, though this not specified. More importantly, though, they seemingly come down on the side of the canon, favoring examples that have "the greatest impact" or are more "historically significant," drawing heavily on the *SCCJ* and similar sources.

As a scan of the text demonstrates, however, these examples do not deviate significantly from previous narratives, though there are some notable differences. For example, Porter and Ullman include specific chapters on Sidney Bechet, Bill Evans, and a chapter on lesser-studied genres in the 1960s, such as bossa nova and soul jazz. But the basic structure of the narrative is essentially the same as other texts; Armstrong, Ellington, Parker and Coltrane are all discussed in depth, and the decade-defined course of jazz is as evident as in previous works. Porter and Ullman are clearly influenced by analytical discussions following the model of Gunther Schuller's texts and also rely on personal interviews conducted by Ullman (a point the authors themselves allude to in the Preface). For Porter and Ullman, the problem with jazz historiography does not seem to be the canon itself (which they clearly follow, and even could be said to reinforce), but rather the haphazard scholarship and lack of attention to detail that plagued books like Tirro's, or the lack of a cohesive contextual argument in a work such as Gridley's. There is none of the posturing about the canon that we find in Megill and Demory's work—for the most part, the canonical narrative is assumed to be at the heart of an historical understanding of the idiom. In relying heavily on such narratives, and such sources as the *SCCJ*, Porter and Ullman make full use of the canon rather than engage with it critically, as one might expect given the emergence of the "new jazz studies" at nearly the same time.⁵⁵

54. Schuller's *Early Jazz* appeared in 1968. Its companion volume, *The Swing Era*, would follow in 1989. Both volumes, published by Oxford, are meticulous, painstakingly detailed treatises that represent, in my opinion, some of the most important period work in jazz historiography. As they are not intended as general texts, I have chosen not to include them in the present discussion.

55. DeVeaux's canon-thrashing essay on jazz historiography had appeared two years earlier. Gabbard's edition *Jazz Among the Discourses*, often regarded as marking the

More recently, writers of jazz histories have begun to more explicitly position themselves in relation to the canon in different ways. Critiques of prevailing narratives, implicit or explicit, have begun to influence the textbook market. Perhaps using DeVeaux's 1991 essay as a point of departure, the "official version" of jazz history is increasingly seen as problematic. That does not mean, however, that it has been abandoned. Take, for instance, the remarks of Henry Martin and Keith Waters, whose *Jazz: The First 100 Years* was first published in 2002. In the Preface to the first edition, the authors state:

We wrote *Jazz: The First 100 Years* to provide college students with a text that presents a fresh overview of jazz history and focuses greater attention on jazz since 1970, a period often slighted in previous surveys. We have also tried to stimulate fresh thinking about the jazz canon by including on the accompanying two-CD set recordings that compliment more than duplicate the selections available on the *Smithsonian Collection of Classic Jazz*. In addition to the book's primary concern—the development of jazz and its most important artists—our text relates the music to aspects of social and intellectual history, including the Harlem Renaissance.⁵⁶

Again, a few points are in order. First, the reference to "fresh thinking about the canon" is defined, in this context, almost exclusively in reference to the use of the *SCCJ*, rather than any specific type of narrative. This points both to the pervasiveness of recordings in establishing canonical perspectives on jazz, as well as the role of the *SCCJ* in influencing such perspectives. Second, the authors implicitly suggest that previous sources have not properly contextualized jazz within its social and cultural context. These are both important statements, and begin to move the narrative in a direction that is certainly in line with what DeVeaux suggested in his 1991 essay. But, in the following passage, the authors note:

Our chronological presentation of jazz history preserves the customary divisions of the music into stylistic periods, because we feel that this is the clearest method of introducing the material to the student. Nonetheless, throughout the text we acknowledge the arbitrariness of the stylistic divisions and emphasize that many (if not most) artists have produced significant work beyond the era in which they first came to public attention.⁵⁷

Thus Martin and Waters come face to face with a fundamental dialectic between the problems of the canon, with its limited, circumscribed view of the music, and the necessity of having *some* way of categorizing and

emergence of new jazz studies, appeared the following year, but was based largely on already in-print essays. In other words, the questioning of jazz canon had begun in earnest when Porter and Ullman's text appeared.

56. Henry Martin and Keith Waters, *Jazz: The First 100 Years* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2002), xix.

57. Martin and Waters, *Jazz*, xix.

organizing the often messy, contradictory narratives of jazz's past and present. A canon that is based in large part on a clear chronological development provides just such a method of organization, and it is no surprise that Martin and Waters lean heavily upon it to construct their narrative. Indeed, the chronological presentation of jazz history in this text tracks very closely with that of most previous texts, with discussions devoted to decade-defined stylistic movements, major innovators such as Parker and Coltrane, and a largely developmental thesis. Martin and Waters's text has been increasingly adopted by jazz history teachers, in no small part due to its clear organization and sharp focus on context.⁵⁸

In 2009, W. W. Norton finally got back into the jazz history market after its experience with Frank Tirro's book, publishing a new work co-authored by Scott DeVeaux and Gary Giddins.⁵⁹ The authoring of a book by DeVeaux, considered one of the pre-eminent jazz scholars of the last two decades, and Giddins, one of the most highly regarded jazz critics working today, illustrates Norton's efforts to once again establish itself as a major player in the ever-growing jazz history textbook market. An impressive looking book simply titled *Jazz*, the DeVeaux/Giddins collaboration purports to tell the "story of jazz as it has never been told before" (from the book's back matter). Indeed, a critical perspective is made explicit in the book's introduction, as the authors write that "The canon of masterpieces is open to interpretation,"⁶⁰ a sentiment that has been at the heart of much of DeVeaux's work. But there are, of course, different ways of interpreting this statement. On the one hand, we might critique the idea of the canon itself, whether such a construct is really necessarily or useful for study. If we are to re-interpret the canon, we might start by abandoning some of its most basic assumption, such as which musicians are more important than others, or why we need to privilege certain artists at all. On the other hand, DeVeaux and Giddins might simply be suggesting that the canon, as it exists, is not correct. Maybe Martin Williams simply selected the wrong recordings for the *SCCJ* in some instances—decisions that have had long-lasting consequences for the study of jazz history.

One important departure from many earlier history texts is the inclusion of a bundled four-CD set with the text, breaking the long ties between jazz history texts and the *SCCJ*.⁶¹ Some tracks are notable departures from the

58. In the interest of full disclosure, I have used the Martin and Waters text in my jazz history classes for the past several years.

59. Scott DeVeaux and Gary Giddins, *Jazz* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2009).

60. DeVeaux and Giddins, *Jazz*, xiii.

61. Martin and Waters have also bundled a CD set, and recent editions of Gridley's text have also featured accompanying recordings. The *SCCJ* is currently out of print (though rumors of a successor set have circulated for years), which necessitates that recent textbooks

SCCJ, particularly with the emphasis on pre-jazz genres (included are examples of African music, a Sousa march, and a society band, to name a few). But many of the recordings are from the “usual suspects” of the canon; Armstrong, Ellington, Parker and Coltrane are well represented, as are contemporary artists such as Keith Jarrett and Jason Moran. Omitted are examples of Smooth Jazz and Acid Jazz, as well as contemporary pop-jazz singers like Norah Jones and Diana Krall. To be clear, I’m not necessarily arguing that these latter figures *need* to be included in the narrative jazz history; we all, as teachers, make decisions about what we should teach, and most of us simply do not have the time or resources to address everything. The point, rather, is that a canon built on such a collection is not that much less canonical or “official” than the SCCJ. Could not DeVaux and Giddins simply be replacing one canon with another? Only time (and the extent to which their text is adopted in the discipline) can answer this. But one thing is clear—a canon is often measured as much by what is excluded as by what is included; this, of course, has been one of the primary criticisms of the SCCJ. By not including examples of Acid Jazz, or substantial contributions from either female or non-American artists, do we not risk taking the same route as before? How, in such a context, are we to reinterpret the canon?

The text of *Jazz* seems, for the most part, to be organized along the same lines as previous studies, breaking down jazz’s history roughly by decade-based stylistic categories, and emphasizing the contributions of major figures like Armstrong, Ellington (who are described as jazz’s “pre-eminent” soloist and composer, respectively) and Coltrane, who headline individual chapters. While the thoroughness of the narrative is impressive, DeVaux and Giddins take us through a relatively familiar path, the “official history” that has defined jazz scholarship for so long. Many of the “masterpieces” of jazz are included on the accompanying CD set, and the same major canonical figures occupy the same roles in the narrative. In fact, most of their narrative sounds strikingly familiar to those who have made a study of jazz’s history. In the opening to their chapter on New York, they state that “New York City, particularly the borough of Manhattan, has served as the focus for jazz’s maturity and evolution since the 1920s to the present.”⁶² Louis Armstrong is referred to as the “single most important figure in the development of jazz,”⁶³ Ellington’s “Black and Tan Fantasy” is provided as an example of the

authors create their own collections. Nevertheless, other commercially available anthologies have emerged to fill the void, such as the five-CD set produced in conjunction with the Ken Burns’ *Jazz* series on PBS. Despite this, the production of textbook-CD bundles has become fairly common, indicating that authors and publishers would rather produce their own recorded supplements than rely on existing sources.

62. DeVaux and Giddins, *Jazz*, 111.

63. DeVaux and Giddins, *Jazz*, 139.

"amazing progress jazz made in the 1920s,"⁶⁴ and Dizzy Gillespie is described as the "intellectual force behind bebop,"⁶⁵ all assessments that are decidedly within the canonical discourse of jazz history. Bebop is still defined by mainly Parker and Gillespie in the mid 1940s (which is particularly surprising given DeVeaux's superb study *The Birth of Bebop*, in which he advances a far less canonical view of the genre). There are some notable and welcome exceptions, such as a chapter devoted to the historical debates in jazz today, the discussion of Rhythm and Blues in the 1940s, more extensive coverage of contemporary artists (which may simply be a function of the book's more recent publication), and a discussion of debates over historiography themselves. But by and large the book offers a narrative that is strikingly similar to the "official version" that DeVeaux decried in 1991. The "story of jazz as it has never been told before"⁶⁶ in fact sounds very familiar. The text is limited in its coverage of non-canonical topics such as jazz outside the U.S., and, most notably, women in jazz (a topic which is relegated mainly to an inset box discussion, aside from brief discussions of a few significant figures like Mary Lou Williams). These are, given the current debates that characterize the "new jazz studies," very surprising omissions.

I should stress that I greatly admire both DeVeaux's and Giddins's work, and that overall I find their textbook to be very well researched, engaging, and well written—certainly destined to enjoy wide adoption among jazz history students and teachers. But despite their claims that the canon is "open to interpretation and adjustment," much of the text serves to reinforce what we already know, and what is already part of the "official history."

To Canonize, or Not to Canonize

Critiques of the jazz canon, such as those leveled by Gabbard, DeVeaux, and others whom we might identify with the "new jazz studies" are certainly valuable, and have forced those of us who teach jazz history to question some basic assumptions about how we approach the subject. No one would seriously argue that the canonical narratives of jazz, be they based on a developmental thesis proposed by Marshall Stearns, or the anthology of jazz masterpieces assembled by Martin Williams, are not without deep flaws, perhaps most notably in their exclusion of marginalized groups within the discourse. Such critiques have helped steer the pedagogy of jazz history into a more contextualized, broadly representative perspective, as we can see illustrated in the works of Martin and Waters and DeVeaux and Giddins, in particular.

64. DeVeaux and Giddins, *Jazz*, 137.

65. DeVeaux and Giddins, *Jazz*, 285.

66. From the back cover.

But critiquing the canon as an academic exercise is only part of the equation; applying such sustained critiques to the teaching of history in the classroom is quite another. The particular realities of curriculum and pedagogy—a fixed length term, regular assessment (of both students and faculty), linkages between academic and performance areas, for example—often limit the extent to which teachers feel free to depart from the canon. There is, in most cases, a certain expectation at the programmatic and institutional levels about what will be taught. While we may wish to present an historical narrative for jazz that is more inclusive, that is less rigid in its stylistic classification, or that questions the basic assumptions of canon, most of us by necessity still approach our classes from the same basic narrative, with the same musicians deemed more significant than others. In this sense our academic classes are no different from other aspects of the jazz studies curriculum (lessons and ensembles), which have long faced similar struggles with the tension between jazz as an alternative to the dominance of the western canon, and its own incorporation of canonical pedagogies that have enabled it to function in academia.⁶⁷ When Stearns wrote of the parallels between the developmental trajectories of jazz and western art music, he was doing more than simply pointing out similarities; he was establishing a framework by which jazz could “speak the language” of musical academia. Authors of jazz history textbooks certainly are sensitive to this idea, and in order to be successful, most have adopted similar postures. Jazz history may be messy, confused, and complicated, but these are classifications that are difficult to represent in a syllabus, or in a table of contents, where clarity and simplicity of organization are important.

Jazz history textbooks, despite stated claims about problems with and alternatives to the canon, have almost universally shied away from a sustained critique of the idea of a canon itself; nor have they made a serious attempt to offer alternative methods and perspectives on how to approach jazz history from a broad non-canonical standpoint. Though some teachers have proposed innovative ways of approaching the history of jazz,⁶⁸ there is simply no literature on which to base such a course. Authors of jazz history texts must certainly be aware of such debates and critiques. If there is one constant

67. The curricular and pedagogical structures of jazz studies programs have long been based on an adaptation of the language and perspectives of western art music theory, a topic about which I have written on other venues; see, Kenneth E. Prouty, “The ‘Finite’ Art of Improvisation: Pedagogy and Power in Jazz Education,” *Critical Studies in Improvisation* 4.1 (2008): 1–15, <http://journal.lib.uoguelph.ca/index.php/csieci/article/view/346/964> (accessed 15 February 2010).

68. David Schiff, for example, writes of teaching courses “in reverse,” in order to begin with what student are more familiar. Others in my experience have proposed thematic approaches, focusing on issues such as race or economics, regionally-based approaches, and other non-standard methods; Schiff, “Riffing the Canon,” 20.

in the recent publication of jazz history texts (besides the core narrative itself), it is that writers of jazz history texts seem to express both an uneasiness about canon, and an implicit sense that there is no better game in town. The canon is with us, like it or not. The pages of Prefaces, Introductions, and Author's Notes of jazz history textbooks are filled with ruminations about what is wrong with the canon, and how they are going to go about doing things differently, but the contents of these books are more inclined to demonstrate how much things remain the same. This, I suggest, is the most disappointing aspect of the critiques of canon in contemporary historiographic discourses. It is one thing to point out what is missing or what is wrong with a particular historical narrative. Suggesting an alternative, however, is more difficult. Perhaps this is why we have yet to see a jazz history text that truly departs from the canon, one that represents a clear break from the "consensus view" of Marshall Stearns, or of Scott DeVeaux's "official history."

In writing this, I in no way want to dismiss the outstanding work done by scholars such as DeVeaux (on bebop), Sherrie Tucker (on women in jazz), Taylor Atkins (on global jazz), and others whose work has forced us to ask important questions about what jazz is and what it represents. Nor do I take issue with the basic critiques of canons themselves, as advanced by figures such as Krin Gabbard. This is all exceptionally important work, and it needs to continue. My concern is that such critiques, valuable as they are, often are limited in what they can offer the classroom jazz history teacher. Alternatives to tried-and-true histories are fine in and of themselves, but often fall on deaf ears in a classroom full of jazz majors whose main goal is to play like Parker or Coltrane, or a classroom full of non-major students whose primary goal is to have a clear sense of what may be on the next test. These, of course, are separate issues that have been discussed at great length by many other scholars and teachers, to say nothing of the debates which rage within jazz studies itself. But the reality for many teachers is that they teach from the canon because that is the expectation, or because it is simply easier to teach a canonically-based course than to reinvent the wheel, and those of us who teach jazz history for a living understand this all too well. The canon survives because it is the basic historical language of the musical academy, both in terms of performance and scholarship. It has its uses, allowing us to easily structure a course, and to more closely coordinate historical learning with what students are doing in their ensembles and applied study. We often preface our use of the canon with a qualification, a metaphorical "but there's more to it." Textbooks often reflect this duality, taking perspectives that relate to the canon from within and without. They allow us to utilize, and even embrace the canon, but always with the idea that it cannot be the whole story.

Teaching Music History Today: Making Tangible Connections to Here and Now

MELANIE LOWE

There are two daunting challenges in teaching undergraduate music history courses in the contemporary higher educational environment. First, despite the differences in our professional backgrounds, the wide variation in the level and musical experiences of our students, and the abundance of course formats and subjects, music history instructors often feel an imperative to be thorough and comprehensive, especially in survey courses. External pressures certainly play a role here, from the expectations of departmental colleagues to the obligations of college or university curricula to the very materials our field produces for use in these courses. Arguably the “standard” text (or at least the most widely used) in music history courses designed for music majors, the eighth edition of J. Peter Burkholder, Donald Jay Grout, and Claude V. Palisca’s *A History of Western Music*, is a whopping 1,115 pages long. The accompanying three-volume *Norton Anthology of Western Music* literally weighs in at nine pounds.¹

1. I should note that I am a member of the Editorial Advisory Board for Burkholder, Grout, and Palisca’s *A History of Western Music*. I find Burkholder’s revision of this classic text to be remarkably successful in accomplishing its stated goal of making people—not musical style—the protagonists of this telling of the story of Western music (xxiii). This is decidedly not the narrative agenda of the competing texts. Mark Evan Bonds, for example, takes a diametrical stance in his preface: “This book rests on the premise that the best way to convey the history of music is to focus squarely on the music itself” (xiii). Craig Wright and Bryan Simms’s *Music in Western Civilization* splits the difference, organizing the discussion of composers, pieces, and stylistic aspects by location and “placing music in a culturally resonant setting” (xxxv).

All three of these texts are simply enormous, and all three coordinate the narrative and musical examples with hefty recording and annotated score anthologies and a generous variety of online ancillaries for both student and instructor. Douglass Seaton’s *Ideas and Styles in the Western Musical Tradition* offers an alternative. A slight (by comparison) volume of fewer than 500 pages with no accompanying anthologies and a modest (again, by comparison) student and instructor website, Seaton’s text makes good on his promise to tell the story of Western musical history in terms of the “epistemological underpinnings of the culture in which composers created it” (xvii). That said, while the philosophical orientation of the book ensures that musical thought is emphasized as part of the main narrative, musical style more

At the Blair School of Music at Vanderbilt University, where I teach, we have had until very recently a great luxury in teaching music history—four semesters (two whole years!) dedicated to a survey of Western music from the ancient world to our world. And yet, with even that much time, all of the useful, readily available, and quite wonderful resources out there, and twenty years of experience teaching undergraduate music courses, I have been unable to survey the history of Western music in any satisfying, meaningful, or lasting way. In meeting the challenge of giving my students the big picture, the whole picture, or even a corner of the picture more or less complete and intact, I have been an abject failure.

Coming to terms with my inability to survey Western music history and literature was the most liberating experience of my teaching career. To be sure, I still teach the usual assortment of music major survey courses, and I still use *A History of Western Music* and the *Norton Anthology* as my required textbooks. But when facing the task of taking my students on a mythical journey from Euripides to Bright Sheng, I have thrown up my hands and surrendered. I have given up.

Surprisingly (at least it was a surprise to me), failing in the survey allowed me to meet head on what I consider to be the second daunting challenge in teaching undergraduate music history. How do we make the study of music history tangibly relevant in the lives of our students, especially when their student lives seem so different from the student lives we (sometimes all too fondly) remember? And by “relevant,” I do not mean just musically relevant, for that goes (mostly) without saying. We all know and have experienced the tremendous benefits performers gain by studying music history. But, of course, we music historians are not in this business merely to serve at the feet of the almighty musical performance. The real challenge for teachers of music history is to put this history in direct dialogue with our contemporary, everyday lives—to make music history not just musically relevant, but intellectually relevant, politically relevant, sexually relevant, spiritually relevant, psychologically relevant, even ecologically relevant not just in the “there and then” of history but in the “here and now” of today. In other words, our musical-

than ideas nonetheless remains the central character in his story. Moreover, while Seaton nods admirably toward the notion that studying music history “enriches our own thinking and our own human spirit” (xvii), his book still presents an abundance of facts, if not to the same degree as in the other texts. I should also note that I reviewed Seaton’s text in typescript and provided comments and suggestions for the third edition.

See J. Peter Burkholder, Donald Jay Grout, and Claude V. Palisca, *A History of Western Music*, 8th ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 2010); Mark Evan Bonds, *A History of Music in Western Culture*, 3rd ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2010); Craig Wright and Bryan Simms, *Music in Western Civilization* (Boston: Schirmer Cengage Learning, 2010); and Douglass Seaton, *Ideas and Styles in the Western Musical Tradition*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

historical teaching needs to reach our students in ways that profoundly impact their existence as twenty-first-century citizens of Planet Earth.

This is a tall order.

In this essay I will share details of three multi-class activities I use in one music history course—projects that demonstrate how admitting defeat in the challenge to be thorough and comprehensive allowed me to explore tangible connections between the “old stories” of European music history and the experiences of my students’ everyday lives in America.

Popular vs. High Art

In my course on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century music, before we even start reading, talking, or thinking about late eighteenth-century music, I assign my students a writing assignment in which they are to offer personal answers to the following questions:²

Can something that is accessible or that “goes down easy” be “high art”?

Can something that is produced for money, marketed, and sold for profit be “high art”?

Can something that is entertaining be “high art”?

Can something that is *merely* entertaining be “high art”?

What might we mean by “high art” anyway?

After their essays are written, my students spend a whole class meeting debating these questions with each other, and quite often the only musicians mentioned are Miley Cyrus and John Cage. (It’s not everyday that we hear those two names in the same sentence!)

These class discussions are always quite lively. As the students reveal more of their perspectives and debate the questions, I become less of a discussion leader and more of a traffic cop. When the class approaches intellectual road rage (which usually happens around forty minutes), I know we’re truly getting to the heart of the matter, which, of course, is nothing short of the definition, meaning, and purpose of art. In a most revealing moment in one of these discussions, a composition major stood up, waved his arms, and shouted at his classmates: “Art is structure! Art is form!” He was very passionate, and the moment was terribly funny. But for a student so in touch with his inner Hanslick, the more progressive ideas of some of his classmates were truly threatening. These were the very people on whom he relied to perform his music and to transmit his ideas—musical and otherwise—to his audience. In

2. Complete assignment is included as Appendix A.

that moment, he also recognized that these students—his peers—*were* his audience. He was genuinely rattled by the realization that, at the end of the day, he had absolutely no control over the ultimate meanings of his music.

My intentions for this essay assignment and class discussion are not, of course, to give our young composers and performers an anxiety attack or to persuade them to change their majors to civil engineering. Rather, I want my students to become aware of their own musical-historical prejudices and to think about how such prejudices inform their broader aesthetic worldviews. Only by becoming aware of these kinds of biases can they avoid anachronistic thinking in the music history classroom or elsewhere.

For undergraduates, this is subtle and sophisticated intellectual work, and I have never been able to teach the pitfalls of ahistorical thinking effectively with mere presentation. To be sure, explaining the issues and demonstrating a few contradictions may be the most efficient means of communicating such an abstract concept in the classroom. But in my experience “lecturing” the notion of anachronistic thought into undergraduate minds simply does not work. Students need to reach this kind of conclusion on their own, and the ripening of their ideas cannot be rushed. Rather than acting as a transmitter beaming challenging intellectual content at a room full of receivers, I strive to provide the exercises, the opportunities, and—most importantly—the *time* for students to reflect on their own musical-historical thought processes and to examine (and then re-examine) what informs them.

Moreover, it is only after questioning their individual preconceptions of what art is and, more importantly, by examining the origins of those preconceptions that my students have been able to approach a composer like Haydn and to understand his music, at least initially, on its own terms. Before beginning their study of this composer, they have already wrestled with some of the big issues in Haydn reception history. That Haydn was a great artist, they readily concede. But it proves more difficult for them to reconcile his undeniable “artistry” with certain historical facts of Haydn’s career—for example, that he wrote many pieces that were accessible, popular, entertaining, and easy to digest, and that many of his greatest works were produced for money, marketed, and sold for profit. Indeed, these are the very reasons for which, in their essays and subsequent class discussion, nearly all of my students denied the status of “artist” to “mere entertainer” Miley Cyrus.

Of course, in my classes on Haydn we also talk about such important historical details as Haydn’s contract with the Esterházy family, his career at Eszterháza, the status of composers and musicians in eighteenth-century society, rhetoric and “classical” style, the aesthetics of the Enlightenment, the make up of eighteenth-century concert audiences, performance practices, and structure and formal aspects of the music itself. But all of these historical, social, cultural, and musical details are framed by questions that are relevant today,

questions I believe are absolutely critical for our young music students to consider deeply. Ultimately, our study of Haydn's music in its own time and consideration of issues in reception history lead to a rather uncomfortable discussion about snobbery and the situation of classical music in contemporary American culture—something our music students are keenly aware of and at least somewhat concerned about.

As we study Haydn's Symphony No. 45 in F-sharp Minor, "Farewell," and Symphony No. 92 in G Major, "Oxford,"³ for instance, students who initially don't care much for Haydn (they naively think his music is too "light" and "happy") find themselves challenged by what they hear as "proto-Romantic" in the "Farewell's" *Sturm und Drang* style. They also struggle to hear the more accessible and "popular" style of the "Oxford" symphony as coming nearly two decades *later* than the "Farewell" symphony. Since most students subscribe (if unknowingly) to the Enlightenment notion of progress in all things, including the arts, they tend to cling to a false linearity in the history of musical style.

To complement the historical and analytical study of Haydn's symphonies, I assign several musicological works by some of our field's heaviest hitters—including excerpts from H.C. Robbins Landon's five-volume chronicle of the composer's life and works (which cites many generic accolades from Haydn's time alongside Landon's own musical assessments) and James Webster's exploration of art and entertainment in Haydn's symphonies of the late 1770s.⁴ Students immediately leap to Haydn's defense when confronted with what they read as snobbery in Landon's writing, even if it is more challenging for them to recognize a subtle contradiction in Webster's "rescue" of certain critically maligned Haydn symphonies by revealing the hidden complexity of those works.

The facility with which our combined historical, analytical, and musicological study of two Haydn symphonies leads my students to personal reflections on what *they* value in music, art, and entertainment is, to my mind,

3. Haydn's Symphony No. 92 in G Major, "Oxford," is included in J. Peter Burkholder and Claude V. Palisca, *Norton Anthology of Western Music*, 6th ed., Vol. 2 (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 2010); the third and fourth movements of Haydn's Symphony No. 101 in D Major, "The Clock," are included in Mark Evan Bonds, ed., *Anthology of Scores to A History of Music in Western Culture*, 3rd ed., Vol. 2 (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2010); and the second movement of Haydn's Symphony No. 94 in G Major, "Surprise," and the first movement of Haydn's Symphony No. 103 in E flat Major, "Drum Roll," are included Craig Wright and Bryan Simms, *Anthology for Music in Western Civilization*, Vol. 2 (Boston: Schirmer Cengage Learning, 2010). Any of these symphonies will work well for the late Haydn symphony this assignment.

4. See H. C. Robbins Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works II: Haydn at Eszterháza, 1766–1790* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978); James Webster, "Haydn's Symphonies between *Sturm und Drang* and 'Classical style': Art and Entertainment," in *Haydn Studies*, etc. W. Dean Sutcliffe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 218–45.

the ultimate pedagogical payoff here. In the study of Haydn's music itself, my students confront a musical history that seems "backwards" to them, forcing some reflection on what aesthetic ideals informed that false historical linearity in the first place and why many of them prefer "later" (read: "romantic") music to "earlier" (read: "classical" = "antiseptic" = "boring") music. Then, as we reflect on how much we, like Landon, Webster, and countless other writers in Haydn reception, tend to value complexity over simplicity in "high art," class discussions inevitably wind back to questions of audience composition, music education, the nature of musical understanding, and our own contemporary classical musical culture.

Questions about value and sophistication, complexity and communication, and entertainment and audience are not only about Haydn, music history, musicology, or even the historical versus contemporary standing of his symphonies within the context of "great" European music. These questions are much broader. They are relevant here and now, in our own time, place, and cultural situation—especially politically. In my experience, if given the opportunity, students readily relate musical-historical course content to their own contemporary cultural experiences. For example, in a class discussion about musical taste, value judgment, and Haydn's "popular style" that took place during the 2008 presidential election season, my students made tangible connections between Landon's claim that Haydn "pander[ed] to the lowest common denominator"⁵ and a particular candidate's ostensibly adopted populism. To be sure, I try to prevent my music history classroom discussions from degenerating into heated debates about the significance of lettuce preference in American politics (which is where this particular discussion ultimately ended up). But when the questions and ideas we explore in a class on late eighteenth-century European instrumental music call up issues that are tangibly relevant to my students' everyday lives in twenty-first-century America, I believe we should explore such points of intersection. This is important work and an opportunity not to be missed.

Figaro Here and Now

The second multi-class project focuses on a piece that lends itself quite easily to this kind of approach in a music history course—Mozart's *Le nozze di Figaro*. Its themes of class and gender warfare, as well as its entanglement with the progressive politics of the Age of Enlightenment, are obviously relevant in our own time. Making this connection is the easy part. What I find more difficult to teach is how the *music itself* participates in the opera's social critique.

5. Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works II*, 561.

My students can readily identify various social and political agendas in the plot and libretto, but they are unable to hear the social critique in the music.

In the same survey course on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century music, two activities frame our engagement with Mozart's opera. The first is aimed directly at solving an unsolvable problem: we do not have eighteenth-century ears and we never will. That said, there are many striking similarities between how we hear the music of our world and how listeners in the eighteenth century heard the music of their world. The first activity in my *Figaro* unit is an intense, twenty-four-hour listening exercise designed to heighten my students' awareness of how *they* hear music and then to stimulate active and reflective thought about how they invest musical experiences with meaning.⁶

For one full day, my students are required keep a journal—they have to take it everywhere they go—and make note of *every* musical experience they have. Their entries include such various musical experiences as hearing music in a music history or theory class, on the sound system in Starbucks, in the practice rooms, on their video games, at a frat party, in the basketball arena, during marching-band practice, in the supermarket, from their next-door neighbor's dorm room, and while trying to ignore television commercials. Most of them make a good faith effort to list anything and everything they hear that they consider to be music.

By doing this exercise, my students realize first of all just how much music is surrounding them at all times and then, perhaps more importantly, just how little attention they are actually paying to most of it. In our class discussion of their experiences keeping such a journal, questions follow about how they themselves and their classmates hear music and how musical meaning is created in these everyday experiences—whether they're in the concert hall or the coffee shop. This activity forces them to become aware and *mindful* of all of the associations that code the music of our everyday soundscape and the instantaneous mental work we perform to decode it. For example, many of them notice for the first time the structural communication musical bumpers and stingers provide on CNN Headline News or ESPN SportsCenter. Others notice how ringtones both reflect and project personal identity (as well as being supremely annoying). In a revealing (if uncomfortable) moment, one student claimed that he could identify the make of an automobile that pulled up behind him at a red light in and around Nashville, where Vanderbilt is located, simply by hearing the music playing on the car's stereo: if the music were country, it would be an old model Chevy pick-up with a gun rack; if it were hip hop, it would be a black Escalade. Some students were shocked by this comment—others reluctantly (and embarrassingly) agreed.

6. Complete assignment is included as Appendix B.

Within the context of my course, this exercise is pedagogically designed to lay the groundwork for an introduction to topical analysis—to prepare my students for the idea that musical figures, rhythms, gestures, and styles communicate meaning by means of association with other types of music and sounds from everyday life. So, in the end, this exercise returns to Mozart's *Le nozze di Figaro*. But the musical and intellectual route taken back to the eighteenth century puts this historical point in direct contact with my students' own present-day musical listening experiences and habits.

As in our study of Haydn, in my *Figaro* unit we consider everything one would expect in a period survey course for music majors—dramatic structures, musical form, ensemble composition, topical analysis, and aria typology, as well as the historical details of this opera's composition. But the second exercise on Mozart's opera, which I have also at times used as the capstone essay for the whole course, is designed again to bring the study of music history into the present—to make this material (if not also our discipline) tangibly relevant to the lives of twenty-first-century music students. After studying *Le nozze di Figaro* for a few weeks (a luxury indeed, but one that requires the “giving up” I described at the beginning of this article), my students design their own productions of the opera.⁷ In a substantial essay, they must first make a compelling argument for their concepts by taking into consideration the central themes of the opera and the philosophical and political ideals of the Enlightenment. Then, they must communicate passionately the relevance of those ideas today.

So far, this assignment may sound rather straight forward, as the issues and politics of Mozart's opera are not just obvious; they are obviously still important. But here's the catch. For this assignment, my students cannot simply discuss such issues either in general or in the abstract. Each student must choose a specific American opera company and tailor his or her production proposal for that particular institution and audience. Before designing their productions, they need to consider such things as the expectations of their audience, how one communicates effectively both musically and dramatically with that audience, the company's historical balance between tradition and innovation, the cultural needs for the particular environment, and the company's financial situation. Many questions arise: What are the implications of taking a risk in a production? What are the implications of playing it safe? Ultimately, what are the stakes when we perform a 225-year-old piece of music in our contemporary world? The answers to these questions vary widely, of course. But in sharing their individual research with each other in class discussion, it becomes abundantly clear to my students that a production that

7. Complete assignment is included as Appendix C.

may soar at the New York City Opera would likely crash and burn in our own city's Nashville Opera.⁸

Overall, students derive great pleasure from this project. They write interesting, engaging essays, and while many defend passionately a traditional production, with powdered wigs and all, others offer production concepts that are quite creative (if not downright outrageous). Several years ago, for instance, not too long after the Monica Lewinsky scandal, one student set *Figaro* in the Clinton White House: President Bill Clinton was the Count; Hillary Rodham Clinton the Countess, obviously; Monica Lewinsky was Susanna; Newt Gingrich Figaro (a stretch, admittedly); Linda Tripp was Marcellina; George Stephanopoulos was Basilio; and Ken Starr Dr. Bartolo. To be sure, many aspects of this production seem forced, but the student made a strong case for the exploration of gender, sexuality, politics, and power differentials. In the end she suggested that the more things change, the more they stay the same.

Another recent production set the opera on a southern plantation just before the civil war, when it was clear that a particular way of life was under threat—not unlike the situation for many members of the upper classes in Joseph II's Vienna in the late eighteenth century. But in addition to the class and gender warfare of the piece, this student added a complicated racial dimension. Susanna and Figaro were black, as were Antonio and Barbarina; the rest of the characters were white. Here, questions of power, race, and miscegenation enter the mix. Similarly, just as the immigration debate was heating up in the United States a few years ago, another student proposed a contemporary setting in which Susanna was an undocumented Honduran immigrant, infusing the story with not only a racial conflict but questions of national identity, political will, and even human rights. (I will refrain from recounting the many settings on the starship Enterprise or in the Star Wars Expanded Universe I have read over the years, as wonderful as they were.)

In rising to the challenge of this exercise, my students not only learn about the opera *Le nozze di Figaro*, its creators Mozart and da Ponte, and its performances in its own time, but they also consider deeply their own contemporary musical and cultural scenes. In the end, they acquire a much richer and more sophisticated sense of what it means to perform eighteenth-century European music in twenty-first-century America. And more importantly, many of them for the first time begin to reflect on just what is at stake in a musical enterprise.

8. Incidentally, a 27 September 2009 article on the front page of the Arts & Leisure section of the *New York Times* reported on how Peter Gelb, general manager of New York's Metropolitan Opera, is negotiating these very issues. See Charles McGrath, "It's a New Met. Get Over It," *New York Times*, 27 September 2009. Next semester I will include this article as assigned reading for this project.

The last class in our *Figaro* unit is a class discussion in which my students share their production concepts with each other. Many students defend their progressive and challenging productions with the obvious argument: that in its own time *Le nozze di Figaro* was charged with contemporary political issues and, if we are to remain true to the opera, it still needs to be. Interestingly, those students who defend a more traditional production make exactly the same argument: since class and gender warfare is still ubiquitous in our world, the piece already speaks to contemporary issues. Quite often this discussion intensifies, and more often than not the traditionalists in the room band together and attack the progressives—those bold students who would dare to disrespect Mozart’s intentions. This turn of the conversation, then, allows me to direct discussion toward such important and potentially controversial issues as the integrity of an artwork, the knowable versus unknowable intentions of a composer, and the production and location of musical meaning.

Today, Less is More

Before I started teaching this way, I had to perform some strained syllabus contortions to include content that at first glance may seem beyond the purview of a course on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century music history. But now, I accept and even embrace the inevitable reality that lots of music and many topics just have to be sacrificed on my syllabi.⁹ To be sure, because of the amount of time I dedicate each semester to the three projects described in this essay, it is certainly a fair criticism that the students who take their seventeenth- and eighteenth-century music history survey with me have not studied as much music as other students. To put it plainly, they just don’t know some things. But, in my experience, even a strenuous effort to be comprehensive and thorough in music history courses produces students who don’t

9. As painful as it is, in the eighteenth-century portion of this course I no longer cover Gay, Gluck, Billings, or Domenico Scarlatti at all in class meetings; I cram Pergolesi, Hasse, Sammartini, Stamitz, and C. P. E. Bach into one class meeting; and I skip Haydn’s piano sonatas and oratorios and Mozart’s concertos and church music altogether. I am most assuredly guilty of teaching only the heart of the canon. Further, my choice of repertory does little to expand the canon, dislodge it, or even challenge the value judgments that define it.

I am, however, up front with my students about my pedagogical choices and why I have made them. In setting up the second half of the eighteenth century, for example, I discuss canon formation, particularly the musical, social, political, religious, national, and aesthetic values that informed and continue to inform its construction. I also share my personal discomfort that my teaching and research choices undoubtedly appear as a tacit endorsement of the Western canon as we know it and, in many ways, seem to conflict with my commitment to diversity in university curricula. I would like to believe that this open admission of such contradictions within my own work demonstrates the complex nature and tricky balancing acts of all pedagogical and scholarly endeavors. But admittedly, such professorial confessions may be, at best, merely confusing; some students likely find them disingenuous.

know as much as we would like them to. My students might not know much about Haydn's career as an opera composer or what a baryton is, they will probably mis-identify Mozart's "Dissonance" quartet, and many probably (and sadly) do not even realize that Haydn lived for almost another two decades after Mozart's death. This is certainly discouraging, if not a serious problem.

On the other hand, they can speak intelligently about the cultural and social pitfalls of the Enlightenment notion of progress, the aesthetics of political entertainment in the eighteenth century, and the integrity of a musical composition (or lack thereof). More importantly, they can articulate how and why such issues, concepts, and ideas as those encountered in the history of Western European music have value in their everyday lives today—as musicians, students, responsible citizens, and thinking and sensitive human beings. Is this not more valuable than mastering a plethora of musical-historical facts? The question, of course, is one of quantity: how much information—how many facts per se—do our undergraduate students need to have at their fingertips to be able to think intelligently, meaningfully, and humanely about music? Perhaps far fewer than we may think.

APPENDIX A. Writing Assignment on Entertainment and High Art

Please think about and sketch answers to the following questions. Implied with each question is why/why not?—a simple yes or no won't cut it.

1. Can something that is accessible or that "goes down easy" be "high art"?
2. Can something that is produced for money, marketed, and sold for profit be "high art"?
3. Can something that is entertaining be "high art"?
4. Can something that is *merely* entertaining be "high art"?
5. What do we mean by "high art" anyway?

Then, once you have formulated your thoughts, use these questions and your answers to them as the launch-pad for a short essay on the situation of "high art" (however you define it) in our contemporary culture. This is a personal reflection essay, not a research paper. As such, your essay should contain *your own* thoughts, opinions, and definitions. I'm not particularly interested in what Webster, Grove, or the wiki-wisdom might have to say on these matters.

Length: As long as it takes, but aim for 3 double-spaced pages

Submit: MS Word document (YourLastName.doc or .docx) via e-mail attachment

[Notes to the reader on assessment: Grading this kind of assignment is undeniably subjective. The following are my general guidelines for assessing this assignment:

- An “A” paper presents fully developed ideas that are nicely and passionately articulated in a correct and reasonably elegant prose style. Substantial discussion of specific examples supports the argument. The structure of the argument is clear, linear, and lean.
- A “B” paper is essentially an “A” paper that comes up somewhat short in the writing style *or* the level of sophistication of the ideas presented.
- A “C” paper is essentially an “A” paper that comes up short in the writing style *and* the level of sophistication of the ideas presented.
- A “D” paper is poorly written *or* contains primarily underdeveloped ideas.
- An “F” paper is poorly written *and* contains primarily underdeveloped ideas.]

APPENDIX B. Mozart, *Le nozze di Figaro*, Assignment #1: 24-Hour Listening Journal

This assignment is an exercise in listening. It is simple, but also intense and time consuming (in many small bursts—a second or two many times over). Hopefully it will also be engaging, thought-provoking, and eye-opening. To complete this assignment you must purchase two things you might not already have on hand:

1. A small journalist’s notebook that will fit comfortably in your pocket or purse
2. A pen or pencil

For twenty-four hours, starting from the moment you wake up tomorrow morning, please note—by hand in your notebook—*every* musical experience you have. If you use an iPod clock/docking station as your alarm, your first entry will be the music you have chosen to wake you up. If you use a clock radio, note the song playing—if one is playing, that is. If it’s a commercial break and music plays as part of the commercial, note that. If you don’t recognize the music, describe it briefly. If you use a tone, bell, buzzer, or other sound to wake you up, you need to decide whether that sound counts as a

musical experience. If it does, note it. If it doesn't, be sure you've considered at least for a second or two why such a sound is not music to your ears.

You must take your journal with you *everywhere you go* for the next twenty-four hours and record, however briefly, anything and everything you hear that you would categorize as music. What you hear during your practicing, lessons, and rehearsals is obviously music (or I'm at least assuming you'd consider it to be music). What's on the sound system in the rec center, the supermarket, and Starbucks is also presumably music. But what about the annoying ringtone of the person sitting across from you in the dining hall? What about your roommate singing in the shower? Are these musical experiences? If so, you must make note of them. And if you decide that they are not musical experiences, again, be sure you can articulate why you do not consider such sounds music. (You don't have to note your reasons in your journal, but be sure that if I ask you about these kinds of sounds you can articulate clearly *why* you do not hear them as music.)

Your entries will likely be brief, just a few words, but be sure that you can tell from your notes what it was that you were hearing. Better still, do your best to ensure that *I* can tell what you were hearing, since *you will be turning in these journals to me* the day after tomorrow. We will discuss the experience of completing this assignment in class on Friday. And I'll also share with you just why I had you do such a bizarre exercise.

[Notes to the reader on assessment: Grading this kind of assignment is undeniably subjective. It is also difficult because there is no way I can know just what my students hear and where they hear it. Also, because the entries are supposed to be spontaneous, there is no expectation for their level of writing—spelling, grammar, style, etc. do not matter for this assignment. For these reasons, I use three grades—“check-plus,” “check,” and “check-minus”—in my assessment of student listening journals. The following are my general guidelines for assigning these grades:

Check-plus: the student clearly included each and every sound that s/he heard as music. The list is long and somewhat varied in content.

Check: the student seems to have made a good-faith effort to include each and every sound that s/he heard as music. The list is at least somewhat varied in content.

Check-minus: the student seems not to have taken the assignment seriously. S/he turned in a tossed-off list of music that could easily have been written ten minuets before class.]

APPENDIX C. Mozart, *Le nozze di Figaro*, Assignment #2: Production Proposal

You, an up-and-coming opera director, have just been given the first big break in your career: a chance to stage Mozart's opera *Le nozze di Figaro* at <<an American opera company, chosen by you in consultation with me>>. The general manager of <<your company>> has reminded you that your production should be tailored to suit the needs, tastes, and expectations of this particular audience. At the same time, however, s/he has informed you that <<your company>> is trying to attract new people and grow the audience. Knowing that you need the general manager solidly in your corner to get the budget to do the production as you envision it, you write a most passionate proposal (at least five typed double-spaced pages) arguing for your setting and interpretation.

In your proposal, be sure to consider the central themes of the opera, the social and political ideals of the Enlightenment, the relevance of such ideals today, the expectations of your particular opera audience, the financial realities of that company, and the need to attract a broader audience to ensure fiscal stability for the future of the company.

Some questions and exercises to get you thinking:

- How is tension between the social classes established as a central theme of the opera?
- How is tension between the genders established as a central theme of the opera?
- Find at least one example of the intersection of tensions between class and gender.
- Consider the turn of events at the end of the opera in terms of class, gender, and power.
- What are the implications of taking a risk in your production?
- What are the implications of playing it safe?
- Ultimately, what are the stakes when we perform a 225-year-old piece of music in our own contemporary world?

Be prepared to discuss these issues and to defend your productions in class on Friday.

Length: As long as it takes, but aim for 5 double-spaced pages

Submit: MS Word document (YourLastName.doc or .docx) via e-mail attachment

[Notes to the reader on assessment: Grading this kind of assignment is less subjective than the other assignments included here. The following are my general guidelines for assessing the proposals:

An “A” paper presents a passionate, persuasive, and detailed proposal.

Its structure is tight and the writing style is both grammatically correct and elegant. The student incorporates *all* of the following in his or her proposal:

- the central themes of *Le nozze di Figaro*
- the social and political ideals of the Enlightenment
- the relevance of such ideals today
- the expectations of the particular opera audience
- the financial realities of that company
- how to attract a broader audience

A “B” paper is essentially an “A” paper that comes up somewhat short in the writing style *or* does not address all of the issues listed above.

A “C” paper is essentially an “A” paper that comes up short in the writing style *and* does not address all of the issues listed above.

A “D” paper is poorly written *or* contains primarily underdeveloped ideas.

An “F” paper is poorly written *and* contains primarily underdeveloped ideas.]

A Select Bibliography of Music History Pedagogy Since 2000 with a List of Papers Read at the 2009 Teaching Music History Day

C. MATTHEW BALENSUELA

The following bibliography includes recently published works related to music history pedagogy. It includes a small number of articles on writing assignments in music history classes and pedagogy articles in related fields, but generally omits articles on information literacy and analysis (although these topics may be considered by some to be within the realm of music history teaching). Articles in collected essays are cited in an abbreviated format with reference to the full bibliographic information included in a main entry under the editor. The bibliography concludes with a list of papers given at the 2009 Music History Teaching Day. Any bibliographic endeavor cannot be totally complete and the compiler encourages readers to bring any omissions to his attention.

Archetto, Maria. "Teaching Non-Majors: The Introductory Course: Interdisciplinary Approaches to the Introduction to Music Course." In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 69–76.

Balensuela, C. Matthew. "Music History/History of Theory: Dynamic Tensions between Theory and Composition in the Classical Era." In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (2010): 93–104.

Ballora, Mark. "Expanding Frames of Reference: Teaching the History of Electro-Acoustic Music." *College Music Symposium* 46 (Fall 2006): 1–16.

Beal, Amy. "Music and Politics in the Classroom: Politics and Protest in American Musical History." *Music and Politics* 2, no. 1 (Winter 2008).

<http://www.music.ucsb.edu/projects/musicandpolitics/archive/2008-1/beal.html>

Describes approaches to a ten-week, two-unit elective course (in the category of "Freshman Discovery Seminar") offered at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

Beckerman, Michael. "How Can You Teach What You Don't Know? ...and Other Tales from Music History Pedagogy." In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (2010): 3–18.

Journal of Music History Pedagogy, vol. 1, no 1, pp. 61–66. ISSN 2155-1099X (online)

© 2010, *Journal of Music History Pedagogy*, licensed under CC BY 3.0

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>)

- Bisson, Noël. "First Nights: Awakening Students' Critical Skills in a Large Lecture Course." In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 95–107.
- Bowen, Antonio José. "Teaching Naked: Why Removing Technology from your Classroom will Improve Student Learning." *National Forum for Teaching and Learning* 16, no. 1 (December 2006): 1-5.
<http://www.ntlf.com/html/ti/naked.htm>
- Briscoe, James, ed. *Vitalizing Music History Teaching*. Monographs and Bibliographies in American Music 20. Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon Press, 2010.
- . "Avoiding the Slough of Despond, or, Teaching by Touchstone." In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (2010): 105–24.
- Broman, Per F. "Gender, Ideology, and Structure: Pedagogical Approaches to the Music of Karin Rehnqvist." *College Music Symposium* 44 (Fall 2004): 15–27.
- . "The Good, the True, and the Professional: Teaching Music History in an Age of Excess." In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (2010): 19–26.
- Burkholder, J. Peter. "Peer Learning in Music History Courses." In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 204–24.
- Byrd, Joseph. "Whitewashing Blackface Minstrelsy in American College Textbooks." *Popular Music and Society* 32, no. 1 (February 2009): 77–86.
- Cateforis, Theo. "Sources and Storytelling: Teaching the History of Rock Through its Primary Documents." *Journal of Popular Music Studies* 21, no. 1 (March 2009): 20–58.
- Citron, Marcia J. "Feminist Waves and Classical Music: Pedagogy, Performance, Research." *Women and Music: A Journal of Gender and Culture* 8 (2004): 47–60.
- . "Women and the Western Art Canon: Where Are We Now?" *Notes* 64, no. 2 (December 2007) 209–15.
- Conkling, Susan Wharton. "Envisioning a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning For The Music Discipline." *College Music Symposium* 43 (Fall 2003): 54–64.
- Conway, Colleen M. and Thomas M. Hodgman. *Teaching Music in Higher Education*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
Designed specifically to help graduate students in music teach undergraduates (both music- and non-music majors).
- Cook, Susan C. "Don't Fence me in: The Pleasures of Teaching American Music." In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 145–53.

- . “Teaching Others, Others Teaching or Music History Like It Mattered.” In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (2010): 125–38.
- Corrigan, Vincent. “The Myths of Music History.” In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 181–92.
- Davis, James A. “Aesthetic Questions and Questions of Aesthetics in the Music History Classroom.” *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 35, no. 3 (Fall 2001): 87–94.
- Douglas, Gavin. “Some Thoughts on Teaching Music History from an Ethnomusicological Perspective.” In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (2010): 27–44.
- Elliott, Robin. “Teaching Canadian Music in Undergraduate Music History Courses.” In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (2010): 163–76.
- Fillerup, Jessie. “Cage and the Chaotic Classroom: Pedagogy for the Avant-garde.” In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (2010): 177–88.
- Fink, Robert. “Teaching Music History (after the End of History): ‘History Games’ for the 20th-Century Survey.” In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 43–65.
- Follet, Diane. “Redeeming Alma: The Songs of Alma Mahler.” *College Music Symposium* 44 (Fall 2004): 28–42.
- Ford, Phil. “Appreciation Without Apologies.” *College Music Symposium* 46 (Fall 2006): 31–44.
- Gridley, Mark. “Misconceptions in Linking Free Jazz with the Civil Rights Movement.” *College Music Symposium* 47 (2007): 139–55.
See also Harker, Brian. *College Music Symposium* (2008).
- Halley, Jeanne. “A Mysterious Lacuna: Reconsidering the Exclusion of French Baroque Music and Dance from the Curricula.” In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (2010): 189–202.
- Hanning, Barbara Russano. “Teaching Music History through Art.” In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (2010): 189–202.
- Harker, Brian. “In Defense of Context in Jazz History: A Response to Mark Gridley.” *College Music Symposium* 48 (2008): 157–59.
See also: Gridley, Mark. *College Music Symposium* (2007).
- Henry, Michele L. and Laurel E. Zeiss. “Musicians as Authors: Teaching the Art of Writing Program Notes.” *College Music Symposium* 44 (Fall 2004): 121–32.
- Hess, Carol A. “Score and Word: Writing about Music.” In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 193–204.

- Holloway, Martha Snead. "The Use of Cooperative Action Learning to Increase Music Appreciation Students' Listening Skills." *College Music Symposium* 44 (Fall 2004): 83–93.
- Hunter, Mary. "General Issues: Teaching at a Liberal Arts College." In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 157–68.
- Jones, Fernando. "Teaching the Blues Effectively." *Journal of Popular Music Studies* 21, no. 1 (March 2009): 108–12.
- Kelley, Bruce C. "Design for Change: Creating Significant Learning Experiences in the Music Classroom." *College Music Symposium* 46 (Fall 2006): 64–76.
- Krikun, Andrew. "Mixing Memphis Soul into the Community College Curriculum Stew." *Journal of Popular Music Studies* 21, no. 1 (March 2009): 76–89.
- Locke, Ralph P. "What Chopin (and Mozart, and Others) Heard: Folk, Popular, 'Functional' and Non-western Music in the Classic/Romantic Survey Course." In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 25–42.
- Macey, Patrick. "Providing Context: Teaching Medieval and Renaissance music." In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 3–12.
- McGowan, James. "'Consonance' in Tonal Jazz: A Critical Survey of its Semantic History." *Jazz Perspectives* 2, no. 1 (May 2008): 69–102.
- Murray, Russell E., Jr. "Creating Anthologies for the Middle Ages and Renaissance." In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 225–37.
- Natvig, Mary, ed. *Teaching Music History*. Aldershot, Hants and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2000.
- Natvig, Mary. "Topics Courses: Teaching 'Women in Music'." In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 111–20.
- Nott, Kenneth. "Teaching Baroque Music to the Bright and Interested and Ignorant." In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 13–24.
- Oehler, Susan and Jason Hanley. "Perspectives of Popular Music Pedagogy in Practice: An Introduction." *Journal of Popular Music Studies* 21, no. 1 (March 2009): 2–19.
- O'Hagin, Isabel Barbara and David Harnish. "From 'What does it Matter' to the 'Heart of the Matter:' Recommendations for Multicultural Education Experiences in Undergraduate Music Programs." *College Music Symposium* 43 (Fall 2003): 42–54.

- Parakilas, James. "Texts, Contexts, and Non-Texts in Music History Pedagogy." In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (2010): 45–58.
- Pederson, Sanna. "Defining the Term 'Absolute Music' Historically." *Music and Letters* 90, no. 2 (May 2009): 240–62.
- Pisani, Michael. "Teaching Film Music in the Liberal Arts Curriculum." In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 121–44.
- Pohly, Linda. "Teaching Teachers of Music Appreciation: What we can Learn from MGS Pedagogy." *College Music Symposium* 47 (2007): 127–38.
- Roth, Majorie. "The 'Why' of Music: Variations on a Cosmic Theme." In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 77–94.
- Samplaski, Art. "Music History at Ten Years a Minute." *College Music Symposium* 44 (Fall 2004): 94–106.
- Seaton, Douglass. "Teaching Music History: Principles, Problems, and Proposals." In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (2010): 59–72.
- Siegel, Linda. "Johanna Kinkel's *Chopin als Komponist* and Other Musical Writings: Untapped Source Readings in the History of Romantic Music." *College Music Symposium* 43 (Fall 2003): 105–25.
- Starr, Pamela. "Teaching in the Centrifugal Classroom." In Natvig, *Teaching Music History* (2000): 169–80.
- Stauffer, Sandra L. "Process, Passion, People: Pedagogical Notes for Musician-Scholar-Educators." In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching*, (2010): 73–84.
- Titon, Jeff Todd. "Teaching Blues and Country Music, and Leading an Old-Time String Band—at an Ivy League University." *Journal of Popular Music Studies* 21, no. 1 (March 2009): 113–24.
- Weast, Wade. "Music History Teaching in the 21st Century: One Administrator's Perspective." In Briscoe, *Vitalizing Music History Teaching* (2010): 85–92.

Pedagogy In Related Fields

- Bains, Ken *What the Best College Teachers Do*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Booth, Alan. *Teaching History at University*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

See particularly Chapter 9: "Developing Understanding of Teaching."

Booth, Alan and Paul Hyland eds. *The Practice of University History Teaching*.
Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2000.

See particularly Alan Booth and Paul Hyland, "Introduction: Developing
Scholarship in History Teaching," pp. 1–13.

Light, Richard J. *Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds*.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

PAPERS GIVEN AT TEACHING MUSIC HISTORY DAY 2009

Saturday, September 12, 2009

Edinboro University of Pennsylvania

Michael J. Malone (Ohio Wesleyan University), "Reconceptualizing Music
History: Some Thoughts on Categories Versus Chronology in Music
History Survey Courses."

Dane Heuchemer (Kenyon College), "Time for Reevaluation: Content vs.
Process in Teaching Music History in Tumultuous Times."

Dina Lentsner (Capital University Conservatory of Music), "The 'Teaching
Self' as a Central Concept in Music History Pedagogy."

Ann van der Merwe (Miami University of Ohio), "Broadening the Music
History Curriculum: Suggestions for Success."

Joshua Veltman (Union University), "'If You Can't Beat 'em, Join 'em:' Editing
Wikipedia as a Research Project."

Benjamin Binder (Duquesne University), "Literacy vs. Critical Thinking in
the Music History Survey."

Andrew Dell'Antonio, with Domenica Bongiovanni and Joshua Ogden-Davis
(The University of Texas at Austin), "Wiki, Clickie, Nice and Schticky:
(re)Writing Music History in the Survey for Majors."

Eric Hung (Westminster College of the Arts), "The Lessons of Applied
Ethnomusicology Pedagogy for Teaching Music History."

Molly Cryderman-Weber (Lansing Community College), "Active Learning in
the Music History Classroom."

Carolyn Ponce (Arkansas State University), "Writer's Workshop with Music
Appreciation Learners."

Brian Mann (Vassar College), "Hearing 'the Classical' in the 'Popular:' Film
Music and the Classical Tradition."

A-R Editions, *Online Music Anthology*.

<https://www1.areditions.com/>

DANE OWEN HEUCHEMER

Teachers of music history often experience frustration when constructing course listening and score lists. Selecting one of the numerous available package deals (in which a text, anthologies, and recordings are sold together) has been the most convenient option. After that decision, however, the teacher faces another: whether to accept the selections made by the author, editor, and publisher, or to augment the anthology with additional resources. For those wanting to augment, this means putting additional scores and recordings on library reserve, employing multiple anthologies, or both. Another issue complicates the problem: it seems as though an increasing percentage of students take the easiest path to learning, and teachers must take steps to ensure that students go the extra scholarly mile. Otherwise, a thorough study of works beyond the textbook anthology is not very likely. Finally, a few music history textbooks do not come with a package of scores and recordings (such as Douglas Seaton's *Ideas and Styles in the Western Musical Tradition*, also reviewed in this issue of *JMHP*) and instructors must either use an anthology designed by another author or create their own.

For instructors seeking better solutions to these problems, A-R Edition's *Online Music Anthology* might be an attractive alternative. Under the direct management of veteran staff member and musicologist James Zychowicz, A-R Editions put their online resource on display during the 2009 Philadelphia meeting of the American Musicological Society.

Conceived as a digital resource, A-R Edition's anthology utilizes Adobe® Flash® technology, and the result is a product that moves from mouse click to screen in short order. As of the Philadelphia meeting, the list of works available to users totaled 350 pieces comprising 2,400 pages of music, with another 4,500–5,000 pages soon to be added (much of this content from the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century repertoire). Thus, the anthology is currently a work “in progress.” In addition to having the significant resources assembled as a part of their *Recent Researches* series, numerous other compositions have also been added, including works found in existing print anthologies. Additionally, A-R holds the licenses for works included in editions published by the American Institute of Musicology.

Much of the discussion during the Philadelphia presentation focused on issues involving opera. For publishers, opera seems a particular challenge: the libretto and its translation (if provided) require space, and piano reductions are often substituted for orchestral scores. As a result, students may struggle to gain a complete appreciation of the sophistication and complexity that opera possesses. A-R seems interested in accommodating those not satisfied with available print options, offering an impressive list of opera excerpts both currently available and in preparation. A-R is also very receptive to the idea of continuing to expand the number of available works, suggesting that it would accommodate requests from instructors. Essentially, their response was, “If you do not see it on the list, contact us and we’ll do our best to accommodate your request.” Obviously, those hoping to take advantage of A-R’s offer should submit “wish lists” long before the materials are needed.

For faculty, access to the website is easy and free via a simple registration process. Once logged in, the construction of a course anthology is a fairly straight-ahead process. Selecting works from A-R’s available holdings into an instructor’s course anthology is as easy as clicking an “add” link. Repertoire lists are easy to assemble and augment or reduce. Finding individual works is made convenient via the site’s advanced search engine. All scores are in concert pitch.

When students log in, those works selected by the instructor appear in the menu. At this point, A-R Editions is basing student access on a six-month paid subscription (\$50). Feedback from several instructors at the Philadelphia presentation included numerous suggestions with respect to student access. A-R responded immediately, showing that many possible options are being contemplated. The online anthology team also seemed willing to provide information about the sources used for scores, including available facsimile editions.

The site itself presents the scores in high quality images; even when magnified, the notation is very clean. Scores can also be printed in fairly high quality. In fact, for those who would prefer to use a hard copy of their assembled anthology, A-R expressed a willingness to provide shrink-wrapped printed copies, provided they are given suitable time to prepare the materials. Flash® files present some limitations: they cannot be saved as a separate document on the user’s desktop, nor can images be immediately altered to highlight themes or structural points. An instructor wanting to highlight something on the score would need to find another option, such as projecting the image on a whiteboard, or printing the page and then using a document projector. In response to a query about this, A-R replied that they might consider sending PDF files to instructors. Dr. Zychowicz also mentioned that A-R is exploring the possibility of pairing their scores with available audio files.

As an experiment, I spent about ninety minutes reassembling my upper-level survey on Medieval and Renaissance music on the A-R website. I was impressed: of the sixty-nine items on my semester listening list—the vast

majority drawn from anthologies including Norton, Bonds, Stolba, Atlas, and Yudkin [*Music in Medieval Europe*] with a half-dozen or so additional works taken from collected editions or other resources—I found just eight compositions not already available through A-R. In some of those cases a clear substitute was available. Additionally, A-R agreed to add three works after I submitted a request. Clearly, the A-R anthology would be a viable option for my Medieval/Renaissance class right now, and the expansion of the common practice period repertoire that is now underway will make the resource appropriate for classes concentrating on the Baroque, Classical, and Romantic eras. At this time, however, the twentieth century seems “a bit further away.” If A-R reaches that mark, though, it might receive my upper-level twentieth-century survey business as well. One other thing I would like to see: zooming in on individual pages is very easy, but there are times (for example, when teaching from a laptop) in which displaying a complete page of an orchestral score requires some extra steps. I had to use my internet browser’s “zoom out” command to get “in the neighborhood,” then employ A-R’s “zoom in” to get maximum screen size.

A-R seems to be doing their best to offer what printed anthologies cannot provide: flexibility. What must be seen is how flexible A-R can become while also striving for an adequate profit margin. Additionally, the company will face the same challenges all online publishers are confronting—security of the site and its materials, pirating of content, and so forth. The ultimate success of the A-R online anthology might not be apparent for some time.

As someone who has long championed the concept of students working with a printed copy of a score, I freely admit to being impressed by A-R Edition’s *Online Music Anthology*. In this time of financial constraint, libraries are doing all they can to reduce costs, and this includes not only limiting the acquisition of new materials, but also reducing the time that facilities are available to students. With my students becoming ever more nocturnal and the multimedia room often closing before they stop studying, I am certainly considering adding my students to A-R’s patrons.

**Douglass Seaton, *Ideas and Styles in the Western Musical Tradition*, 3rd ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. 486 pages. \$59.95.
ISBN 978-0-19-537988-4**

ANGELA MARIANI

The teaching of music history today takes place in a plethora of different situations, from seminars with five graduate musicology students to auditoriums teeming with four-hundred-fifty non-majors. Dealing with different technologies, navigating online educational resources, and adjusting the level of discourse to each situation create interesting questions of balance, particularly if teachers do not wish to compromise our academic and pedagogical principles. Douglass Seaton's newly revised *Ideas and Styles in the Western Musical Tradition* is a welcome example of a textbook that can be used effectively in a number of different academic situations. *Ideas and Styles* provides a quick but substantive tour through Western musical history and the ideas and cultural context that shaped it. Written in a scholarly yet accessible and engaging narrative style, it is completely suitable for undergraduates while being more than sufficiently erudite for graduate students.

In the companion website (<http://www.oup.com/us/Seaton>), Seaton describes *Ideas and Styles* as a "discursive survey of musical thought." Thought, both individual and collective, is an ever-changing continuum, and indeed the history of music is presented as arising from historical, political, and cultural influences and values, rather than functioning as an artifact that can be boxed into the usual handy but somewhat arbitrary historical categories. Thus, for example, the thousand years usually subsumed into the category of "medieval music" are presented as a logical outgrowth of their historical context: "The Early Christian Period," "The Establishment of a Catholic Tradition," and so on. The words "Renaissance" and "Baroque" do not appear in the Table of Contents; instead we are invited to explore ideas such as "Humanism and Music," "The Reformation in Music," and "Rationalism and its Impact on Music." Musical concepts are presented through the prevailing thought of a particular culture and time period; for example, one is encouraged to understand the characteristics of nineteenth-century orchestral form and harmony

Journal of Music History Pedagogy, vol. 1, no 1, pp. 71–73. ISSN 2155-1099X (online)

© 2010, *Journal of Music History Pedagogy*, licensed under CC BY 3.0

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>)

as a manifestation of the connection between “structural and emotional drama in the Classic and Romantic periods.”¹

Ideas and Styles is not a comprehensive collection of historical facts, nor does it emphasize detailed form and analysis. It does not take the place of histories such as J. Peter Burkholder’s new rewrite of *A History of Western Music* (aka “The Grout”) or Mark Evan Bonds’s *A History of Music in Western Culture*, both with their extensive score and audio anthologies.² It is, however, more comprehensive than a number of other texts specifically designed for one-semester classes, which all too often do not have the depth and scope necessary to challenge a class of music majors or graduate students. In short, it is a stimulating book about ideas and the way that they inform musical process, presented in chronological history. In the preface, Seaton writes:

[This book] provides, as the title suggests, a look at some important contributions to Western musical thinking. It intends to encourage you to respond with thoughts of your own about the music you make and hear. But this should not serve you as a comprehensive historical reference book about music; certainly many interesting events, fine composers, and important musical works cannot be mentioned here. It is not even a compendium of information that a musically cultured person should know.³

Seaton then refers the reader to dictionaries, encyclopedias, various theoretical studies, or the “larger and more detailed histories” mentioned above. The reader is further reminded to look beyond the pages of the book through Seaton’s placement of excellent “Suggestions for Further Reading” at the end of each chapter. The Timeline can also steer students in the direction of related interdisciplinary topics, juxtaposing a chronology of music and musicians alongside a column containing contemporary world events and figures in the Arts and Humanities.

Ideas and Styles in the Western Musical Tradition has no “companion anthology” of recordings. Instead, it provides a chart correlating the contents of the book with a number of well-known recorded anthologies. This can be viewed as an advantage for an instructor who would enjoy having more individual choice and control over listening examples and audio resources, and it facilitates the use of the increasing abundance of online resources (see for example, Dane Heuchemer’s review of A-R Editions’ *Online Music Anthology*

1. Douglass Seaton, from the Introduction to the “Instructor Resources” page on the companion website to *Ideas and Styles in the Western Musical Tradition*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010). <http://www.oup.com/us/companion.websites/9780195379884/instructor/intro/?view=usa>.

2. J. Peter Burkholder, Donald Jay Grout, and Claude V. Palisca, *A History of Western Music*, 8th ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 2010); Mark Evan Bonds, *A History of Music in Western Culture*, 3rd ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2009).

3. Seaton, *Ideas and Styles*, xx.

in this issue). The potential for expanding the listening portion of a course is therefore maximized, which is in keeping with Seaton's philosophy; in his preface he makes it clear that the student should spend "much more time listening to music and studying representative works than you do reading," as "the history of the music is in the music itself."⁴

The companion website, accessible at no additional charge, is an extremely useful adjunct to the book. In addition to the correlation chart between the book's content and several popular recording anthologies, the instructor's resource pages contain a sample syllabus and, for each chapter, overviews and ideas for classroom approaches, discussion topics, stated learning objectives, PowerPoint slides, quizzes, and lists of terms and concepts. The classroom approaches are varied and allow the instructor to pick and choose according to the nature of the class itself; there are exercises that would be completely suitable for a class of non-musicians and exercises tailored to performers. The student resources include the above plus review quizzes and additional resources, such as a "Guide to Research and Writing in Musicology" and "Pronouncing Church Latin: A Quick Reference."

Music textbooks have increasingly adopted a web-style visual format in which a single page may contain multiple images, sidebars, section headings, and cross-references to companion anthologies. Such a design is compatible with the learning styles of contemporary college students, who are visually oriented and accustomed to assimilating knowledge in easily digestible portions that can be "saved" into mental "folders." Seaton's book does not wholly adopt the graphic intensity of the colorful webpage style; however, it is clearly laid-out with section headings and easy-to-read examples, figures, and maps. Primary sources and non-musical context are worked into the narrative of the text, rather than being isolated into separate sidebars that can be easily ignored. Color plates are all collected together in the middle of the book, and while one might wish that they were nearer in proximity to the relevant passages in the text, they are beautiful and vibrant.

Ideas and Styles in the Western Musical Tradition "views music history through the conviction that the cultural and philosophical contexts in which music lives—the *ideas* that surround it—interplay continuously with the *styles* of the music itself." Seaton's approach beautifully addresses the issue of music history's "relevance," contributing to students' wider understanding of the world and encouraging them to think critically about ways in which their own ideas and cultures shape them as musical performers and listeners.⁵

4. Seaton, *Ideas and Styles*, xix.

5. Seaton, *Ideas and Styles*, xix.

The “Textbook Issue”

The next issue of the *Journal of Music History Pedagogy* (vol. 1, no. 2, Spring 2011) will focus on one of the main fixtures of music history teaching—the survey textbook. The editors invited several textbook authors to contribute articles and are pleased to present the following contributions as well as a study of Donald J. Grout’s seminal, *A History of Western Music* in the next issue:

Mark Evan Bonds (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), “Selecting Dots, Connecting Dots: The Anthology as History”

J. Peter Burkholder (Indiana University), “Decoding the Discipline of Music History for Our Students”

John Walter Hill (University of Illinois, emeritus), “A Small Selection from among the Many Things that I Still do not Know about Baroque Music”

Kristy Swift (University of Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music), “Grout the Progressive: Grappling With Donald Jay Grout’s Essays on Music Historiography”

Reviews in the issue will include:

José Bowen (Southern Methodist University), a review essay on the pedagogy literature in other disciplines

James Briscoe (Butler University), Report from the First International Symposium of Music History Pedagogy, University of São Paulo School of Communications and Arts (August 2–7, 2010)

Tony Bushard (University of Nebraska), *Film Music: A Very Short Introduction* by Kathryn Kalinak (Oxford University Press)

Jan Herlinger (Louisiana State University, emeritus), *Music Education in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, edited by Russell E. Murray, Jr., Susan Forscher Weiss, and Cynthia J. Cyrus (Indiana University Press)

Readers interested in contributing articles or reviews to the *JMHP* should consult the “Author Guidelines” at the “For Authors” link on the website. The editors invite comments and feedback on the *Journal* in the form of Letters to the Editor; we are committed to printing a selection of letters that we consider to be of interest to our readers in future issues.