



Cornell University

John S. Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines

Document Title: Exploring the Writer's Voice

Author: Nancy Rachel November

Course: Music 111-3

Course Title: Reverie: Music History Through Myths and Legends

Year: 2000

Copyright Statement:

This material is copyrighted by the author and made available through the Cornell University eCommons Digital Repository under a Creative Commons Attribution, Non-Commercial License.

This document is part of the John S. Knight Writing in the Disciplines First-year Writing Seminar Program collection in Cornell's eCommons Digital Repository.

<http://ecommons.library.cornell.edu/handle/1813/10813>.

MUSIC 111-3: Genius, Fantasy, & Reverie: Music History
Through Myths & Legends

**RATIONALE AND ASSIGNMENT SEQUENCES: EXPLORING THE
WRITER'S VOICE**

**Nancy November
Department of Music**

I. INTRODUCTION

“Look, I know it seems ‘uncool,’ but believe me there’s method behind this Martian madness.” My students are eyeing me skeptically. It is mid-way through the semester and I have just handed out the “expanded syllabus” for Unit 4: “The Mozart Myths”. This is one of two units in Music 111-3 in which I ask the writers to adopt a particular “voice” based on a central view-point that we have studied in the unit. In Unit 4, the students adopt the “outsider” perspective of a Martian, visiting earth 200 years after Mozart’s death in order to report back on Mozartian myths and legends to the “Martian Intra-Galactic Institute of Cultural Studies” (MIICS). The students had already been given a taste of the experience (new for most) of adopting another writer’s voice in Unit 2. Here they explored the view-point of the famous music critic E. T. A. Hoffmann, taking on the “purple prose” of Romanticism to write their own reviews of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony.

My motivation in constructing these assignment sequences was two-fold. First, I wanted the students to experience a variety of rhetorical frameworks through reading and writing, with a view to broadening their own palette of possible approaches to writing. Further, through the experience of a variety of writerly personae, I hoped the students would develop (and observe the development of) unique voices of their own. When I ran the course last semester, I found that students were unwilling to depart from the comfortable familiarity of the conventional “thesis paper” mold, which most of the class had learned in high school. Thus not only did I want to give the students the opportunity to take on writerly roles that they may well not have tried before (that of the music reviewer for example), but I also sought to nuance their approaches to writing a scholarly paper. The writing styles that I ask them to adopt (especially that of Hoffmann) invite, indeed demand, that the students be experimental with language, and with the micro- and macro-structure of their writing. These two units were interleaved between Units 1 and 3, in which the students were to write more conventional position papers at the end of the unit. In the final unit, I asked them to develop their own rhetorical frameworks for a project on Berlioz and the *Symphonie Fantastique*.

Second, I designed these two units in order that the students would consciously use writing to explore crux points in the texts for the course. I ask them to actively engage with the texts, rewriting them by reversing narratives and removing distinctive features of the prose. In this way, I hope to have the students start to uncover underlying narratives, and to think about how one might critique these. In particular, I encourage

students to think critically about the implicit and explicit value judgments, which have been and are being made about music and musicians. I ask students to consider all the visual and written texts we encounter—from the movie “Amadeus” to current articles appearing in the most prestigious journals—as possible participants in the myth-making process. As they identify “master narratives” and reflect on the constructed nature of music history, I hope that the students are stimulated to take yet greater perspective. The assignment sequences lead us to ask: Who or what do these narratives tell us most about? Which works, composers, or indeed view-points/“voices”, might be overlooked or marginalized in the process?

Moreover, I seek to emphasize that this critical mode can and should be applied to the students’ own writings: I encourage them to note that they themselves are constructing value-driven narratives. Further, a primary task in the assignment sequences for this course is to encourage constructive criticism of all of the writings we produce and encounter in terms of the writing issues we discuss. I point out too that the quick-writing assignments, drafts, and end-of-unit papers are part of an open-ended process. We generate several layers of feedback on this process through peer review (both in class and the highly popular “take home” variety), and conference discussion motivated by the students’ own “diagnostic” journal writing. In the final unit for this course, I incorporated a feedback loop that could well have been used more often. I asked the students to give a brief presentation focusing on a single writing issue from a paper in process. As they spoke, the rest of us jotted down one question and one comment addressed to the writer.

In what follows, I provide a more detailed rationale for the sequence of reading, listening, and writing assignments in Units 2 and 4 of Music 111-3. The rationale should ideally be read in conjunction with the expanded syllabi, which appear below. In this third section, I have provided the actual materials that I handed out at the beginning of Units 2 and 4, together with samples of in-class writing assignments, interleaved at the relevant places in the sequence. Please note that “Williams” refers to Joseph Williams’s *Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace* 6 ed. (New York: Longman, 1999), while “Hacker” refers to Diana Hacker’s *A Writer’s Reference* 4 ed. (New York: St. Martin’s College Press, 1999).

II. ASSIGNMENT SEQUENCE RATIONALE

UNIT II: Beethoven Reception 1: Periodization

Writing about symphonic works provides the students with a significant challenge. Thus I begin this unit in which the students will write about Beethoven’s Fifth and Ninth Symphonies by asking them to listen to their choice from one of three recordings of Beethoven’s Fifth with a detailed listening guide. The journal prompts I provide here are designed to have the students move beyond a simple expression of likes and dislikes, to a more critical discussion of the music. At this stage in the course, I encourage them to be as precise as possible in discussing the musical examples, engaging with the music on their own terms while starting to incorporate new musical terminology. I emphasize that these examples will provide the material for illustrating their own arguments in the “body” of the reviews that they will outline in Periodization 1. For this

writing exercise, we review Hacker's comments on planning a paper and formulating arguments, then the students produce a skeletal review of the Fifth Symphony. We examine these in class, discussing the elements of a well-structured argument.

Now that the students have listened to and written about Beethoven's Fifth from their own points of view, we read the first part of the famous review of the work by the early nineteenth-century critic E. T. A. Hoffmann. The in-class exercise on "levels of reading" was designed in the first instance to familiarize the class with the overall structure of Hoffmann's argument. We then produce a skeleton of his review in the form of a list of topic sentences. Sharpening the focus, we take a closer look at Hoffmann's distinctive prose: his use of metaphor, third person, active and passive voice, and his choice of words. In Periodization 2, I ask the students to explore this further by attempting to eliminate the unique character of Hoffmann's "voice" to access the underlying narrative that he constructs around the lives and works of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. I link this into an on-going discussion of clarity in prose, motivated further by readings and exercises from Williams.

Webster's article on periodization allows us to focus simultaneously on the critique of musical "style periods" and on argument construction. Journal prompts here are designed with the twin purpose of having the students identify and evaluate the structure of Webster's lucid article. In class, we use these journal notes to continue our discussion of the role of the "thesis statement", "meta-discourse", and the incorporation of supporting evidence. In Periodization 3, the students resume the process of reflective re-writing, adopting Hoffmann's rhetoric but assuming the opposite narrative model of music history, which valorizes the earliest period (i.e., Haydn rather than Beethoven). The results (many of which were read out in class) were hilarious. The students clearly reveled in the task of manipulating Hoffmann's purple prose. In the writing that followed, I noticed greater experimentation in the students' descriptions of emotions evoked by music generally, and in the use of metaphor in particular.

The reading from Knittel's work provides the students with further motivation for the rhetorical framework they will adopt in the end-of-unit paper. In the final class we focus on contemporary reception of "late" Beethoven, the Ninth Symphony in particular. The students now return to the task of writing a 19th-century review, and again they adopt Hoffmann's writing persona. In responding to Periodization 4, I focus my comments on the extent to which they have successfully adopted Hoffmann's point of view (both his rhetorical style and musical attitudes), and use of specific musical examples to support the points they make. Hoffmann's style certainly caught the students' imaginations: lively reviews rather than conventional "thesis papers" were the fruits of this unit.

UNIT IV: The Mozart Myths

At the start of this unit, the students write a short, informal piece (Mozart Myths 1) on their own creative processes before reading both myth-making and myth-debunking literature on Mozart's creative process. The idea here is to create a personal frame of reference within which to view this literature. The journal prompts I provide at this point are, as usual, designed both to probe narratives and underlying values in the readings, and to motivate critique of the writing style. The students are invited to compare Mozart's supposed creative process with their own and (via Hertzmann) with that of Beethoven.

Hertzmann's article on Mozart's creative process was written in the 1960s, before much revisionist work on the subject. Using facsimiles of Mozart's autograph scores (the Requiem and "Haydn" Quartets) to illustrate, I lead a discussion about how writings such as those of Hertzmann perpetuate myths initiated by late eighteenth-century writers such as Rochlitz. This leads us to discuss Hertzmann's use of evidence in detail. We scrutinize his prose looking to see where he makes appropriate or inappropriate use of "hedgies" or "intensifiers" (as discussed in Williams's Lesson 7).

Next we turn to the role of "Amadeus" in modern day Mozart myth-making. In preparation for this, the class reads from a selection of myth-debunking literature, including a website on the movie. Mozart Myths 2 then asks the students to reflect on their previous reading and writing for this unit, producing a single "body" paragraph for an hypothetical paper on Mozart myths. I ask the students to focus on concision here, and in this spirit, we now turn back to revise Mozart Myths 1. Previous experience had taught me that I should provide a fairly focused framework for the critique of "Amadeus". Hence I ask the students to keep track (in journal "viewing notes") of the piece of their choice from the soundtrack, noting the drama with which it is associated. In Mozart Myths 3, I then asked the students to relate this to the movie myth-making process. We continue to focus on the crafting of "body" paragraphs so that by the time they come to write the end-of-unit paper, the students should have three to four concisely-worded paragraphs to be further revised and incorporated into the paper.

Bruno Nettl adopts the perspective of an "ethnographer from Mars" in the final reading for this unit, which serves to set up the rhetorical framework for the end-of-unit paper. We discuss how this "outsider voice" allows Nettl take stock of the activities of the "denizens" of the "North American Music Building" in his provocative commentary on music as cultural practice today. Nettl's perspective throws light on the way we in the West construct music history, and exposes the values underlying this construction. In Mozart Myths 4, I ask the students to adopt the "outsider" perspective in producing the bicentennial report on Mozart reception to the fictitious "Martian Institute of Intra-Galactic Studies".

"But it's so cheesy!" Many students failed to maintain the Martian viewpoint throughout their reports, which led to a class discussion on the reasons for adopting various "voices" and rhetorical frameworks in general, that of the "outsider" in particular. For further revisions, we sought strategies for maintaining the Martian reporting role throughout. I linked this to a discussion of clarity of argument structure. We noted that a paper could be revised with respect to coherence through the repetition of key words and phrases, together with references back to the central thesis of the paper at key structural points. In the final two units, the class showed a greater willingness to experiment with new viewpoints and structural techniques. In Unit 5, reactions to four controversial "new readings" of Bach's Brandenburg Concerto No. 5 were voiced in the form of engaging reviews for the *Ithaca Journal*, while in Unit 6 the students developed a wide variety of writerly personae for a final project. One enthusiast treated the class to a further MIICS report, following up Mozart Myth-Debunker II's mission with a further visit to earth to report on Earthling Berlioz reception.

An important component of this unit was the take-home peer review. This reviewing method was implemented in response to students' complaints that they did not

have enough time to do justice to peers' work in the in-class peer review sessions carried out in units 1-3. Each class member submitted two copies of the end-of-unit paper and two copies of a self-evaluation sheet: one to me, and one to a randomly assigned reviewer. Further, to provide a check on intended vs. audience-perceived goals and structure for a paper, we decided it would be useful to have peer reviewers construct an outline for the paper after reading it. This was then compared to an outline submitted by the author, drawn up *after* the paper was finished.

III. THE ASSIGNMENT SEQUENCES

UNIT II: Beethoven Reception 1: Periodization

Listening: Beethoven, Symphony No. 5 and Symphony No. 9

Writing Issues: Descriptive and persuasive language; adopting a suitable writing “persona” for a specific audience; further discussion of argument structure and clarity

Unit 2, Class 1

- Read: Review Hacker, Section C1 (“Planning”), and read Section C5 (“Arguments”).

- Listen: Beethoven, Symphony No. 5, following along with the music guide (choose from one of the three CDs on reserve). Please take journal notes at the same time (see below). Please look up terms such as cadence, counterpoint, fermata, fugue, motive, modulation, and theme in *The New Harvard Dictionary* or similar.

- Write:

1. Journal:

As you listen to Beethoven’s Fifth (following along with the music guide), make a note of any musical details that strike you as unusual, as worthy of attention. Pause the CD and replay the passage, while at the same time trying to note down as specifically as possible how the musical effect is achieved. If you can, refer to the score.

Try to listen in another way, too. What does Beethoven seem to be trying to “say” in each movement? In the entire work?

- Does Beethoven attempt to appeal to the audience’s emotions? If so, which emotions?

- Does the work seem to engage in some kind of narrative (tell some kind of story?)

- Is the work coherent? Does it seem to “hang together”? Or not? Explain.

2. Periodization 1:

For the first but not the last time in Music 111-3, you have the enviable opportunity of riding the “Cayuga Starlight Express”—this time back to the early nineteenth century. You have been asked to write a review of the first performance of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, a memorable event in December of 1808, at which the

Sixth Symphony was also showcased. The concert lasted five hours and was highly successful, despite the fact that the heating in the hall failed. Assume that your audience is interested in music (with a level of music literacy on par with music 111-3 class members), but largely unfamiliar with the works of Beethoven. The editor of the journal you are writing for is looking for an article which stakes a claim—expresses an opinion—as to the effectiveness or otherwise of the symphony. Hence you would want to be able to state the reasoning behind your like or dislike of the work by referring to specific musical events.

Your task here is not to write the actual review, but rather to outline your first draft. To this end, I'd like you to come up with a (typed) outline that clearly shows me the following:

- Your overall impression of the work. What overriding message will your reader “take away” from the review? (Approx. one short paragraph.)
- An outline of the body of your review showing topic sentences that will develop your argument, and the musical examples that will support your claims. Please try to develop the musical examples into coherent sentences.

Note on recordings: As a matter of interest, you might like to compare recordings of this movement that claim to use “period instruments” (for example, CD 895 and CD 3832) with those on modern instruments (for example, CD 5040, v.2). This is *not* part of the assignment!

Sample in-class writing exercise from Unit 2, Class 1.

[I start this exercise by asking a volunteer to read Hoffmann's review out loud—preferably suitably “camped up”.]

I. Levels of Reading

For the moment, I would like you to examine Hoffmann's text with a view to understanding the large-scale structure. Please carry out the following steps in your journals:

- Read the excerpt through once without taking any notes. When you have finished, set the review aside and jot down answers to the following:
 - (a) In a sentence, what is E. T. A. Hoffmann's mission in writing this review?
 - (b) To whom is he writing, and why (what is your impression of the style he adopts)?
 - (c) What sort of linguistic devices does Hoffmann use to help him convey his point? Do any particular words or phrases from the text come to mind?

Label these notes “initial reactions”.

- Now turn back to the review and under the heading “topic sentences” in your journal, try to summarize each paragraph in a single sentence. This sentence can be a combination of your ideas about both form and content. Sentence fragments are fine. Use language helpful/understandable for your own reference. For example “Introduction. H's great respect for the works of Beethoven”, etc. At this stage you should still be

skimming the text for the main ideas; try not to get bogged down with Hoffmann's rhetoric!

- Compare notes in discussion groups of four (or five).

[I ask these discussion groups to report back, writing down a list of answers to each part on the board.]

II. Voice

• Now that we have discussed the basic ideas of the text, take a closer look at Hoffmann's writing style. Referring back to your initial reactions, reconsider the following question: Who is it that is addressing the audience in this review? In other words, who is speaking to the audience in Hoffmann's review? What grammatical cues are there as to Hoffmann's "persona" here? What effect do these have on the listener? [Class discussion of "voice" followed, with examples from the text. We discussed personal/impersonal style and passive/active voice.]

• Have a go at re-writing Hoffmann's review using a more active voice. In other words, rather than "the reviewer" use "I". Attempt to convert the discussion into an engaging account of Hoffmann's own impressions of Beethoven.

Unit 2, Class 2

- Read: Webster (course packet); Williams, Lesson 4: "Clarity 2: Characters."
- Listen: Beethoven, Symphony No. 9, movements 1-3.
- Write:
 1. Journal: As you read the article by Webster, jot down answers to the following:
 - What is Webster's central thesis? Can you locate his "thesis statement"?
 - How does Webster structure his argument? Sketch a flow chart showing how he proceeds (in order to do this, you may like to first make note of the topic sentences for each paragraph).
 - What kind of supporting evidence does he use?
 - What, and how does he conclude?
 - Do you find this article convincing? I would like you to consider this question both from the point of view of the writer's style, and the actual content (i.e., whether the thesis together with supporting evidence convinces you, and why/why not).
 2. Periodization 2:

Depth and color can be created in writing by the use of well-chosen descriptive language. In class you may have noted down some of the "buzz words" which lend a particular character to Hoffmann's text. Try re-writing the three paragraphs on p. 132—on Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven respectively—eliminating the descriptive language that Hoffmann uses. Paraphrase his text with simple, unadorned language, attempting to state what it is that Hoffmann is describing with his analogies. Bring Periodization 2 to class on Tuesday for discussion.

Unit 2, Class 3

- Read: Knittel (course packet).
- Listen: Beethoven, Symphony No. 9 (to refresh your memory!)
- Write: Periodization 3

How would Hoffmann's article differ if his view of music history were turned on its head? Assume, for the sake of this assignment, that you are E. T. A. Hoffmann's twin brother. You share his schooling in rhetoric, but not his ideas about Beethoven. In fact, you enjoy the "representational" works of little-known masters of the late 18th Century such as Dittersdorf, and think that music history reached its pinnacle in the works of Haydn, declining thereafter with Mozart, and reaching an all-time low in the works of Beethoven. Adopting the "purple" rhetoric of romanticism, write your review! Bring your work to class on Thursday for peer review.

Unit 2, Class 4

- Write: Periodization 4 (2-3 pages)

E. T. A. Hoffmann died in 1822, two years before Beethoven completed his Ninth Symphony. Nevertheless, we can speculate about how he would have reacted to the work. Pretend you are E. T. A. Hoffmann, and that you have been asked to write a review of Symphony No. 9 for the same journal that published your review of No. 5. In this review you will focus on your opinion as to the effectiveness (or otherwise) of the final movement. As with your earlier review, be sure to support the points you make with references to specific musical events. Don't forget to adopt:

- Hoffmann's style of writing, replete with romantic metaphors;
- A suitable (early 19th-century) critical approach to the work as "late" Beethoven (see Knittel's article);
- A suitably Hoffmannesque approach to the inclusion of voices in the final movement of the work

For Conferences

- Write: Journal reflections on your paper.

You might like to consider the following questions:

What do I like most/least about this paper?

What is the next step in the revision process for this paper?

UNIT IV: The Mozart Myths

Listening: Mozart's Requiem; Soundtrack to "Amadeus"

Writing Issues: Analyzing and revising sentences for concision; adopting and maintaining a given point of view (that of the "ethnomusicologist from Mars"); revising for coherence

Unit 4, Class 1

- Write:

Mozart Myths 1: Choose a creative activity that you are currently involved in, or have tried at some stage in the past. Perhaps you once tried your hand at pottery, painting, composing, or choreography? Very likely you've done some creative prose writing, or written poetry. Write 1-2 pages on your creative process. Did the work of art flow easily or was it an effort? What steps did you take to create the finished product? Were there any "side products" such as sketches, drafts, or discarded first attempts? This piece is to be short and informal.

Unit 4, Class 2

- Read: Williams, Lesson 7; Hertzmann, your assigned Rochlitz Anecdote (course packet).

- Listen: I'd like you to start to familiarize yourself with the sound track to "Amadeus", especially the excerpts from Mozart's Requiem: Dies irae, Rex tremendae majestatis, Confutatis, Lacrymosa. These can be found on tracks 8-11 of CD 1989, and tracks 4-7 of CD 4255.

For your interest and additional information, scores (including the facsimile of the autograph manuscript), and other recordings/versions of the Requiem are on reserve.

Please note:

For the traditional Süssmayr completion, listen to CD 5949;

For Robert Levin's completion, listen to CD 4873 and see +M2010.M93 K. 626 1994 (score);

For Richard Maunder's completion (with "Amen fugue"), listen to CD 53 and see ++M2010 M93 K. 626 1988 (score).

- Write: The following responses to Hertzmann should take the form of journal notes:

1. Issues of content:

- (a) How does Hertzmann characterize Mozart's creative process? Examine his descriptive language and jot down some of the phrases he uses to describe Mozart's method of composition. How, in Hertzmann's opinion, does Mozart's creative process compare to that of Beethoven?

- (b) Referring back to your readings on periodization, think critically about what Hertzmann is saying on pp. 25-26 (pp. 14-15 of the course packet). What is the implied influence of Mozart's life on his music here? Which events are singled out as "turning

points”? Which composers are singled out as being particularly influential in the formation of Mozart’s style? Which of the periodization types does Hertzmann adopt? How is Mozart’s creative process seen to change? Which adjectives does Hertzmann use to describe the new process? Can you spot the “organic” metaphor? Think about the *implications* of your answers to these questions. What does Hertzmann leave out of the picture, and why?

(c) How does Hertzmann characterize Mozart’s relationship with his father? With Archbishop Colloredo? With his audiences? With society in general?

2. Writing issues:

(a) Think about how Hertzmann uses his evidence. Can you identify the different types of evidence he cites? Does he always assess these sources critically? Can you find any examples of unsupported assertions? Are there any places where you long for a footnote so you can check up on what Hertzmann is saying? Looking at pp. 18-20 (course packet pp. 11-12) from the paragraph beginning “Constanze’s reminiscences” to “... an imaginary score he knew by heart”, consider Hertzmann’s language from the point of view of “hedging and intensifying” (see Williams pp. 153-157).

(b) Choose a page in the article (i.e., half a page in the course packet) to revise with respect to concision. See Williams’s checklist on pp. 162-3. Please bring this to class to discuss and hand in (you may hand in a photocopy if you wish, but I’ll get this page back to you).

Please look up any unfamiliar musical terms Hertzmann uses here in Randel’s or Grove’s dictionary.

Unit 4, Class 3

“Amadeus” Viewing

Viewing notes: Please bring your journal along to the media center to make some notes on the movie (see Mozart Myths 3).

- Read: I would like you to read a selection from the literature concerned with debunking the Mozart myths. This should provide you with some background for assessing the portrayal of Mozart in Shaffer’s/Forman’s “Amadeus”. Please read Stafford and Solomon (both in the course packet), and the essay published at the following website: <http://www.frontiernet.net/~sboerner/mozart/essays/brown.html>. In addition, please read through the “Quick and dirty film glossary” handed out in class, and Hacker sections W2 (“Wordy sentences”) and W5 (“Exact language”).

- Listen: CD 1989 (on reserve) has the entire soundtrack to “Amadeus”, while CD 4255 has selections. I would like you to select a piece (or two if you like) from the sound track, then attempt to trace the use of this music in the movie. In order to do this, you should have the music firmly in your head before viewing, and have your journal handy to note the action when you hear your tune! You will use this information in writing Mozart Myths 3.

- Write:

1. With the readings from Hacker's section W and Williams's Lesson 7 in mind, edit your work for Mozart Myths 1 on your own creative process being extremely picky about concision, and word choice in general. Hand in your original version with your corrections and annotations marked in.

2. Mozart Myths 2: Using what you learned from reading Rochlitz, Hertzmann, writing about your own creative process, and reading from the Mozart "myth debunking" literature, write a paragraph on "The Myths of Mozart's Creative Process". Imagine that this is to be a paragraph within a paper on Mozart myths in general. As you write, be concision conscious!

Both of these items are to be handed in at the first "Amadeus" viewing session.

Extra material:

Please note that a copy of Peter Shaffer's original play "Amadeus" is also on reserve if you would like to see the text that was used as a basis for the screen play.

Unit 4, Class 5

- Read: Nettle (Course Packet), Hacker, section E4 ("Shifts"), and review Williams, Lesson 7. Please bring your copy of Williams to class.

- Write: Mozart Myths 3 (two paragraphs).

1. Using your viewing notes, describe in a paragraph how one of the Mozart myths is perpetuated/enhanced/alterd by the movie "Amadeus". Please refer to the "Quick and dirty film glossary" for any technical language that you may require.

2. In a second paragraph, explain how the piece of music you chose to trace from the soundtrack of "Amadeus" was used in the unfolding drama. How was the music correlated with the action? Was it used repeatedly in certain situations? What sort of mood did it convey or enhance? Did it contribute to the myth-making process in this movie? If so, how?

When you have finished, edit your prose for concision (again, see Williams's checklist pp. 162-3.)

Unit 4, Class 6

- Read: Williams, Lesson 8, pp. 165-180.

- Write: Mozart Myths 4.

Like Nettle, you are to imagine that you are an "ethnographer from Mars". Every two hundred years, the Martian Institute of Intra-Galactic Cultural Studies (MIICS) sends representatives down to earth to survey the cultural life and report back. The last visit took place in the 1790s, around the time of Mozart's death, so the musical correspondent (who, by chance, landed in Vienna) chose to focus on Mozart in his report. The MIICS has chosen you as their new musical correspondent, and is asking that you up-date their

files. They have heard on the grapevine that Mozart is still very much alive in the minds of music lovers of the late twentieth century, and wish for an account of this behavior, which they regard as highly unusual. (Martians tend to listen exclusively to newly composed works, regarding any music composed more than two weeks ago as outdated.) Their main questions are: “Who is W. A. Mozart to the late twentieth-century Earthling? Two hundred years on, do Earthlings still have the same views on the man and his music?”.

You have now read from and viewed a variety of documents, which either perpetuate or attempt to debunk the various Mozart Myths. For the purpose of the report, consider this part of the research that you conducted during your stay on Earth. Please write this report in the form of a 2-3 page memo to the MIICS. After a suitable introduction, structure the paragraphs of your report around several of the myths we have discussed (for example, those about “Mozart as “perpetual child”, Mozart as “genius and misfit” etc.). Be sure to identify the source(s) of the myth (e.g. in “Amadeus”, *Mozart and Salieri*, course packet readings, etc.), and to use the “myth-debunking” literature you have read in this unit in order to construct your report.

In each paragraph, please pay attention to the issues of clarity, concision, cohesion, and coherence you have read about in Williams. Please use standard referencing procedures (footnotes, paraphrase, quotations, etc.).

Peer review:

You will be receiving two layers of feedback for this paper. I will collect, comment on, and grade your work as usual. In addition, please print off another copy of your paper for peer review. Please fill out the self-evaluation sheet, which will accompany your essay to assist the responder in evaluating the work. Photocopy this self-evaluation sheet and submit a copy with each copy of the essay.