

The Harvard Dictionary of Music. Edited by Don Michael Randel. Fourth edition. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003. \$59.95. 978 p. ISBN 0-674-01163-5

When I began my undergraduate studies at the University of Toronto in the mid-1960s, I was required to purchase a copy of the original *Harvard Dictionary of Music* (*HDM1*, 1944) for the first-year music-literature course, then taught by the late Harvey Olnick. Willi Apel's one-volume dictionary was a model of clear, concise information, and proved to be a helpful quick-reference tool during my undergraduate years, particularly for terms used in the study of the history, theory, and performance of Western art music. Later, an underlined and annotated copy of Apel's second edition (*HDM2*, 1969) saw me successfully through my doctoral comprehensive exams at the Eastman School of Music, though I found it necessary to consult other sources for more complete information on twentieth-century and non-Western music.

The third edition (*NHDM*, 1986), edited by Don Michael Randel, expanded the coverage of twentieth-century and non-Western music, and included information on jazz and popular music for the first time. Though I also own a copy of that edition, I did not get to know its contents as intimately as I did those of the first two, and was not aware until recently to what extent it may have modified the Western and historical focuses of the earlier editions. It was with favourable memories of the first two editions and anticipation of experiencing another scholarly tour de force that I set about acquainting myself with the latest edition (*HDM4*) and comparing it to *NHDM*, since Randel explains in his preface to the new edition that it "does proceed rather directly from its predecessor." Presumably to underline

that point, the preface to *NHDM* is also reprinted in the new edition.

I noted right away that *HDM4* has only thirty-six pages more than *NHDM*. Even if it had gained additional space through selected deletions or contractions of the recycled *NHDM* texts, I wondered how it could adequately cover the many developments in the musical world since the mid-1980s. In his new preface, Randel mentions "numerous changes... reflect[ing] new developments in music scholarship, especially the expanding range of subjects now being studied by music scholars, as well as the fact that the world and its political boundaries have substantially changed since the last edition" (p. v). That statement is as noteworthy for what it does not include (e.g., intellectual, social, and technological changes) as for what it does. So, is *HDM4* a worthy successor to the earlier editions I knew so well, and will it meet my needs and those of other music scholars, students, and amateurs of the early twenty-first century?

HDM4 continues the tradition of clean layout, impeccable copy editing, and succinct, uncomplicated prose that were hallmarks of the earlier editions. Many paragraphs are rather long for my taste but this is a stylistic matter, and fewer paragraphs presumably require fewer pages, always a consideration in book publishing. Cross references are plentiful, though there are some oversights (discussed below). As with earlier editions, bibliographies accompany many longer articles. One notable omission was a glossary, which previous editions also lacked, but in a dictionary of

almost 1,000 pages it would be of great help to those in search of information about the many terms not given their own entries (e.g., digital audio workstation).

New entries, though few, cover a wide range of topics, as the following sampling shows: "Algorithmic composition," "Gender and music," "ISMN," "Modernism," "Transformational theory," and "Wind ensemble." Curiously, there is also a new article on "Album," an oversight in *NHDM* but now an anachronism mistakenly applied to CDs: "The 'boxed set'...became a familiar album format of the 1990s" (p. 32). To my way of thinking, individual CDs are analogous to individual LP albums, and the term "boxed set" applies equally to LPs and CDs.

Deletions from *NHDM* include "Psychology of music," though there are new articles on the "Brain and music," "Musical ability, development of," and "Music cognition." The lack of cross-references to those new articles from even a bare entry on "Psychology of music" is an unfortunate oversight, in my view. This whole area of study has grown dramatically in recent years and I counted eight monographs published since 1986 with "music" and "psychology" in their titles in my library's on-line catalogue. Students or amateurs might not be savvy enough to search further upon finding no entry on the psychology of music. Also puzzling was the deletion of "Tests of musical capacity and ability," which is not covered in the new entry on "Musical ability." Among notable omissions from both editions were gay and lesbian music, and environmental music, both of which have entries in *New Grove 2*.

Turning to updated articles containing the fruits of post-*NHDM* scholarship, I found

recent developments in "Ethnomusicology," fresh details on "American Indian music," a new slant on "Authenticity" relating to the historical performance-practice movement, and completely rewritten articles on "Jewish music" and the "Magnus liber organi." The revised article on "Recording" contains one slip: it contends that digital audio tape (DAT) is still used in professional recording studios (p. 709). DAT never was an industry-standard format and has already gone the way of the dinosaur, replaced by computer hard drives and the recordable CD. DAT is still used for off-site "location" work in film and television production, though the new Porta Drive (a hard-disc-based recorder) will likely soon make it a thing of the past even for location work.

"Theory" has also been rewritten and expanded, but the long bibliographical lists accompanying this article in *NHDM* are repeated here with only minor revisions. Most other articles in *NHDM* that featured long lists, including "Bibliography," "Dictionaries and Encyclopedias," "Editions," and "Periodicals," have had the lists dropped from *HDM4*, presumably because the information is available elsewhere and space was needed for other topics.

I was surprised to find numerous other inconsistencies in this publication, not the least of which was its title. The publisher has retreated from the title adopted for the third edition which, befitting its change of editor and a minimal carryover of copy from *HDM2*, had added *New* to its name. Now, despite retaining Randel as editor and recycling a great deal of content from *NHDM*, the 2003 edition has dropped the "New" and appropriated Apel's old title. So, unlike the 2001 edition of the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and*

Musicians, Stanley Sadie's second as editor which is known as *New Grove 2*, *HDM4* will not be known as "New Harvard 2."

While the name flip-flop in itself may seem inconsequential, it results in differences in cataloguing (ML100.H37 2003 versus ML100.R3 1986) and means that *HDM4* must occupy a different place on the reference shelves than *NHDM* did (which was conveniently near *New Grove 2* in my library), unless librarians make local decisions to depart from the Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication data supplied by the publisher. Such inconsistencies give librarians grey hair. But this was only a preamble to the many inconsistencies, editorial lapses, and other shortcomings I found inside, beginning on page one where Ralph Locke's article on "Absolute music," mostly a reprint from *NHDM*, still uses the present tense to discuss twentieth-century music.

Historical Emphasis

In general, I found far too many verbatim repeats of entries from *NHDM* for the prefatory promise of "numerous changes" in *HDM4* to be considered much more than promotional hyperbole. As a result, the editor's choice of language about the new edition "proceed[ing] rather directly from its predecessor" (italics mine) achieves unintended irony in its understatement.

At best, most of the longer unrevised articles offer a few additions of post-*NHDM* titles in their bibliographies. One example is the entry on Western secular art song ("Song"), which includes a number of additions to the 1986 bibliography. The article itself, typical of the publication, gives a strong

historical summary and ends by mentioning selected twentieth-century art-song composers, the most recent of whom are Messiaen, Barber, Rorem, and Tippett. Since only Rorem was still alive in 2003 when *HDM4* was published, the simple addition to the list of some recent exponents of the genre—e.g., Argento, Bolcom, Corigliano, Heggie, Kernis, Del Tredici, et al—might have completed its narrative about the twentieth century or even brought us into the new millennium. The pattern of thorough historical coverage and incomplete or non-existent reporting of more recent works or events is all too common throughout the dictionary.

In some cases, not even the bibliographies have been amended. For example, the last item in the bibliography accompanying "Suzuki method" dates from 1973, and the article itself makes no mention of Suzuki methodology having expanded beyond violin, cello, and piano to be adapted to the teaching of double bass, flute, guitar, harp, recorder, and other instruments. The entry on "Sociology of Music" is another repeat lacking updates in its bibliography. A quick keyword search of "music" and "sociology" in my library's catalogue showed half a dozen monographs published since *NHDM* featuring those words in the titles alone; the full list of post-1986 search results was much longer.

Another entry where neither the article nor bibliography was changed from *NHDM* is "Film music." Considering the number of colleges and universities now offering courses on film and film-music, one would think that a twenty-first-century publication purporting to cover popular genres would not miss the chance to update a 1986 article in which the latest film mentioned dated from 1982, and the most recent entry in the bibliography from

1981. It also happens that the original article was notable for significant omissions, and should have been a candidate for a rewrite in the new edition. While the historical and technical aspects of film scoring are adequately covered in the article, though I question the need for the technical data, information on post-1970s film music is almost nonexistent.

John Williams, who has scored over two hundred films, including many box-office hits directed by George Lucas and Steven Spielberg, and for which he has won five Academy Awards and seventeen Grammys, among other honours, is not mentioned. Major European film composers, such as Georges Delarue (a collaborator of François Truffaut's), Maurice Jarre (associated with David Lean), and Nino Rota (Federico Fellini) were also omitted. Distinguished British film composers, including Richard Addinsell (remember the *Warsaw Concerto*?), William Alwyn, Malcolm Arnold, Richard Rodney Bennett, Brian Easdale, Michael Nyman, Ralph Vaughan Williams, and William Walton were all left out, along with the Americans Danny Elfman, Jerry Goldsmith, Victor Young (who collaborated with Cecil B. DeMille), and Hans Zimmer.

Meanwhile, in the "Opera" entry, only the last sentence of a seven-page article has been amended, as if that could sufficiently update the article. Coverage up to the early 1950s is excellent but beyond that point discussion tails off dramatically, and few post-1950s operas are mentioned: two each by Britten, Tippett, and Glass; one each by Dallapiccola and Sessions; and Messiaen's *Saint François d'Assise: Scènes franciscaines* (1983), the most recent opera mentioned in the dictionary, and the only addition to the original *NHDM* text. Those nine titles and the few lines of text

discussing them stand in stark contrast to thirty-eight titles from the first six decades of the twentieth century and the several paragraphs devoted to them. The bibliography, which is extensive (almost a full page), remains exactly as it was in *NHDM* despite the fact that there have been dozens of books published on various aspects of opera just since 2000.

Completely missing from the article is any consideration of works by Adams (*Nixon in China* and *The Death of Klinghoffer*), Adès (*Powder Her Face*), Argento (*Postcard from Morocco*), Blitzstein (*Regina*), Corigliano (*The Ghosts of Versailles*), Previn (*A Streetcar Named Desire*), and Tan Dun (*Marco Polo*), not to mention the considerable operatic output of Ashley, Henze, Machover, Rautavaara, and others. The editor's failure to update such significant entries as those on "Film music," "Opera," and "Song" constitutes a major failing of *HDM4*, and seems to fly in the face of his statement that his editions of the dictionary reflect "the growing proportion of scholarship and criticism devoted to more recent music" (p. vii).

Even the core historical coverage is rife with inconsistencies. The entry on "Répertoire international..." has cross references to articles on *RIdIM*, *RILM*, and *RISM*, but not to *RIPM* (which does, however, have an entry). While *RIdIM*, *RILM*, and *RIPM* are given two- or three-line entries merely identifying the acronyms, *RISM* has almost two full columns, given over mainly to the type of list that was standard in *NHDM* but which has been suppressed in many other entries in this edition. *RISM* is also the only one of the four identified as a joint project of IAML and IMS, with some background on the project included; no such information is given

for the others, and none of the four entries has any details about Web availability. “*RIPM*” does contain a cross-reference to “Periodicals,” where some additional information about both *RIPM* and *RILM* can be found, though “*RILM*” has no analogous cross-reference.

Another issue evident throughout the publication is an American bias. The American Musicological Society has its own entry but the International Musicological Society (IMS) does not. The “Copyright and performance right” article says nothing about the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) treaties, and gives no hint of the differences between the Americans and others on such issues as moral rights and third-party rights, or concepts such as “fair use” versus “fair dealing.” Strangely though, despite the American slant, the copyright article omits mention of the Technology, Education, and Copyright Harmonization (TEACH) Act of 2002 in the U.S., nor does it mention the U.S. Digital Millennium Copyright Act by name. The issue of American bias will return again.

A further issue is clarity of language, one of any dictionary’s essential ingredients, which on occasion in Randel’s two editions has been sacrificed to the demands of brevity. A case in point is the unsigned, three-sentence entry on “Res facta,” recycled unchanged from *NHDM*, which reads as follows:

A composition, usually but not always written, in which each voice is constructed with regard for all others. Since the first occurrence of the term (in the works of Tinctoris, ca. 1435-1511), writers have exhibited considerable confusion over its meaning. It has most commonly been

used to designate written, as opposed to improvised, counterpoint (pp. 719-720).

This definition will likely add to the numbers of confused people, as it gives no hint that the term applies only to fifteenth-century contrapuntal music of a certain type, and has no application to music of later eras. Based on the entry’s first sentence, one might think that a Bach fugue is a good example of *res facta*, which would be mistaken. The sort of history-related myopia exhibited by this brief article, among others, is acute enough to be considered a serious shortcoming, since Randel’s editions were supposed to have “conceive[d] the dictionary afresh” (p. vii).

This entry also used its allotted space poorly, devoting about one-and-a-half of its three sentences to the question of written versus improvised, and another half sentence to the extraneous “confusion” issue, while completely failing to explain why “each voice [being] constructed with regard for all others” was so important that *res facta* merited its own entry. To me, the essence of *res facta* is that it represented a significant departure from the earlier practice of ensuring harmonic consonance only between each contrapuntal voice and the *cantus firmus*, but not necessarily among all the voices. In the end, this article does not deliver even key historical information.

20th- and 21st-Century Music

The historical emphasis of the publication seems to have mitigated against adequate treatment of music of all types from the last hundred years. Moreover, as with other topic areas, the twin bugaboos of inconsistency and

oversight dog the coverage of contemporary music in particular. On the asset side of the ledger, the entry on “Program music” has been expanded and updated, and this article actually mentions living composers and works from the 1980s and '90s. Still more are listed under “Program symphony.” On the deficit side, well-known operas, ballets, symphonies, masses, etc., from music history are generally given brief entries of their own but coverage of twentieth-century works is erratic, with many titles particularly from the last fifty years nowhere to be found.

Vaughan Williams’ *Sinfonia Antartica* was omitted, along with Copland’s *Red Pony* and *Rodeo*, Ligeti’s *Le Grand Macabre* and *Atmosphères*, Penderecki’s *Threnody (To the Victims of Hiroshima)*, and Stockhausen’s *Stimmung*. Bernstein’s *West Side Story*, *Chichester Psalms*, and other titles are missing, as are Glass’s operas (as we saw earlier), Adams’ *Shaker Loops* and *Short Ride in a Fast Machine*, Corigliano’s *Pied Piper Fantasy*, Crumb’s *Echoes of Time and the River* and *Vox balaenae*, Del Tredici’s *Final Alice*, Gorecki’s *Symphony of Sorrowful Songs*, Pärt’s *Fratres*, Picker’s *Old and Lost Rivers*, Schnittke’s *Labyrinths*, Tavener’s *The Protecting Veil*, Torke’s *Bright Blue Music*, and virtually all other oft-performed works of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

What are readers to infer from the exclusion of these titles—that they are not as significant as the *Peer Gynt Suite*, *Hänsel und Gretel*, *Swan Lake*, and other works that do have entries? Most of the latter, including the three mentioned, have been there since Apel’s second edition, leading me to suspect that Randel has taken more of a cue from Apel than he would have us believe when he writes

in the preface to *NHDM* that it “includes only a handful of articles based on the earlier dictionaries” (p. vii).

Contemporary-music terms completely overlooked in *HDM4* include acousmatic, electronica, glitch, granular synthesis, interactive music, physical modeling, postminimal, softsynth, pitch space, and spectral music. The digital audio workstation is mentioned only briefly in the entry on “Electro-Acoustic Music,” but might have received its own entry, in my opinion. Under “Recording,” there is no mention of computer-based digital editing and noise-reduction (the norm in recording and audio conservation studios today), or DOLBY 5. Audio streaming, RealAudio, and MP3 are also not included. IRCAM, Stochastic Music, and the Darmstadt International Summer Course for New Music lack entries, though Darmstadt is mentioned under “Austria” and IRCAM under “France.”

Even some standard terms are given short shrift. “Whole tone scales” receive almost three inches of text but there is no separate entry for octatonic scales, which are mentioned only in passing at the end of the “Scale” article, and there only in connection with Stravinsky, whereas Messiaen, Schwantner, and many others have made extensive use of octatonic scales more recently. And although the Prix de Rome has an entry, I found no other musical awards included anywhere. Some discussion of the Praemium Imperiale and Pulitzer Prize for music, along with the Grammy and Academy Awards for musical composition, might have been useful in augmenting the publication’s coverage of twentieth-century music of all types.

In addition, there are no entries for the Internet or the World Wide Web, nor any URLs for Web databases, audio archives, or other sites. There are only passing references in one or two articles to the Internet itself, and brief mentions of *JSTOR* and the Web versions of *RILM* and *RIPM* in "Periodicals" (given without their URLs). It is almost as if the Web didn't exist, and there may well have been a decision by the editor or publisher to ignore it. But the evolution from analogue to digital formats since the 1980s has had profound consequences across the musical spectrum, from composing, recording, editing, and publishing music, to cataloguing it in libraries and converting the content of manuscripts and historic audio and video documents for preservation purposes, as well as publishing music periodicals electronically and conducting scholarly research. With the advent of the Internet in the 1990s and the virtual explosion of high-quality Web-based music sites (e.g., *Music Index Online*, *Grove Dictionary*, and Canada's own *Virtual Gramophone*), it became well-nigh impossible for scholarly publications such as *HDM4* to ignore the Web.

Narrow Perspective

Besides the overwhelming lack of coverage for music and technology of recent years, are there any other drawbacks to the dictionary's historical approach? In a word, yes. In my view, too many terms are treated in an overly restrictive fashion, thereby possibly skewing some readers' perceptions. For example, "Academy" is defined as a "scholarly or artistic society" (p. 2) with that use of the word traced forward from ancient Greece to Renaissance Italy and seventeenth-century France. Only the last sentence of the article allows for other types of musical academies,

including schools of music and groups promoting musical performance, but even here the notion of "learned associations devoted to studies of music theory and history" (p. 3) returns. Are these not still "scholarly societies" under another name?

I would suggest that many of the students and amateurs who are part of the dictionary's target audience might associate the term "academy" today with other meanings, and that those might more properly begin the article, with discussion of the term's historical usage coming afterward. In fact, the dictionary would have been more accessible or user-friendly had this model been applied throughout. Willi Apel employed it for "articles which are of interest to the amateur as well as to the musicologist," and drew attention in the preface to his first edition to "clearly dividing the material into two paragraphs, one of which treats the subject from the present-day point of view, the other, from that of the historian" (1944, p. v).

For the record, other uses of the word "academy" that occur to me include short-term venues for master classes and workshops (e.g., summer programs such as the Accademia Musicale Chigiana in Siena, Italy, or the Music Academy of the West in Santa Barbara, California, neither of which is an actual bricks-and-mortar school), or such venerable institutions as the Music Academy in Philadelphia, a concert hall which the Philadelphia Orchestra calls home.

Another of the many definitions in the volume based only on historic meanings is "Tattoo." While *New Grove 2* defines it as a "term now applied to a military display or presentation to which the public is admitted" (Vol. 25, p. 121), *HDM4* gives only the

following: "A call sounded on bugles, drums, or fifes to summon soldiers to their quarters at night" (p. 871). That meaning, which dates from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, has been defunct for almost a hundred years, and public military tattoos have taken place since at least World War I. Surely *HDM4* could have done more to reflect the "changes in the character of musical life" (Preface, *NDHM*) it claims to address.

Of numerous other entries that might have included more complete or up-to-date information, here are a few:

- "Anonymous IV," "Camerata," "Chronos," "Eurythmics" "Kantorei," "Musica reservata," "Tafelmusik," and "Vingt-Quatre Violons du Roy" all omit any reference to highly regarded performing ensembles of recent international fame.
- "Chansonnier" is defined only as a songbook, whereas it also designates a song-writer or balladeer. Charles Aznavour, Gilbert Bécaud, and Jacques Brel are among many who flourished in the international francophone community during the second half of the twentieth century, and whose work goes unmentioned in the dictionary.
- "Ostinato" gives no details about the varied applications of this rhythmic phenomenon in indigenous musics, jazz, and rock.
- "Period" makes no mention of the extremely popular period-instrument movement of recent decades, which is otherwise only obliquely referred to (i.e.,

not by that term) under "Performance practice."

- "Watermark" omits any reference to current applications of the concept: i.e., digital "watermarks" attached to electronic files (e.g., scores) to protect their authenticity and copyrights.

Non-Western Music

Non-Western instruments appear to have received exhaustive treatment in *HDM4*, but there are many inconsistencies and weaknesses in the overall coverage of non-Western music. To begin, the old Wade-Giles system of transliterating Chinese words (e.g., Peking) continues to dominate in *HDM4*, whereas *pinyin*-system words (e.g., Beijing), now in almost universal usage, are included only in brackets to accompany Wade-Giles words the first time they appear. This seems particularly anachronistic.

Japanese Noh theatre has its own entry with a full column of text while "Kabuki" is given under two lines in its entry. "Raga" has under an inch of text, but "Gamelan" is given three column-inches devoted to a technical discussion about bell tunings; this article gives no general information for the benefit of uninitiated readers about the components of gamelans or their musical styles and genres.

With respect to the political changes cited by Randel in his preface, presumably including the fall of the USSR and the disintegration of the Eastern Bloc in Europe, there is an updated article on Albania and new entries on Russia and the republics that formerly made up Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. "Africa" has also been rewritten.

Not being particularly well-versed in non-Western music, I searched for a term I did know. Without a glossary, it took some persistence but I finally found references to throat singing only in “Russia” and “Tuva,” a little-known Siberian republic of the former Soviet Union that somehow merited a separate article while most other former Soviet republics did not. In fact, the *HDM4* article on Russia is drawn largely from the *NHDM* article on “Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,” minus the coverage of folk music in republics outside of Russia proper. While the Baltic countries now have their own article, and Mongolia receives adequate treatment in the expanded “East Asia” article, coverage of other Russian regions and former Soviet republics seems to have slipped through the cracks, except for some brief passing references: e.g., “The peoples of Afghanistan, Central Asia, and the Caucasus share in [a system of liturgical, classical, folk, and modern popular music] peripherally (“Near and Middle East,” p. 550). Not much information there. In a relatively brief new article on Central Asia (a little over one column), no mention is made of any former Soviet republics.

But I digress. As many Canadians know, throat singing is a type of vocal game or contest practiced by Inuit women of the Canadian Arctic. According to the *Encyclopedia of Music in Canada*, it has also been documented in Alaska and Japan, thus making it an international phenomenon. Placing it only in the Siberian peninsula, as *HDM4* does, is misleading. Moreover, by not giving throat singing a separate entry, the editor missed an opportunity to enlarge the coverage of both non-Western music and music-making by females.

In the entry on “American Indian music,” written by the eminent ethnomusicologist, Bruno Nettl, there is an otherwise unexplained mention of “throat games” (p. 40) ascribed to “the Eskimo” (a colonial-era term normally replaced by “Inuit” today), and made without any reference to throat singing, Russia, or Tuva. This article of just over three-and-a-half pages purportedly on the music of the indigenous peoples of North and South America does not do justice to the breadth of its subject (and perhaps could not in the space afforded), focusing heavily on native peoples of the U.S. (Nettl’s own area of specialization) while giving both Canadian and South American natives minimal attention. The closing paragraph, under the rubric “Research,” actually mentions Beverley Diamond, a distinguished Canadian ethnomusicologist, but I found none of her writings nor those of any other Canadian (e.g., Nicole Beaudry) listed in the bibliography, which appears to be completely bereft of any Canadian content. It occurs to me that the word “American” in the title of this entry, while perhaps not originally meant to convey “U.S. only” as it is routinely utilized, was interpreted in just that way by the author. Perhaps had the article been entitled something like “Indian (or Indigenous) Music of the Americas,” the musical traditions of non-U.S. native peoples might have received more equitable treatment.

Jazz

As with the treatment of twentieth-century art music, coverage of jazz in this edition is rather hit-and-miss. Some entries are excellent, including the “Jazz” overview article which has been nicely updated from *NHDM*. Others are weaker and, overall, numerous

opportunities to amplify the reader's knowledge of jazz were missed. For instance, the definition of a trio, as it relates to jazz, is restricted only to the grouping of piano, bass, and drums, with no allowance made for variations such as the well-known piano-guitar-bass formation used by Nat "King" Cole, Art Tatum, Oscar Peterson, and others.

"Voicing" is defined only in the classical context of manipulating the tone quality of pianos and pipe organs, not as it relates to the formation of jazz chords on guitar and piano, or the scoring of big-band instrumental parts such that "charts" by Rob McConnell or Phil Nimmons are immediately recognizable as their own. "Block chords" and "Parallel chords" describe only classical usage of the terms, making no reference to George Shearing's distinctive "locked-hands" style of piano-playing (not discussed elsewhere in the volume, either), since emulated by other pianists.

New Orleans and Chicago jazz styles have their own entries but Kansas City does not. There is no reference under "Swing" or "Doo wop" to their recent revivals. No linkage of "Growl" to "Wa-wa" or "Mute" is made: i.e., opening and closing the hand or a rubber plunger over a trumpet, flugelhorn, or trombone bell to alter the tone quality in combination with the guttural sound of flutter-tonguing. Coincidentally, the rubber plunger is mentioned only with respect to the trombone.

For me, the pièce de résistance on jazz is an unsigned entry on "Fake-book notation," recycled from *NHDM*, which gives a convoluted explanation of almost four column-inches about chord symbols and abbreviations, a harmonic short-hand used in jazz and popular music. The author, likely an *HDM4*

staffer, evidently viewed their use in fake-books as being of major consequence, thus the term "fake-book notation," which I've never encountered anywhere else. It is not found in Barry Kernfeld's *New Grove Dictionary of Jazz*, for example. Why not give "chord symbols" their own entry (with more examples and less (or clearer) prose) rather than inexpertly coining a term no one will recognize or use?

As someone who has played from many a fake book, I've always considered them collections of "lead sheets," which Kernfeld himself correctly defines elsewhere in *HDM4*. Thus, fake books feature lead-sheet layout, not the reverse. In addition to their use in lead sheets, chord symbols are ubiquitous in rhythm-section parts for combo and big-band charts. They are also routinely inserted into sections of ensemble charts where brass or reed players are directed to improvise, thus giving the musicians the harmonic framework for their solos. This article betrays such fundamental ignorance of basic jazz lore that I'm reminded of the famous couplet from Alexander Pope's *Essay on Criticism*:

*A little learning is a dang'rous thing;
Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring.*

Popular Music

Many of the major articles on countries or geographic regions are organized under rubrics such as "Current musical life and related institutions," "History," "Folk music," etc. A few stipulate "Folk and popular music" but give scant space to the latter (e.g., "Russia"), while some others touch on popular music in passing without specifying it in a heading ("United States"). Most exclude any

discussion of it at all (e.g., “Austria,” “England,” “France,” “Germany,” and others). In sum, popular-music history and genres are given very spotty treatment in most of the country-specific and geographic articles, which could have highlighted significant artists and ensembles, as well as national phenomena (e.g., French-language “covers” of anglophone pop music in Quebec) and regional dialects (e.g., Russian or East-Asian country music). From this, I concluded as follows:

- the contributors of the “offending” articles had no expertise in popular music and simply used up all their allotted space discussing art music; and,
- the editor apparently did not force the issue with any of them or secure alternative means to include the missing information.

So, where does one look for the coverage of popular music first promised in *NHDM* and supposedly updated in *HDM4*? Besides the summary article, “Popular music,” which, to its credit, devotes close to half its five-and-a-half columns to European antecedents and a gloss of late-twentieth-century practitioners outside the U.S., there are separate articles on “Rock,” “Disco,” “Heavy metal,” and so on, with new entries on “Klezmer,” “Hip hop,” “Free bop,” and “Rap” (almost two full columns), among others. “African American music” (formerly “Afro-American music”) has also been expanded and updated from *NHDM*.

As is the case with jazz and twentieth-century art music, treatment of this subject is of decidedly mixed quality. “Merseybeat” has an entry that gives no details about its distinguishing musical characteristics. What was “Rock ‘n’ roll” in *NHDM* is now “Rock

and roll.” Was this change seen as an improvement? “Country and western music” in *NDHM* has become “Country” in *HDM4*, and “Cover version” in the earlier edition is now simply “Cover,” possibly reflecting current vernacular usage for both terms. But few other bows to recent customs are evident: for example, the term “roots music,” in widespread use for well over a decade to describe folk musics of many types (from rural to urban, and traditional to newly composed), is nowhere to be found. Similarly, alternative rock, break dancing, line dancing, rave, and techno-pop are among many current terms from the popular-music domain that are missing.

Just when I was ready to give up on finding any cutting-edge pop-music terms in the dictionary, I found “Samplers” discussed under “Electro-Acoustic Music,” but neither that term nor the better-known “sampling” has an entry of its own. However, “Turntablism” does have an entry describing the phenomenon of turntabling, arising out of the hip hop movement but now taught to aspiring “scratch DJs” at several American schools.

I was disappointed to find no article on “jingle,” a musical phenomenon that intrudes into the daily lives of probably more people in the world than any other kind of music except possibly Muzak, which, perhaps surprisingly, does have an entry. There are also no entries on television or radio music, and none on “record producer,” though the importance of producers such as George Martin to the Beatles, Jim Vallance to Bryan Adams, Daniel Lanois to U2, Robert “Mutt” Lange to Shania Twain, and David Foster to Barbra Streisand, Céline Dion, and others, cannot be overstated. The significance of the producer’s role is recognized in many ways, including Grammy

awards for Best Producer and the inclusion by the CRTC of producers in its four-pronged "MAPL" criteria for determining Canadian content in sound recordings. (In fairness, I should point out that some discussion of earlier record producers is included under "Rock and roll," but it is far from the comprehensive discussion that a separate article on record producers could have given.)

There are also no entries for, or discussion of, Napster, Kazaa, Limewire, AudioGalaxy, or any of the other Web sites that facilitate peer-to-peer sharing of audio files on the Internet. The "Copyright and performance right" article also omits discussion of the issues surrounding file-sharing, not the least of which is the copyright-infringement litigation aggressively pursued by the Recording Industry Association of America in recent years, which has forced Napster to change its business model and charge fees. I also found no coverage anywhere in the dictionary of mechanical reproduction rights, which govern the use of sound recordings.

Despite the above-mentioned shortcomings, do the entries that are included on aspects of popular music do justice to their subjects? In general, yes, but from an overwhelmingly American perspective. Admittedly, jazz and rock music first flourished in the U.S. but, for instance, did the article on popular song, as distinguished from art song, have to be called "Song, American popular?" Tin Pan Alley and Broadway had enormous influence in shaping popular song in the twentieth century but, given the *HDM4*'s strong historical perspective and the important contributions of foreign songwriters (e.g., Lennon and McCartney), I was frankly surprised that it was not seen as only the latest

manifestation of an international vernacular tradition that traces its roots back to medieval times.

Overall, the lack of broader coverage of national or regional popular-music histories and styles, and the "ghetto-ized" coverage of the subject only reinforced my impression that the dictionary's commitment to popular music and jazz was itself either an afterthought or perhaps a grudging concession to the burgeoning phenomenon of university programs focusing on popular culture. Had Belknap been truly committed in *HDM4* and *NHDM* to adequate coverage of music other than the Western classical canon, it could have engaged knowledgeable associate editors (e.g., Barry Kernfeld for jazz), or at least added jazz and popular-music specialists to its editorial board, on which there appear to have been none. Nor do there seem to have been any music theorists or composers, who might have helped strengthen the coverage of late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century Western art music. The nine-member board for both *HDM4* and *NHDM* included five historian/musicologists (one of whom, according to the *Directory of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities, U.S. and Canada* (Missoula: College Music Society, 2003) is also versed in ethnomusicology), one ethnomusicologist, a music librarian, a music critic, and a museum curator of musical instruments. The editor, Don Randel, is also a historian/musicologist.

Canada

Canadian representation among the contributors to *HDM4* includes academics and music librarians from Hamilton, Kingston, Montreal, and Toronto. Coverage of Canadian

music is restricted mainly to the article on Canada, though the Canadian pop or jazz artists Joni Mitchell (mentioned in at least three articles), Shania Twain, Neil Young, and Diana Krall are referred to elsewhere.

The entry on “Electro-Acoustic music” also cites Montreal as a “a notable center for *musique concrète*” “where composers Francis Dhomont, Robert Normandeau, and others have created a vibrant community for electro-acoustic music.” It might also have mentioned Barry Truax, Hildegard Westerkamp, and others in the active electronic-music scene in Vancouver, and the ground-breaking Canadian Electronic Ensemble in Toronto. More importantly, neither this article nor the one on “Synthesizer” even refers to the Canadian electronic-music pioneer, Hugh LeCaine, who between 1945 and ’48 created the world’s first voltage-controlled synthesizer, the Electronic Sackbut (see <http://www.hughlecaine.com/>), over a decade-and-a-half before Robert Moog, whom *HDM4* mistakenly credits with “the introduction of the principle of voltage control” circa 1964 (p. 862).

The article, “Canada,” newly written by John Beckwith and Kathleen McMorrow, has grown by nearly fifty percent from three columns in *NHDM* to just under four-and-a-half in *HDM4*. The outline they give of the history of art music in Canada is clear, though brief, and I would quibble only about two groups of musicians they list:

1) They count among the “main talents” of the younger generation of composers a group which I found overly Toronto-centric (p. 136): five of the eight they named live there, if I am not mistaken. Among a number of fine composers who joined the professional ranks

since the 1970s and are not Toronto-based, they might have considered John Estacio, Melissa Hui, Marjan Mozetich, and Kelly-Marie Murphy.

2) The only classical performers mentioned in the article are Emma Albani, Glenn Gould, Teresa Stratas, and Jon Vickers—all fine artists, to be sure, but there have been so many more. Pierrette Alarie, Maureen Forrester, Éva Gauthier, Raoul Jobin, Lois Marshall, Louis Quilico, Joseph Rouleau, and Léopold Simoneau also had major singing careers, and the number of Canadian singers performing on stages around the world has grown exponentially in the past few decades. Isabel Bayrakdarian, Victor and Russell Braun, Benjamin Butterfield, Judith Forst, Ben Heppner, Suzie Leblanc, Gino Quilico, Gary and John Relyea, Catherine Robbin, Michael Schade, and Edith Wiens are some of the best-known Canadians singing now.

Regarding instrumentalists, the Orford and St. Lawrence String Quartets, the Canadian Brass, and the Gryphon Trio have garnered international attention, while Peter Oundjian, Andrew Dawes, and Martin Beaver have all occupied the first-violin chair of the world-renowned Tokyo String Quartet. Among soloists, Ellen Ballon, Zara Nelsova, and Kathleen Parlow had careers of distinction, and James Ehnes, Marc-André Hamelin, Angela Hewitt, André Laplante, Stéphane Lemelin, Louis Lortie, Jon Kimura Parker, Richard Raymond, Shauna Rolston, and Lara St. John are a few of the current Canadian artists enjoying international careers. Even though space was limited, mentioning only four historical figures does not begin to convey the extent of Canada’s musical contributions to the world or the impact that

Canadian performers have made outside of Canada.

Beyond the lists of names, the article regrettably betrays hints of hasty preparation or sloppy editing. In the first sentence we are told that “Canada’s culture, like that of every Western Hemisphere country, *coordinates* aboriginal and colonial elements” (p. 134, italics mine). Coordinates? Perhaps “incorporates” was intended? Later we learn that “professional and amateur [choral] ensembles are found in *every* city and town” (p. 135, italics mine). Notwithstanding the abundance of choirs in Canada, this statement should have been qualified along the lines of “nearly every” or “many a city and town” to avoid needless exaggeration.

Beckwith and McMorro deserve credit for devoting a paragraph in their article to popular music. Unfortunately, I found some of the statements they made about aspects of popular music and the music business in Canada problematical, and they might have been well advised to consult experts in those fields before submitting their article for publication. For instance, they give the impression that Félix Leclerc, Gilles Vigneault, Robert Charlebois, and the *chansonnier* movement flourished in the 1950s and ’60s (p. 136). Folk-singing and the “hootenany era,” as it is sometimes referred to by anglophone writers, blossomed in the 1960s and continued into the ’70s before being eclipsed by disco and other musical styles. Vigneault and Charlebois both came to prominence in the 1960s. Vigneault was active into the 1990s, and Charlebois still is. Leclerc was older than the other two, gained international fame earlier, and died in 1988.

The authors also list Neil Young, k.d. lang, and Céline Dion as “performer-writers of the later twentieth century” who “dominated pop charts both at home and abroad” (p. 136). Unless David Foster or another writer/producer gave Dion a charitable co-writing credit for one of his own efforts, she has written no songs of which I am aware and does not belong in a select grouping of Canadian singer-songwriters. Actually, if only three artists are to be mentioned in this category, Young and lang would come farther down my list after Joni Mitchell, Gordon Lightfoot, and Leonard Cohen, all perennial award-winners who have sold millions of recordings internationally and whose songs have been “covered” by numerous artists. Or if the emphasis were on the very late twentieth century, one might pick Shania Twain, Bryan Adams, and Alanis Morissette before lang, who, unlike the others, has never dominated pop charts abroad.

Regrettably, no mention is made in the article of Canadian rock bands that made it big internationally, such as Steppenwolf, the Band, the Guess Who, and Rush. Similarly, vocal groups, including the Four Lads, the Travellers, and the Nylons are excluded, as are Celtic ensembles like the Rankin Family. Rap, hip-hop, and reggae artists are also shut out.

Jazz is relegated to a single sentence in which Montreal is celebrated as the birthplace of outstanding performers from Willie Eckstein to Oscar Peterson. True, but why not name one or two others from there, like Maynard Ferguson and Oliver Jones? And lest we leave the mistaken impression that Montreal is the only place where jazz has flourished in Canada, could we not mention a smattering of Toronto-based jazzmen? Ed Bickert, Moe Koffman, and Rob McConnell

have all enjoyed international reputations through recordings and collaborations with American artists. To try to round things out both geographically and gender-wise, surely the west-coast natives, Diana Krall, whose rise to international prominence in the past decade has been meteoric, and Renee Rosnes, who has nine Blue-Note recordings to her credit, merit inclusion. (Travis Jackson, who updated the "Jazz" article, considered Krall important enough to include her name in that entry.)

Moving on to the music business, Beckwith and McMorrow assert that "recording, radio and television music, music publishing, and concert management are all areas dominated by US agencies" (p. 135). This statement treats a very broad area too categorically for my taste, taking no sectorial differences or nuances into account. There is no question that the AM airwaves, and television and film screens, particularly in the anglophone parts of Canada, are dominated by American products, including pop-music audio and video recordings (notwithstanding the CRTC's Canadian-content regulations), network TV programs, and Hollywood films. But this is not what the authors wrote. Their statement could leave the impression that the creation of music for the admittedly all too few Canadian radio and TV productions (and for argument's sake let us include film music, too – not mentioned in the article but usually written by the same composers who do radio and TV work) is dominated by Americans. At least, that is how I read it. But it is not the case.

Canadian arrangers and composers are more than holding their own against their American counterparts. Background and theme music for most, if not all, radio and television programs produced in Canada for

the Canadian market has long been created in Canada by such names as Lucio Agostini, Michel Brouillette, François Morel, Eric Robertson, and Morris Surdin. The same goes for most documentary and feature films produced by Canadians, for whom Eldon Rathburn, Victor Davies, Paul Hoffert, and others have contributed many musical sound tracks. In addition, Howard Shore (*Saturday Night Live*, *Lord of the Rings*) and Paul Zaza (*Prom Night*) are among Canadian composers who have been routinely scoring American feature films and TV programs for the past quarter-century or more. To date, Shore has won two Academy Awards.

Americans long dominated the recording and music-publishing fields in North America, and it may perhaps technically still be the case in the sphere of the multi-national recording companies and music publishers. Canada has lost several large music publishers in the last few decades (e.g., Ricordi, Boosey and Hawkes) and seen others swallowed up by American giants (e.g., Leeds Music by MCA). It is also true that no Canadian record company enjoys the kind of market penetration that the big multi-national companies enjoy. But the statement by Beckwith and McMorrow gives no hint of the sea change that has been taking place internationally since the advent of the Internet, which has led to serious worldwide contractions in the economies of the recording and publishing industries.

It is too soon to know how it will all play out, but it so happens that the Internet is an ideal vehicle for niche marketing, allowing independent recording companies and specialized publishing operations to take root. The old economic model is in decline and growing numbers of Canadians are taking

advantage of the new model as it applies to recording (e.g., Centrediscs, Skylark Records, SNE), publishing (Leslie Music Supply, Eighth Note Publications), and marketing and disseminating music (Canadian Music Centre).

Regarding concert management, some in the small cadre of Canadian classical soloists and touring ensembles are still managed by foreign agencies, though more than ever before are managed by Canadian firms. Outside of the classical-music field, the statement has even less validity. An overwhelming number of Canadian popular-music artists are managed by Canadian agencies, the largest of which, Bruce Allen Talent and Macklam/Feldman Management Inc., oversee the careers of Bryan Adams, Diana Krall, Sarah McLachlan, Joni Mitchell, Anne Murray, and The Tragically Hip, to name a few. In fact, Macklam/Feldman also manages well-known foreign musicians, including Elvis Costello, Sissel, and Norah Jones.

Conclusion

Ultimately, I found this edition of the dictionary unsatisfactory. The coverage of non-Western, jazz, and popular music was disappointing, and the substantive updates I had anticipated to its coverage of Western art music were few and far between, making my initial concerns about what the editor left unsaid in his Preface more prophetic than I could have imagined. There were few of the promised additions covering the “expanding range of subjects now being studied by music scholars,” and treatment of changes to the political landscape was inconsistent. Overall, many opportunities were missed to go into subjects more thoroughly or update them and

their bibliographies more completely. This edition of the dictionary essentially preserved the main strengths and weaknesses of Apel’s editions, despite pledges to the contrary, and seems based to a surprising extent on Apel’s choices of topics to include and exclude—choices made in the 1940s and ’60s, which could use a top-to-bottom review by now.

The encomiums by musical luminaries such as Charles Rosen and André Previn about the accuracy and reliability of the previous edition that are reproduced on the dust jacket of *HDM4* ring hollow in light of its inaccuracies, inconsistencies, and incompleteness. To be sure, the core material covering Western music history is still generally authoritative, but a new edition was not necessary to reproduce that information. It might have been more appropriate to reprint *NHDM* than to add a few entries to it, update a few others, amend a few of its bibliographies, and market that as a new edition. In my opinion, *HDM4* amounts at most to a slightly revised *NHDM*. Overall, I found it a rather half-hearted effort to which I would assign a charitable grade of C. One wonders if the editor was too busy in his new job as President of the University of Chicago to oversee the project properly. But then, all the more reason for the publisher to engage associate editors or diversify the editorial board to ensure that an adequate job was done.

The dictionary could benefit from some new thinking for next time, with a different editorial team and a proper commitment to rectifying the shortcomings of this edition. It is likely that many libraries have already purchased it. Mine has, and I did so on the strength of the title and my knowledge of the first two editions. Next time, I will wait to see the reviews before I commit \$59.95 or more

on *HDM5*, to make sure we do not get another only slightly revised *NHDM*, which by then could be lacking in-depth coverage of possibly forty to fifty years of recent music and scholarship.

In closing, I wish to acknowledge assistance from Rob van der Blik, Douglas Geers, Richard Green, and Gilles St-Laurent

on various questions I had as I went through the dictionary. Alford Lathrop was particularly generous with his time and expertise on several topics. I am grateful to them all for their kind help. Any errors in the review are my responsibility alone.

S. Timothy Maloney
University of Minnesota