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“The main reason American musicologists do not work more with American music is because there is so brief a tradition of art music that can be taken seriously” (Kerman 1985: 39). This characteristically feisty pronouncement by a noted scholar could well refer to a similar attitude on the part of Canadian musicologists vis-à-vis their own music. One might call it the “great-music-it-ain’t” attitude. The right to be taken seriously is accorded by its holders ultimately not just to a single composer, Beethoven, but to a single group of Beethoven works, the later quartets, and then to a single work among these, and finally to only one or two especially sublime bars. Clearly a great deal of other bars, pieces, composers’ outputs deserve serious consideration and study, and one should not be obliged to describe them as “lesser.” If musicology is a science, it is more relevant to ask of a given work “what is it?” or “what is it like?” than to ask “how good is it?” On this continent, the attitude becomes less and less tenable with the growth in both countries of wider awareness of the indigenous repertoires, and with a stronger and stronger body of scholars who have elected to study it, not because it is ‘great’ by the standards of the German classics, or because they do not appreciate those standards, but because indeed it exists and is theirs. Notably too, a smaller and smaller proportion of the repertoire is definable under the older eurocentric concept ‘art music.’

A brief personal reflection: this reviewer’s classical upbringing in music has been profoundly broadened over the past quarter-century by the experience of teaching an undergraduate university course on the history of Canadian and U.S. music. The parallels between the two national developments are more frequent than the contrasts. In both countries the burgeoning of research and study materials since the middle 1960s is astounding: among the latest U.S. contributions, the fine *New Grove Dictionary of American Music* (subsequently referred to as *NGDAM*) has been closely followed by updatings of two standard surveys, all reflecting even stronger buoyancy and confidence in U.S.-music studies than we have formerly known — which of course is saying a lot.
NGDAM consists, the Preface claims, one-quarter of articles which originally appeared in the (British) New Grove of 1980 and three-quarters of newly-written articles. NG’s American cousin is, we are told, ‘based on a different cultural model, of a more pluralistic character than that of Europe.’ It aims to treat ‘topics germane to the specific character of American musical traditions.’ ‘Ragtime’ in NG, by William Bolcom, is a reasonably full account with a half-page bibliography of works in several languages; a new NGDAM article by Edward A. Berlin is double the length and more elaborately illustrated, but has a bibliography of references in English only. The co-editor, H. Wiley Hitchcock, contributes, among a remarkable number of original pieces, an article on Stravinsky, centring on the achievements of his U.S. years and in effect giving them what amounts to a newer, distinct assessment from that afforded by NG’s Stravinsky piece, despite the latter’s greater length.

Canadian society is a mosaic, that of the United States a melting-pot: this cliché is illustrated by the contrast between the Encyclopedia of Music in Canada (Kallmann 1981) and NGDAM in handling music by immigrant groups. EMC provides entries for each immigrant group or ethnic minority under its own country of origin — entries on ‘Armenia,’ ‘Pakistan,’ ‘Sweden,’ ‘United States of America,’ and so on, treat both sides of musical exchanges between the territory in question and Canada, illustrated in terms of history, personalities, and repertoire. NGDAM, on the other hand, uses a larger organizational approach, with hyphens. Major articles on ‘European-American Music’ (22 pages), ‘Asian-American Music’ (6 1/2 pages), and ‘Afro-American Music’ (8 pages) are broken into subdivisions (‘Korean-American,’ ‘German-American,’ etc.). The ‘Ukrainian-American’ sub-section is by a Canadian scholar, Robert Klymasz. There is an ‘Irish-American’ sub-section but none for ‘Scottish-American’: the latter (smaller than the equivalent in EMC, ‘Scotland,’ understandably) is more or less incorporated under ‘British-American’ — but, as often happens in such cases, more less than more. Where EMC provides separate articles on both ‘Israel’ and ‘the Jews,’ in NGDAM we find an entry of 4 1/2 pages on ‘Jewish-American Music.’ ‘Jewish’ is evidently here not employed as an immigrant-ethnic designation in the same sense as ‘Irish,’ ‘Scandinavian,’ ‘Japanese,’ or ‘Yugoslav,’ in the sub-sections of the larger articles mentioned. A Canadian, Ben Steinberg, is cited among Jewish-American sacred-music composers. Curiously, Jewish popular-music publishing and song-writing of the 1910-1940 period (Kern, Gershwin) is not mentioned, except for specific ventures directed towards the Jewish-American ethnic community; for a more comprehensive view of this phase of the Jewish contribution one is obliged to consult the Tin Pan Alley chapter in Hamm (1979: 326-390) — although Hamm’s excellent keynote article on ‘Popular music’ (21 pages) here does touch on it.

There is no ‘Canadian-American’ sub-section. However, among individuals the coverage of Canadian immigrants to the U.S. seems excellent and that of U.S. emigrants to Canada at least fairly good. There is no biographical entry on Deanna Durbin, but she figures prominently in an illustration accompanying the Stokowski entry, a still from their joint movie A Hundred Men and a Girl. In EMC she is noted in the index only. Among Canadian-born com-
posers who made their careers in the U.S., Henry Brant, Charles Jones, and Colin McPhee all receive appropriate coverage, as do Sydney Hodkinson (defined as a ‘Canadian composer’) and Calixa Lavallée (in a reduced version of Helmut Kallmann’s NG entry); but William Douglas does not. Among Canadian-born performers Lynwood Farnam (expanded from NG), Edward Johnson (slightly rewritten from NG), Wilfrid Pelletier, George London, Herbert L. Clarke, Eva Gauthier, and Oscar Peterson all merit mention; but, in some cases surprisingly, Raymond Dudley, Raoul Jobin, Teresa Stratas, and Jon Vickers do not. Zara Nelsova was born in Winnipeg as Sara Nelson, according to NG, where the year is given as ‘1919.’ NGDAM tells us she was born 23 December 1918 as Zara Katznelson, became a U.S. citizen in 1955 and was the ‘first American cellist to tour the USSR.’ EMC accords with this version of her birthdate and original surname, but gives her first name as ‘Sarah’ and the date of her naturalization as 1953. In EMC’s eyes she is the ‘first North-American cellist to . . .’

A Canadian-born musical scholar whose work has mainly been in the U.S. is H. Colin Slim, and one is surprised at his absence. At the same time neither as an individual nor under the general ethnomusicology rubric is Mieczyslaw Kolinski mentioned, though his name does turn up in the bibliography following the ‘Ethnomusicology’ article. Influential in his last decade in Canada, and the subject of a Festschrift published by a Canadian university press (Falck and Rice, 1982), Kolinski was prominent among the ‘students of the Berlin school’ who are cited in this entry as immigrating to the U.S. to become eventually the chief founders of the Society of Ethnomusicology and pioneering theorists and teachers of this discipline. A scan of early issues of the Ethnomusicology Newsletter suggests greater recognition of his role could well have been appropriate.

Among U.S.-born composers who have settled in Canada, Stephen Chatman, James Tenney, and Michael Colgrass are all found; but Lothar Klein is missing. Conductors with U.S. careers who spent significant years in Canada include Désiré Defauw, James de Priest, Walter Kaufmann, and Brian Priestman; in each case mention is made of their Canadian sojourns. Jacques Singer, Oscar Shumsky, and Lehman Engel are missing examples of musicians in this same category.

According to the contributors’ list given in volume 4, at least seventeen Canadians wrote articles for NGDAM Some are carryovers from NG (Helmut Kallmann, Godfrey Ridout, Francis Sparshott, Thomas C. Brown — the last given here as just ‘T. Brown’) and/or write on subjects with strong Canadian connections (Eric McLean on Pelletier, Nadia Turbide on Gauthier, Ruby Mercer on Edward Johnson). But a number of Canadians prominent in U.S.-music studies are represented by work on U.S. subjects — Beverley Cavanagh on Inuit music (here defined almost exclusively as Alaskan), Ezra Schabas on Theodore Thomas, Robert Witmer on Cover recordings, Soul, and Motown, Gaynor Jones on Donald J. Grout, and Austin Clarkson on several contemporary composers (Bolcom, Druckman, Schuller, Wolpe, and others).
A review of a dictionary is a near-impossible task. The above is the result of a Canadian-oriented skimming view of all four volumes. Skimming is one approach; browsing is quite another. But good dictionaries are surely made for browsing, and NGDAM is good company in this respect. The type size and style are more inviting than the parent, NG, and the illustrations are both more spacious and more numerous. The browsing reviewer’s enjoyment is punctuated by the odd cackle at an error, misprint, or puzzlement. The musicologist Luther A. Dittmer is described as holding a university appointment in Ottawa, Kansas. In the 1970s Dittmer spent a brief period with the music department of the University of Ottawa, Canada. Perhaps ‘Kan.’ was given as an abbreviation of ‘Kanada’ in some German source? — or did the error result from a bad phone connection? In one of several useful entries on U.S. poets with musical connections (Dickinson, Frost), e.e. cummings’ *The Enormous Room* is referred to as a novel, whereas it is an autobiographical account of his imprisonment in France in World War One. Gladys Swarthout, operatic mezzo-soprano, receives a brief entry suggesting she was not very talented; this raises the question why the entry was included: it ignores not only her impressive professional career (opera, film) but her influence on other singers of the 1940s and 1950s, most of whom could give a good take-off of her characteristic powerful chest tones. This example of an unwarranted opinion in a factual writing situation is, however, rare in NGDAM.

A knowledgeable, and generally enthusiastic, review of NGDAM (Britton 1987) regrets the disproportionate allocations of space in favour of recently — as opposed to formerly — popular pop performers, citing Elvis Presley’s 43 column inches in comparison to Frank Sinatra’s 20, Rudy Vallee’s 8, and Bing Crosby’s 6. While this is glaring, the implied bias in general favouring ‘post rock and roll’ over ‘pre rock and roll’ cannot be proven. (Britton’s point is not exactly that, but rather the continuing misunderstanding on the part of scholars of what popularity — especially former popularity — really means. His criticism deserves to be read in full.) The seeker for definitions in the area of ‘Coon songs’ (obviously a dated genre) will find a well-balanced article on this subject. The main entry on ‘Dance’ by Pauline Norton covers both theatrical and social aspects, and incorporates informative materials on indigenous forms from the turkey trot to the bugaloo — though, given the world-wide influence of the shimmy craze of the 1920s it is a disappointment that this form is barely mentioned. Elsewhere a brief definition of the shimmy *is* found, carried over virtually intact from NG; in neither version is the wide incidence of shimmy rhythms in European opera and concert music of the era noted.

Discographies are generally either selective or not included at all — selective for pop and jazz musicians, nothing for the others seems to be the rule. EMCS’s heroic efforts in this regard are not duplicated for NGDAM subjects, with only a few exceptions.

‘Libraries and collections’ is a beautifully-organized account over forty pages long, covering (a) history, (b) classification systems, and (c) a list of main music libraries by state and city. In ‘Criticism’ (9 1/2 pages), the co-
contributors, Edward Downes and John Rockwell, offer a well-reasoned dis-
tinction between U.S. and European views of criticism as well as an overview
of the work of principal critics past and present. ‘Periodicals’ (30 pages) pro-
vides a wonderful indexed list of 1,113 titles. A particularly imaginative item,
notable for its attractive illustrations, is Hitchcock’s own essay on ‘Notation,’
covering everything from colonial sight-singing methods to the original crea-
tive solutions of the post-moderns. Articles by Nicholas Temperley and
Richard Crawford on early psalmody and hymnody are learned and up-to-date —
and comprehensive well beyond what one might expect in a general dic-
tionary. Temperley’s splendid short piece on the ‘Old Way of Singing’ is worth
reading by students of early North-Americana at all levels and may be the
first-ever dictionary treatment of this subject.

As this sampling I hope conveys, the browsing offers no end of enrichment and
fun.

At its first appearance in 1955, Gilbert Chase’s America’s Music was seen as
a landmark in many respects. It incorporated a broad historical view, sum-
marized previous national surveys (see the original Preface), offered Charles
Ives as a figure of special (and formerly unrecognized) import, and pointed the
way to a more serious approach to Afro-American music — all in a crackly
critical style that was both more personal and more readable than a good deal
of scholarly writing on the subject before or since. In view of the enormous
proliferation of Ivesiana (publications, performances, recordings) in the in-
terim, it is odd to read in a review of Chase (Olnick 1957: 85) the hope ‘that
American music, if it can really be said yet to exist as a distinct stylistic
inflection, will find a more noble champion’ than Ives. In 1955 Chase saw U.S.
musical history in three chronological stages: he called them Preparation (7
chapters), Expansion (11 chapters), and Fulfillment (13 chapters). In 1966, in
a revised second edition, he eliminated these section-headings, by implication
modifying the thesis underlying them. He also made other interesting changes.
In the wake of the 1964 founding of the American Society of University
Composers, he stated (Preface): ‘With the university as a stronghold and with
support from private foundations, the composer has found his strength in un-
ion for a common purpose’ — by now a decidedly dated claim. In order to
make room for some new materials, he threw out an earlier chapter on music
of Native peoples, giving as his altogether startling reason that he regarded it
as ‘a fascinating subject in itself but marginal to the mainstream of musical
history in the United States.’

America’s Music in its present third edition (published in the author’s eighty-
second year) is less physically attractive than its predecessors and contains
fewer pages, though perhaps not fewer words. A trend may be indicated by
comparing musical examples and illustrations: in AmMus2 the first seven
chapters contained thirteen musical examples, in AmMus3 the same section
has only ten; but in AmMus2 there were no illustrations for these chapters,
whereas AmMus3 allows them seven. In the chapter on the practitioners of
shape-note psalmody in the 19th century, called in both the second and the
third editions 'The Fasola folk,' there are thirteen charts and musical examples in *AmMus2*, but only four in *AmMus3*; whereas there are no illustrations in *AmMus2*, but five in *AmMus3* (four of them facsimiles of score pages).

In *AmMus3*, a fourteen-page foreword by Richard Crawford is a notably well-written and generous tribute to Chase, his work, and his undeniable influence. The grouping of chapters under composite headings, encountered in the first edition, here returns, but the headings are new, and there are now four rather than three: From Colony to Republic (7 chapters), The People and the Nation (10 chapters), Towards a Composite Culture (7 chapters), and America and the World (10 chapters); within the groups, many individual chapter-headings are new — for example, in the last two sections only three are recognizable from the book's previous versions.

Chase appeared uncomfortable with the deletion of the lone Native-music chapter in *AmMus2*. As he said in his Preface, 'I would have preferred to sacrifice Edward MacDowell; but a more objective judgment prevailed.' The leading U.S. composer of the turn of the century was accordingly discussed to the extent of nineteen pages — an ample, though far from uncritical, treatment. However in the 1987 *AmMus3* we find the chapter on the Amerindians restored in updated form and MacDowell reduced to three pages. (Similar concissions are made with other formerly-prominent compositional figures — for example, Aaron Copland's career and achievement rate eight pages in the second edition, but only three in the third. It seems not just a trade of MacDowell for Indians; many past U.S. composers of concert music are deemed of lesser importance than two decades ago.)

The problem of the inclusion of Native music was neatly dealt with by the author of *Music in the United States: a Historical Introduction*. The volume is one in a series, permitting Hitchcock to refer his readers to a companion book by Bruno Nettl dealing extensively with this topic. Charles Hamm's more recent study of music in the U.S., excellent despite its erroneous title, does devote an opening chapter to 'The Music of the Native American,' but also ventures an explanation for its separation from the main stream of the country's music history: 'Mostly, Indian music has been one thing and all other music in America has been something else.' (Hamm, 1983: 23)

*Music in the United States* remains a remarkable example of a concise, informative, well-organized volume which is also a lively and original piece of writing. At 365 pages, the new third edition is a considerable expansion of the first (270 pages) and the second (286 pages); moreover the page-width is greater. Hitchcock has been less obliged than Chase to make sacrifices (interpretable as revisionist judgments). In his volume's main thesis, by now a standard approach to discussions of U.S. music, he finds the origin of the present music-industry dichotomy 'popular/classical' in the separate avenues of music and musical activity from the early 19th century on, to which he gives the useful names 'vernacular' and 'cultivated.' In *MinUS3* the thesis stays as before, but Hitchcock has added a new final chapter, 'Our pluralistic post-modern era: since the mid-1970s,' brilliantly summarizing (though with fewer
musical examples than found elsewhere in his study) such current phases as post-minimalism, new-age, 'the new accessibility,' and pop-music nostalgia. ('Pluralistic' is a preferable term to Chase's 'composite'; but has 'egalitarian' become obsolete?) This 35-page update, with its handy bibliography, is the sort of chronicle we needed to balance more partisan and/or journalistic materials. Ten pages — two whole sections — have been added to the earlier chapter on post-World-War-Two jazz and popular music — placing this crucial part of the history in clearer perspective than before.

The work has been expanded in other areas as well. Sections on 19th-century dances, dance music, and bands receive added space. The former summary of Ives is amplified by a summary (written for NGDAM) by the veteran Ives scholar and performer John Kirkpatrick. The composers Converse, Goldmark, and D.G. Mason are all referred to at greater length, including the latter's by-now well-known antisemitism. Similarly Riegger, Becker, Antheil, Weiss, and Crawford, all listed by name only in previous editions, are here delineated to the length of a paragraph or so each. Where MinUS1 stated that Ellington 'led his band into the most distinctive and coloristically imaginative style of the era,' without giving any illustrations, MinUS2 called him 'quite simply, one of America's greatest composers.' MinUS3 amplifies this by adding some illustrations of Ellington's scoring procedures, and gives the names of some of his soloists. Treatment of both Carter and Babbitt is enlarged.

Other changes in MinUS3 are less obvious. MinUS1 told you the tuning for the five-string banjo. MinUS3 gives a fresh quotation about the instrument, but the tuning is omitted. A needed vocabulary change dictated in MinUS3 'black' rather than the 'Negro' still used in MinUS2. The composers of the 'First New England school' (this nice term is also Hitchcock's invention) are no longer referred to directly as 'Yankee tunesmiths': the author now distances himself by remarking this is what 'some have called them.' Ives, formerly 'a prolific composer,' is now described as 'a fairly prolific composer.' Louis Gruenberg's hybrid style, formerly called 'jazz-once-removed,' becomes here 'pseudo-jazz,' while what Paul Whiteman played, formerly 'pseudo-jazz,' is merely somewhat 'jazz-influenced.'

In the sections on the immediate post-World-War-Two years, a new contrast between 'forbidding' and 'accessible' is introduced. The author did not make up these adjectives, but his adoption of them from current new-music reviewing and scholarly writings may symbolize a change in the game rules. While these attributes were always recognized in differentiating, say, a work of Sessions from one by Menotti, they were seldom stated as criteria in evaluation. Now they assume exactly that sort of importance. Virtually all Hitchcock tells us regarding Menotti's later operas is that they are 'less successful' than his earlier ones: such diction, was not found, as I recall, in the previous editions.

MinUS3 depends less than its predecessors on examples from the score anthology Music in America (Marrocco 1964). On the other hand, it includes many references to the extensive New World Records recorded collection. Its chapter bibliographies are notably expanded from their former states,
reflecting the general enlargement of this study but more especially the greatly increased availability of published and recorded materials of all kinds since MinUS1. Also evident in this regard is the incorporation of new quotations from current leaders in U.S.-music scholarship (Crawford, Hamm). The illustration material in MinUS3 is again well chosen and generous for such a compact paperback publication. The staves are printed in an obviously wrong order in Examples 2-8 and 10-3.

Well, let us hope the pop-chart indications of current vogues are not becoming our aesthetic standards, continentally speaking. The 'forked road' proposed a decade ago for Canadians in the late 20th century (Creighton 1976), presented two directions leading respectively to northsouth continentalism or to traditional east-west European links. Pace Creighton, and for better or worse, the country seems to have elected the former. For musicians this implies all the more reason to be aware, in the fullest historical sense, of the culture we share with our U.S. colleagues. At the appearance of the Massey Report in the halcyon early 1950s, Frank H. Underhill said in a Canadian Forum essay: ' . . . if we allow ourselves to be obsessed by the danger of American cultural annexation, so that the thought preys on us day and night, we shall only become a slightly bigger Ulster . . . . The more intimately we study the American experience the more we shall profit' (Underhill 1960, 212-13). That advice remains timely.

John Beckwith
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