

REFERENCE

The Pianist's Dictionary. 2nd ed. By Maurice Hinson and Wesley Roberts. Assisted by Sida Hodoroabă-Roberts. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020. [xvi, 233 p. ISBN 9780253047311 (hardcover), \$85; ISBN 9780253047328 (paperback), \$30; also available as e-book, ISBN and price vary.] Music examples, bibliography.

In 2004, Indiana University Press published Maurice Hinson's *Pianist's Dictionary*, described as "a practical guide that covers definitions of terms, performance directions, names of well-known piano pieces, nicknames of pieces, forms, and styles, plus brief biographies of leading pianists, composers of piano music, and piano manufacturers as well as parts of the piano (action, soundboard, etc.) and neglected repertoire the author feels is important" ("Preface to the First Edition," p. ix). Hinson (1930–2015) taught at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, and is known for his widely used reference books dealing with various components of the classical piano literature. A second edition published in 2020 carries the name of Wesley Roberts as coauthor. Roberts, who studied under Hinson, contributes a rather short and uninformative preface that offers little by way of his *modus operandi* or the extent to which he (or Hinson) has contributed new or revised entries to the book. The new volume occupies a mere twelve pages beyond the first edition, in which there are seven brief illustrations of various musical terms and a three-page bibliography of English-language materials. All names, titles, terms, and topics, regardless of origin, are still combined into a strict alphabetical sequence in the second edition ("The Entries"), which adds only a list of abbreviations to the contents.

Despite Hinson's ambitious aims, the original edition was badly flawed by factual errors, omissions, inconsistencies, misspellings, and misleading statements. It would be pleasant to report that the second edition offers a substantial improvement. Unfortunately, that is not the case. Although a modest number of errors have been corrected, further changes have generated an unacceptable level of additional problems.

Overall, the strongest element of the dictionary is its extensive inclusion of musical terms (mostly French, Italian, and German) extracted from the general repertoire. This field, however, is one that has been well covered over many decades, going back at least to venerable, still-in-print reference works, such as those of Theodore Baker, Louis Elson, Willi Apel, and Alison Latham, with her more recent *Oxford Dictionary of Musical Terms* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004)—not to overlook the easy accessibility of definitions via internet sources. Where terminology is concerned, users of these familiar resources will find relatively little of additional value in the Hinson–Roberts volume.

The major problems begin with the dictionary's handling of composers for the piano. Incorrect information abounds: Isaac Albéniz did not study with Franz Liszt. Alexander Scriabin composed ninety (not eighty-five) preludes and twenty-six (not twenty-four) etudes. Frédéric Chopin is credited with only ten of his sixteen polonaises for solo piano. Edvard Grieg composed sixty-six (not seventy-three) *Lyric Pieces*. Michael Tippett is said to have written "several duets for other instruments and piano" (p. 204), although no such works exist, and his important concerto is not mentioned. Charles-Valentin Alkan is given the long-discredited middle name of Henri along with the similarly debunked tale of his death from a falling bookcase. Under Ives, the dictionary mentions Ralph Kirkpatrick as a tireless advocate for the "Concord" Sonata, whereas John Kirkpatrick (no relation) is the performer meant. In one sentence in the entry for Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, he is said to have written twenty-nine piano concertos, yet in the following sentence we read of his "twenty-three concertos for piano and orchestra" (p. 124). According to Roberts, the piano sonata by Henri

Dutilleux “is often cited as unplayable” (p. 46). By whom? Certainly not by the numerous pianists who have frequently performed and recorded it. The dictionary’s inclusion of major twentieth-century composers for the piano is adequate, but where are Donald Martino, Roger Sessions, and Leon Kirchner?

Equally concerning are the small, generally two- or three-sentence biographical sketches of some two hundred prominent pianists, living and dead. In his preface, Roberts asks for “understanding if a favorite composer or performer does not appear” (p. ix). Reasonable enough, yet in light of several marginal figures who do appear, there would seem little justification for the omission of Marc-André Hamelin, Stephen Hough, Yuja Wang, Leslie Howard, Vladimir Sofronitzky, Annie Fischer, Mariia Īudina, Grigoriĭ Sokolov, Howard Shelley, and Samson François—to name but ten. For the pianists who are represented, too many entries lack basic, pertinent information. For example, there is no mention of Leon Fleisher’s long tenure as a sought-after teacher at the Peabody Institute. No one looking up Rudolf Firkušný will learn of his association with composer Leoš Janáček. Alfred Cortot’s influential pedagogical activity and publications are ignored. Robert Casadesus’s extensive work as a composer goes unmentioned. Benno Moiseiwitsch is described as “an expert in classical repertoire” (p. 122), yet he avoided Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and Joseph Haydn, and played only seven or eight works of Ludwig van Beethoven. Then there is the matter of purely erroneous information. Earl Wild did not study with Marguerite Long. Raymond Lewenthal was born in 1923, not 1926. Vladimir Ashkenazy is described as a “Russian-born, American pianist” (p. 9), but he has never resided in the US. His well-established

reputation as a conductor is not mentioned. Ruth Laredo has recorded only a portion of Scriabin’s music, not the “complete works” (p. 104), and Michael Habermann has played only a small number, not “most of” (p. 76), the works of Kaikhosru Shapurji Sorabji. The existence of recordings—an essential fact surrounding any pianist’s activity—is inconsistently handled. In only about one-third of the biographical entries are the artist’s recordings mentioned.

When it comes to descriptions and definitions for standard titles and genres, we again encounter an abundance of unreliable and misleading statements. “Sonata,” for instance, is said to be “an instrumental composition . . . in two to four contrasting movements” (p. 188). While Domenico Scarlatti is mentioned as a rare exception, the fact that Ignaz Moscheles, Franz Liszt, Julius Reubke, Aleksandr Scriabin, Alban Berg, Nicolas Medtner, Sergei Prokofiev, Dmitri Shostakovich, Samuil Feinberg, and many others wrote significant one-movement sonatas is apparently not worth mentioning. There are two separate entries dealing with Liszt’s etudes based on music of Nicolò Paganini; both are confusingly muddled. Liszt also fares badly in a reference to his so-called “Dante” Sonata. Liszt did not give it that title, and the dictionary fails to provide the full version. The entry for “*Marche militaire*” (p. 116) misidentifies this familiar Franz Schubert work as the third, rather than the first, item in his opus 51. Under “‘Funeral March’ Sonata” (p. 65), the Beethoven example is actually the third, not the second, movement of his opus 26. Users looking up “Fantasy” (p. 56) will find no mention of the two greatest examples of the genre: Chopin’s opus 49 and Robert Schumann’s opus 17. Yet Schubert’s solo work of that title (op. 15) is erroneously said to

be in C minor rather than C major, and his great Fantasy in F Minor for four hands is ignored.

The problems enumerated above are only a portion of those that an unwary user of this volume will encounter—and could very well perpetuate further. Rather disturbingly, a great many are carried over from the original edition of *The Pianist's Dictionary*. It is reasonable to expect that during the sixteen years between editions, ample time was available for a thorough review, fact-checking, and correction of obvious errors. But in the authors' attempt,

however commendable, to create a book that would be "all things to all pianists," attention to a minimum level of accuracy seems to have fallen by the wayside. Not to put too fine a point on it: any reference work is only as useful as what it contains for whatever the user is looking up at the moment. No reference work can be perfect, but this is a field where less than the highest standard is unacceptable.

DONALD MANILDI

University of Maryland, College Park

