

Review of Michael Church, ed., *The Other Classical Musics: Fifteen Great Traditions* (Boydell & Brewer, 2015)

Mark Hijleh

COMPARATIVE MUSICOLOGY AND CLASSICAL MUSIC

The Other Classical Musics is an intriguing contribution to what Patrick E. Savage and Steven Brown have in this journal (2013) and on their website, compmus.org, called “the forgotten agenda of comparative musicology,” an endeavor to which Savage and Brown say ethnomusicology is the “modern-day successor,” and which David Locke (2014) suggests ought to be called “comparative ethnomusicology ... a sub-discipline within ethnomusicology.” Savage and Brown provide extensive bibliographies on this concept, to which Clarke (2014) and Grauer (2014) contribute further in responses that have appeared in this journal.¹ In this context, the volume under review here is also a welcome companion to Peter Fletcher’s (2001) monumental *World Musics in Context*, though the two differ in that the former attempts to define (and thus limit) its interests to musics that it defines as “classical” while the latter ostensibly aspires to more global aims. Fletcher (2001, 31) seems to resist the mantle of ethnomusicologist, plainly stating that his work is “principally concerned with the development over time of the world’s differing civilizations, the place of music in that development, and the relevance of that development to music and culture” while claiming that it “does not address in detail a principal concern of ethnomusicologists: namely, the placing of living music in its contemporary social-anthropological context.” Fletcher’s use of the word “civilizations,” though, is important here, since it suggests one of the key bases on which editor Michael Church and his colleagues attempt to define “classical music” in their book, a question that remains a vexing one for many. Too often, the concept itself has been associated primarily or even exclusively with Western Europe, yet the dynamic between the everyday and the set-apart in music is a real one, albeit lived out very differently within and between cultures. Church asserts that “the term ‘art music’ is too broad because all music, even the simplest lullaby, is a form of art” (3), and goes on to suggest that “‘classical’ is the adjective best capable of covering what every society regards as its own Great Tradition [in music],” concluding that “the concept of a canon, validated by a system of music theory, is a defining feature of all classical music” (6). This definition, then, provides the lens through which analysis is approached in the volume: a holistic lens, integrating historical, sociological, and theoretical contexts. That said, *The Other Classical Musics*, written almost entirely by ethnomusicologists, ends up, perhaps unintentionally, making a case not so much for a new comparative musicology *per se*, but for a new view of musical history based on a wider and deeper pool of musics that have endured.

1. Readers will no doubt glean the opportunities and concerns expressed in that ongoing dialogue, as they apply also to *The Other Classical Musics*, but which I will not attempt to rehearse here.

ANALYTICAL CONTEXT AND APPROACH

Church begins the book by coming to the defense of what he calls ethnomusicology's fundamental desire to "preserve and celebrate" rather than standing by while "the music of the past is ... subsumed into a voracious and ever-expanding present" (1). Yet the authors go well beyond merely (re)defining classical music; they make plausible the notion that there are fundamental aspects of human musicality embedded and preserved throughout history in a myriad of cultural contexts, and that these can be identified analytically, a concept that Fletcher (2001) sometimes alludes to as well. Indeed, Church notes that

comparison of seemingly unrelated musics can produce striking parallels ...

Congruences and parallels were always meat and drink to ethnomusicologists, and this book reflects so many that one is tempted to speculate that, just as the world's treasury of folk tales can be reduced to a handful of archetypal plots, so the mechanics of music may be boiled down to a small number of strategies and forms. (3)

One is thus inclined to read the book either looking for or hoping to dispel evidence of these fundamental strategies and forms in the fifteen Great Traditions of music addressed in it; that is, assessing the level of congruence as much as of contrast. Church asserts that the musics chosen "coalesce into a handful of stylistic families" (9), and for the most part provides a predictable basis for analysis through comparative approaches to pitch modality (of which Western tonality is one distinctive flavor), sound concepts (instruments, timbres, vocal styles), formal processes, and rhythmic systems. But the most interesting analytical feature of this work turns out to be attention to the dynamic relationships between notation, oral/aural memory, and improvisation in the context of what constitutes the "canon" that makes each music "classical." The connection between religion and music across cultures is also emphasized in this canonical context, as it is in Fletcher (2001) and, for example, in Beck (2006), with occasional commentary on the effect of religious context on actual musical sound.

Each chapter in *The Other Classical Musics* ends with useful recommended further reading and listening lists that bring the work of additional established experts into the conversation and allow the reader an opportunity to hear the musical features discussed in the text.

FIFTEEN GREAT TRADITIONS

Referring collectively to the fifteen traditions selected for inclusion, Church affirms that "the musics focused on here may have an uneven geographical spread, but they do reflect the course of history," since "the conditions required for the evolution of a classical music don't exist in newly-formed societies" (8); that is, classical musics take time and some measure of social stability to form. This is a primary reason given for two significant omissions: Latin American musics and Sub-Saharan African musics outside of the Mande *jaliyaa* tradition. Yet the fusion of Iberian, West African, and South American indigenous influences that constitutes Latin American music is at least 200 years old, and can plausibly be seen

beginning to coalesce 300 years before that, however “newly-formed” the authors may consider Latin American societies to be. Notwithstanding Church’s comments about “the new kaleidoscope” (19), and even his use of the word “fusion,” the omission of Latin American music may suggest a bias against fusion over time as a legitimate process that can produce a stable classical music, even though such fusion-like characteristics are demonstrable in other musics chosen for inclusion, certainly in American jazz, and not least in the music of Andalusian Spain/North Africa or even Western Europe. As I have suggested elsewhere (Hijleh 2012), a theory or a musicology that does not provide robust analytical concepts and tools for working with synergistic cross-cultural fusions will not be able to adequately account for a number of musics in our time, old or new, since—as even Church and his colleagues seem to acknowledge—musical styles in general tend to evolve over time from disparate inputs, albeit at different rates of change. In fairness, however, *The Other Classical Musics* does not deliberately purport to propose either a music theory or a musicology; it simply attempts to show that there are various world traditions that can plausibly be called classical. And a music cannot by these authors’ definition be classical without an established repertoire; an established style alone is not adequate. Still, it is noteworthy that the fifteen Great Traditions chosen are living traditions at one level or another, not museum pieces, emphasizing again a potential tension between stability and evolution.

It is not clear to this reviewer why these traditions are presented in the particular order in which they appear, but Asia—understood to include a broad swath across East, Southeast, Central, and West Asia—certainly predominates, and this may hearken back to Church’s point about “the conditions required for the evolution of a classical music” (8). That is, many aspects of Asian cultures are among the oldest in human history, where history is understood to mean that which is recorded or remembered. The fascinating tension between notation and oral/aural history in classical music cannot be avoided, but the authors seem to want to draw a distinction between that tension and the formation of actual, stable repertoires, whatever the means.

Terry Miller begins his chapter on the music of Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam by emphasizing another subtext of the book, namely that classical music tends to be music of elite patronage, and often for elite tastes. That said, these Southeast Asian musics have much in common historically and stylistically, according to Miller (Fletcher [2001, 273ff.] also helpfully links a broad range of Southeast Asian musics as the “gong-chime” group), though the first three are “deeply Indianised” (26), whereas Vietnamese music reflects more Chinese influence. Miller notes that “all classical music in Thailand, Cambodia and Laos consists of fixed compositions,” but that “Thai classical composers notate nothing: their compositions are created in their minds and then committed to memory,” which they share with the other musicians through dictating a “fundamental form of the piece” (*luk khawng*) on a large gong circle known as *khawng wong yai* (32). Miller continues, “On hearing this version, each musician then ‘realises’ that structure in the idiom of his or her instrument,” such as the higher xylophone called the *ranat ek*. This concept, as Miller describes it, applies to a number

of other musics, and could be seen as analogous to how the core melody (*balungan*) in Javanese *gamelan* music provides the basis for the other players' parts.² Pieces that become part of the respective canon (e.g., the Thai form *phleng thao* discussed by Miller, 35, or the Javanese *gendhing* explicated by Sorrell, 60) are thus fixed to some degree but also open in many respects. Miller describes this general approach, in Thai music, as "a highly controlled process of improvisation on a fixed structure, somewhat analogous to jazz" (33), while Sorrell notes that, in Javanese *gamelan*,

this practice of realisation ... known as *garapan* ... is not quite improvisation, as the player of each elaborating instrument must choose an appropriate pattern according to the *pathet* [sub-mode] and *irama* [tempo map] from the available repertoire for that particular instrument. (61)

Miller (36) affirms the view that the tuning of fixed-frequency Thai instruments is 7-part equal division of the octave (7-EDO), out of which a pentatonic subset is most often used (see also Duriyanga 1972, though Garzoli 2015 disputes this understanding), but notes that there is more flexibility of tuning with voices, stringed and wind instruments—a point, incidentally, that applies to performance tuning in Western 12-EDO, though its harmonic system encourages more consonance in order to reinforce resonance. He also correctly notes that Thai music is generally conceived in duple meter, and that its cycles are end-accented, unlike front-accented Western music (37). The congruence of this last point with Javanese music is largely missed by both Miller and Sorrell. Finally, the similarities of pitch, rhythm, and instrumental timbres between Thai, Laotian, and Cambodian classical music are more or less assumed throughout. A very helpful chart showing the analogues among instruments, for example, appears on page 30. Miller is careful to point out characteristics that distinguish Vietnamese music from these other three (40–42), not least the use of a more extensive set of modal resources that also includes common melodic motives, ornamentation, and cadential idioms, though he does not detail these analytically. All in all, both Hindu and Buddhist sensibilities are said to play a role in these four musics; in Vietnam, one key difference is that there is less emphasis on classical music as by and for the elite (e.g., 46).

Sorrell's chapter on *gamelan* in Java would benefit from more attention to Balinese traditions as documented so well by Michael Tenzer (1997, 1998, 2000) and others; indeed, the absence of any reference to Tenzer's work in this volume is an unfortunate decision. However, once again, the implicit rationale (52) seems to be that *gamelan* traditions outside of Java are newer and less well established, a claim that Tenzer (2000, 4) might have some sympathy with, but one that also continues to beg the question of whether or when a newer music that has significant older roots should be considered classical. Again, Fletcher (2001, 273ff.) makes much clearer that Indonesian music can be usefully understood as within the same general "gong-chime" family, though both Fletcher and Sorrell (and Tenzer) detail the specifics of *laras* (modes) *slendro* and *pelog* and their *pathets* (sub-tonalities), which are conceptually

2. See Neil Sorrell's chapter on Java (60–61), though Sumarsam (1984) posits a significantly different view of the nature and role of the *balungan*.

consistent but which Sorrell more emphatically points out are not consistent in tuning from ensemble to ensemble or village to village (59). Indeed, as Sorrell notes, “the avoidance of [standardisation of any kind] is still a key feature of gamelan music” (55). Sorrell spends an appropriate amount of space discussing the concept of *irama* (roughly, tempo relations) in *gamelan* (60–61), along with its rhythmic implications. He also opines that use of the term “heterophony” in the context of Javanese *gamelan* is simplistic, and that this music ought instead to be considered a more sophisticated form of polyphony (67). To his credit, Sorrell respectfully mentions both Jaap Kunst ([1934] 1973) and Mantle Hood among the resources, and happily also calls attention to Marc Perlman’s (2004) fascinating *Unplayed Melodies*, which posits a clearer theoretical context for this music and suggests ways in which that context may be usefully extended to other musics.

Gagaku (specifically *tōgaku*), *noh*, and *kabuki*, along with repertoires for *koto* and *shakuhachi*, form the basis for David Hughes’s chapter on Japan, one interesting thesis of which (first suggested on p. 75) is that Western European classical music has increasingly become what Japanese people think of when they use the term “classical,” while native genres are less well known—or at least less appreciated. Hughes rightly points out that the oldest of these genres, *tōgaku* (“Tang [dynasty] music”), largely evolved from Chinese origins (76), and in doing so creates some expectation for a comparative look at Chinese classical music in chapters four and five of this book. The term “pentatonic” is often used for both musics, though Japanese music uses alterations that add dissonance to the more globally common anhemitonic pentatonic structure that dominates in China and holds a key place in much of the rest of the world’s music (see Hijleh 2012, 69–73). Hughes prefers the term “pentacentric” (91), and provides a helpful chart of Japanese modal elements (92). The concept of *meri* (lowered pitch) in *shakuhachi* technique represents well the colorations that transform common pentatonic into the most distinctive Japanese mode, *miyako-bushi*. The other three shown by Hughes have analogues elsewhere: *ritsu* is parallel to one of the arrangements of common pentatonic in Chinese music; *inaka-bushi* mirrors what has come to be known as “minor pentatonic” (upon which it can be shown that the blues scale is also based structurally, and a subset of which is prevalent in Native American musics); while the less common *Ryūkyū* reflects most of the interval structures in *miyako-bushi* in a different order. The flexibility of pitch outside of structural pitches is also manifested in the way vocal lines are conceived and executed in *noh* (94).

With regard to rhythm, Hughes sums up another distinctive quality of Japanese music by noting that “many traditional pieces have no beat or pulse, and thus no metre,” and by highlighting the notion of *ma*, or the “correct” space/timing between sounds (95). Another interesting connection is found between *shakuhachi* timbre, blowing wind and breath, and other “pitchless” sounds (97), all of which reflect sensibilities from Zen Buddhism and other religious contexts. An unusual feature in the management of Japanese musical time, and thus form, is the *jo-ha-kyū* concept (essentially “slow, faster, fastest”) that shows up in several genres at both the micro and macro levels (98).

Hughes makes clear that musical notation has a long history in several Japanese genres, but that it is not as consistent as Western notation, in part because the notational system for each instrumental school is incompatible with others, and in part because notation was not widely used for practical music-making until after the Meiji Restoration of 1868, during which Japan began robust cross-cultural engagement again after many centuries of isolation (77, 89). Still, notation has long been understood to have a key role in preserving and transmitting the Japanese classical canons, and is an important resource for modern transcription and analysis.

All in all, the distinctive elements of Japanese music work together to produce an aural result that is harder to subsume into a larger cultural grouping; thus, though its roots (and those of Korean music) are indeed to be found in ancient China, and though it continues to share some high-level characteristics with neighboring musics, Japanese classical music may be one of the best examples of a highly distinctive classical tradition outside the West, a point that could be made more explicitly in this book. Elsewhere, in their essay “Context and Change in Japanese Music,” Hughes and his colleague Alison Tokita (2008) are able to show clearly how Japanese music has become both more globally influenced and more globally influential over the course of the last 100 years, and though that narrative could complicate the thesis of *The Other Classical Musics*, it might provide a useful example of how fusion sensibilities are transforming even the most classical of societies and its music.

The Chinese traditions of music for *guqin* (or simply “*qin*,” a zither) and the genre of *xiju* (a kind of opera theater with many specific subgenres) are examined in chapters four and five respectively, and here a clearer (though not absolute) dividing line between music for elite and non-elite emerges: Whereas Frank Kouwenhoven emphasizes the ancient, largely Confucian history of the *qin*, Terry Miller and Michael Church note that “most forms of [Chinese opera] are intended for farmers, merchants, factory workers and housewives” (127). Kouwenhoven softens this divide by discussing the evolution of the *qin* over the centuries into a more “ordinary” and popular instrument (107), suggesting that a mix of “high” and “low” music has always been part of Chinese culture (109, 114). Hughes (78) makes the point that Japanese *noh* is a *Gesamtkunstwerk* (“total art work”), and Miller’s and Church’s description of *xiju* as “an amalgam of acting, singing, acrobatics, the visual arts and theater” (127) suggests it is in the same category. This attention to spectacle does seem further removed from the Confucian roots of the *qin*, but Miller’s and Church’s discussion of the musical material and process in *xiju* (132–34) reveals that the two musics rely on rather similar pitch roots, using modes and sub-modes within anhemitonic pentatonic (see Hijleh 2012, 69–70), though with distinctive idiomatic and ornamental approaches to this basic set. Rhythmically, *qin* music is freer (122) while *xiju* relies on set pieces that utilize specific beat and metrical patterns associated with dramatic elements (134). Likewise, musical process is driven by the very different contexts of these repertoires. Fletcher (2001, 323–71) provides greater and more helpful detail on the religious and social roots of Chinese music; attempting to remain true to the narrower focus of Chinese “classical” music seems to create tensions for Kouwenhoven, Miller, and Church. As in Japan, twentieth-century Chinese consensus coalesced more around Western classical music as the appropriate (or preferred) “high” cultural expression

(108–109); only since the 1980s has this trend begun to soften. And, again as in Japan, this complicates the analytical questions and suggests that searching for deeper common roots might be more helpful.

Richard Widdess's chapter on North India emphasizes even more sharply the distinction between classical and non-classical practice, with the former being "music ... for the delectation of an attentive audience, typically drawn from an educated, wealthy, urban social elite" (139). Moreover, the carefully developed underlying theories of pitch (*rāga*) and rhythm (*tāla*), and the musicians' consequent opportunities to manipulate expectation in order to achieve affective results, clearly parallels one key way classical music functions in the West (see Meyer 1956, though any *cultural* meaning attending these processes would of course be very different). However, the relationship between "composition" and "improvisation" in Hindustani music is fundamentally different in that recognizably pre-composed elements, or references to pre-composed pieces, form the basis for extensive but still carefully controlled improvisation—hearkening back, incidentally, to Terry Miller's earlier description of Thai classical music, and reinforcing Miller's discussion of the important relationships between these two cultures. Still, Indian music has been resistant to notation, perhaps in order to maintain flexibility in this continuum.

Widdess provides two very enlightening short transcriptions that illustrate the relationship between the underlying structure of *rāga Bihag* (143–45) and the elaboration upon that structure both "compositionally" and "improvisationally," illuminating the continuum between those categories non-verbally while also reinforcing the point that seasoned listeners (or those otherwise educated analytically in this fashion) can best follow such subtleties aurally—and thus that this classical music is really by and for an elite. Indeed, it is at this point in the book that this underlying thesis and its interesting connection to the notion of analysis becomes clear; classical music is music that benefits from analysis at one level or another. It is music that blossoms for those with the training to listen to it critically.

Jonathan Katz's explication of South Indian music follows a similar pattern, while making the important point that the religious connections and contexts of the Carnatic tradition are generally stronger than in the North.

At this point (178), the book makes a series of unexpected departures. West African Mande *jaliyaa* represents the only Sub-Saharan tradition in the collection, and Roderic Knight attempts to provide an immediate explanation for that: "The reason most African classical-music traditions have escaped our attention is that they lack many of the usual markers" (179). There is no notation, though this is also true of some other classical musics. There is no written, codified theoretical system. "Western listeners to African music typically notice constructs of melody, rhythm and metre that seem familiar, yet the musicians say nothing of these" (179). Knight then makes an interesting observation that is also highly pertinent to comparative musicology: "[Africa's music theory] is similar to the practical knowledge that Indian performers regard as more important to their art than the revered theoretical heritage

that has grown up around what they do” (ibid.).

If true, this statement strikes at the heart of what classical music means in the context of this text. Can music intended to resist inquiry into its theoretical bases be considered truly classical? Knight directly asks, “is this classical music, or is it maybe jazz?” (195), adding that even the concept of individual practice in preparation for music-making is not part of this culture (180). Knight does little to demonstrate anything like a repertoire, instead consistently framing *jaliyaa* as more of a set of musical skills (e.g., 193). He finally lands on a feature that he feels sets *jaliyaa* apart from many other African musics as more classical: that it is one of the very few intended for an attentive, listening audience rather than embedded in a participatory context (180).³ Knight also implies that the hereditary nature and feudal associations of *jaliyaa* edge it towards being an elite tradition.

On pages 189 to 192, Knight traverses some familiar general territory as he briefly discusses the pitch, rhythm, and process of *jaliyaa* (e.g., Ekwueme 1974; Nketia 1974; Kubik 1985), bolstering his claim that there is an underlying theory for this music.⁴ In the end, though, inclusion of this tradition proves an uncomfortable fit with the rest of the book, exposing the problems of attempting to be too inclusive and too exclusive at the same time.

Continuing with the unexpected, Church (198) next chooses to draw the reader’s attention to North American jazz. Scott DeVaux does a very fine job with his assignment here, but its inclusion is in one sense perplexing, given the earlier insistence on excluding another key fusion that is at least as old—Latin American music. Be that as it may, jazz certainly features a repertoire and a sophisticated underlying theory that synthesizes and transcends several different previous musics, and tends to demand intentionally active listening. Still, though a good argument can be made that it requires a certain kind of elite training to produce, jazz overall hardly seems to be music consistently targeted to an elite. DeVaux posits the notion that improvisation in jazz is its “most celebrated and most misunderstood feature” (203). As noted earlier, several other authors in this study compare the classical traditions they explicate to jazz in terms of the balance between composed and improvised elements, and DeVaux’s description here sounds a lot like Widdess’s earlier explication of process in North Indian music, for example.

Church next calls upon Ivan Hewett to provide a discussion of Europe’s classical traditions, a decision that seems intended to draw distinctions with the now growing body of “other” classical musics. Hewett quickly makes the point that “the disparities are just too great” across time and space in European classical music to even begin to discuss that tradition in any consolidated way:

The enormous historical dynamism of Western music rules ... out any attempt to lay the major styles of classical music side by side—Medieval, Renaissance, Baroque, Romantic,

³ However, his dismissal of the *mbira* tradition of East Africa as non-classical seems too facile in this regard.

⁴ In fact, Nzewi (1997) goes much further in proposing and justifying a robust theory of African music outside of Western terms.

Modern—and tease out what they have in common. (218)

This observation is fascinating in the context of the book’s definition of “classical,” since it implies that each of these styles (and presumably many sub-styles) would be separate classical musics of their own, none having a common theory. Even more fascinating, each of these respective repertoires would not naturally overlap—it is simply the disposition of the West to carry them over past their particular historical contexts.

As expected, Hewett places a good deal of emphasis on the development and use of musical notation in the West, while also helpfully noting that “the combining of independently conceived lines—polyphony—is indeed a defining characteristic of Western classical music,” and rightly attributing the emergence of “tonal harmony” to this tradition (218–20, 228). He also interestingly evokes the concept of “euphony” as at the heart of the original development of European classical music (222). Hewett focuses on the economic development of the West and the relationship of that development to the association of its classical music with the elite (232ff.), but not before noting that the elite in earlier eras was at least as much associated with religious matters, and thus so was its classical music. He ends the chapter with a discussion of how this “Great Tradition” has “dissolved away” over the last 120 years or so:

Classical music now defines itself not by a sophisticated syntax that binds its notes together, nor by the use of inherited forms like the symphony, nor by inherited media like the orchestra. These days the defining feature is much more nebulous, and is best described as an alliance of a subjective attitude and an institutional framework. This subjective attitude is one of willed seriousness. (241)

In other words, in Hewett’s view, a lot of what had traditionally made Western classical music “classical” no longer applies; the repertoire has been diffused and no coherent theory now predominates. Only the most elite can now appreciate or participate. This is a gloomy assessment, and could be refuted, but Hewett may be on to something; there is certainly ample evidence of a breakdown in consensus in the music of the modern West, where any taste can be accommodated by individual technological means. How are we to analyze music in such a context? Is it really classical anymore? Perhaps more importantly, since these technologies increasingly empower a great deal of musical individualism that now extends beyond the West, can any classical music really be sustained for much longer?

The Other Classical Musics returns to its main road with chapters that cover West Asian (Middle Eastern) and Central Asian musical roots. Emphasis on melodic development and heterophony is a key feature of these musics, as it is in other Asian musics and indeed in most musics outside the West, which explains the highly developed and complex pitch modalities involved, along with more attention to rhythm and little to harmony. Perhaps the most important of these traditions is that from what the Arab world once called *al-Andalus*: North Africa, southern Spain, and the Eastern Mediterranean. Dwight Reynolds notes that

Andalusian music is now understood to mean music that is

composed within the genres, themes and style first established [in medieval al-Andalus]. Indeed composers and poets who have added to the repertoire over the centuries have cleaved so closely to these models that we cannot today easily distinguish a piece of Andalusian music that is only a few decades old from one that dates back centuries. (247–48)

This adds an interesting twist to the question of established repertoire in this classical tradition: It is as much about stability of style as about preservation of particular pieces. Reynolds is on solid ground in this chapter, but does not add much to previous work done by Farmer (1929), Touma (1996), Davis (2004), and Wendt (2000, 190–92), all but the latter of whom he credits either directly or through secondary reference. Arabic music in general, and Andalusian music not least, has well-established theoretical roots, especially with regard to the modal melodic system known across the region as *maqam*, along with a set of rhythmic modes or patterns (*iqa'at*, or other names depending on particular context). Reynolds notes that although notation was uncommon (261), many details of the system have been reconstructed from thorough written treatises; however he also echoes many of his colleagues throughout the chapter in suggesting that these theoretical concepts do not always apply functionally to actual music-making.

All in all, this chapter represents one of the clearest cases for an “other” classical music: Andalusian theory, repertoire, and longevity. Missing, though, is a clear and consistent functional acknowledgment of the multicultural history of this tradition, and the implications of that history for nascent European music and for global music today, despite Reynolds’s solitary statement that its forms (at least) “appear to have been forged in the cultural interaction among Arabs, Berbers, Jews and Iberian Christians” (252). Astonishingly, Reynolds reprints illustrations from the thirteenth-century Galician-Portuguese *Cantigas de Santa Maria*, drawing attention to the mix of Christian and Muslim musicians and instruments displayed (254), while almost simultaneously suggesting as strongly as he can that Troubadour songs should not be seen as a cousin of the *muwahshah* (poetry-songs) within the *nūba* (defining Andalusian genre; 255). While that very specific pronouncement may or may not be strictly true, Fletcher (2001, 414–19) does a much more convincing job of supporting the general notion that medieval Muslim and European musics were highly mutually influential. An underlying question about this study therefore reemerges: Ought we to have such selective resistance to the idea that fusion could be a precursor to or an ongoing developmental feature of established classical musics? The authors generally acknowledge that even classical traditions continue to evolve, but too often refuse to accept the tensions this creates with the idea of long-term stability and the definition of “classical” itself.

Other West Asian practices, from the Eastern Arab world (Cairo, Beirut, Damascus, Aleppo, and others), Turkey, and Iran are examined in chapters 12 to 14, by Scott Marcus, Robert Labaree, and Ameneh Youssefzadeh, respectively. Like Andalusian music, each of

these reflects combinations of well-documented theories of pitch, rhythm, and process with strong stable repertoires, and are thus rather uncontroversially “classical” according to the definition at hand. Turkish music is more like Arabic music in its combination of *makam* modality and rhythmic resources out of which flows a dynamic practice combining continuous variation and fixed compositions (315), while Iranian music has its own more distinctive modes (*dastgāh*, *āvāz*) and phrases (*gusheh*) and a more fixed canon based on serial arrangements of these resources (*radif*), which is passed along in a distinctive form (333) from teacher to student while remaining resistant to notation. Youssefzadeh notes that even “as a corpus of pedagogical material the radif is transmitted orally, and the process can take years” (334). But, again, the musics featured in chapters II to I4 are closely related through ancient roots, which reinforces their classical identities—and one could argue that Indian music belongs in this same category as a kind of West Asian tradition—while hearkening back to Church’s point about the value of congruences among distinct musics.

Intriguingly, Church chooses to end *The Other Classical Musics* with Will Sumits’s chapter on the Central Asian traditions of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. The implicit importance of this choice with regard to a new view of musical history is summed up well by Sumits:

[Central Asia’s] situation at the centre of the world’s largest continental land-mass gave rise to the trade routes which collectively came to be known as the Silk Road, and it was along this colossal network linking the Far East with Europe that merchants, emissaries and adventurers travelled to and from the furthest corners of the earth. (341)

Sumits goes on to highlight a key connection to many of the most well-defined classical musics in this volume, namely that in this region

the term *maqām* is used to denote the repertoires of ‘classical’ music. Over the course of history this word has acquired a variety of meanings in the Islamic world, but it has always indicated elevated musical forms embodying both a repertoire of refined musical works and a highly-developed musical theory and system of modes ... *Maqom* [the regionally accepted spelling] is often considered an Oriental counterpart to European classical music. (341, 343)

That is, the Central Asian crossroads of the ancient world should be seen as one of the key breeding grounds for classical music as a concept—a global multicultural concept. Sumits goes on to make a specific, plausible case for Central Asia as the region from which many practices flowed to adjacent regions, including Iran, and draws clear connections to Indian history via the origins of the Mughal empire (345–47). Beyond this, the implications of his comment on the effect music flowing from East to West and back again along the Silk Road likely had on the entire world are clear and compelling. Sumits rightly mourns the destructive effects the Soviet Union had on the region and its traditions, though he is also hopeful about evidence of the revival of those traditions, and even suggests that the Soviet devotion to

sociology and science allowed more preservation than might have otherwise been the case (e.g., 352).

CONCLUSION

Despite some of its unresolved tensions, *The Other Classical Musics* is a valuable, accessible, and highly recommended book. Attractively illustrated, it constitutes a manageable and useful compendium suitable for a variety of reference and educational purposes while providing an intriguing outline for meaningful conceptual change. Michael Church especially understands the realities of our contemporary musical world as well as its roots, and one hopes for more of his bold leadership in cogently synthesizing the aims of comparative musicology and its proponents.

REFERENCES

- Beck, Guy L., ed. 2006. *Sacred Sound: Experiencing Music in World Religions*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Clarke, David. 2014. "On Not Losing Heart: A Response to Savage and Brown's 'Toward a New Comparative Musicology.'" *Analytical Approaches to World Music* 3(2): 1–14.
- Davis, Ruth F. 2004. *Ma 'lūf: Reflections on the Arab Andalusian Music of Tunisia*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Duriyanga, Phra Chen. 1972. *Thai Music in Western Notation*. 3rd ed. Bangkok: The Fine Arts Department.
- Ekwueme, Lazarus E.N. 1974. "African-Music Retentions in the New World." *The Black Perspective in Music* 2(2): 128–44.
- Farmer, Henry George. [1929] 1994. *A History of Arabian Music to the XIIIth Century*. London: Luzac.
- Fletcher, Peter. 2001. *World Musics in Context*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Garzoli, John. 2015. "The Myth of Equidistance in Thai Tuning." *Analytical Approaches to World Music* 4(2).
- Grauer, Victor. 2014. "Toward a New Comparative Musicology: Some Comments on the Paper by Savage and Brown." *Analytical Approaches to World Music* 3(2): 15–21.
- Hijleh, Mark. 2012. *Towards a Global Music Theory: Practical Concepts and Methods for the Analysis of Music Across Human Cultures*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate.
- Kubik, Gerhard. 1985. "African Tone-Systems: A Reassessment." *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 17: 31–63.
- Locke, David. 2014. "Let It Be Called 'Comparative Ethnomusicology.'" *Analytical Approaches to World Music* 3(2): 22–23.
- Meyer, Leonard. 1956. *Emotion and Meaning in Music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nketia, J.H. Kwabena. 1974. *The Music of Africa*. New York: W.W. Norton.

- Nzewi, Meki. 1997. *African Music: Theoretical Content and Creative Continuum*. Olderhausen, Germany: Lugert Verlag (Institut für Didaktik populärer Musick).
- Perlman, Marc. 2004. *Unplayed Melodies: Javanese Gamelan and the Genesis of Music Theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Savage, Patrick E., and Steven Brown. 2013. "Toward a New Comparative Musicology." *Analytical Approaches to World Music* 2(2): 148–197.
- Sumarsam. 1984. "Inner Melody in Javanese Gamelan." In *Karawitan: Source Readings in Javanese Gamelan and Vocal Music*, volume 1, edited by Judith Becker and Alan H. Feinstein, 245–304. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan.
- Tenzer, Michael. 1997. "The Life in Gendhing: Approaches to Javanese Gamelan." *Indonesia* 63: 169–86.
- . 1998. *Balinese Music*. Berkeley: Periplus Editions.
- . 2000. *Gamelan Gong Kebyar: The Art of Twentieth-Century Balinese Music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tokita, Alison McQueen, and David W. Hughes. 2008. "Context and Change in Japanese Music." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Japanese Music*, edited by Alison Tokita and David Hughes, 1–33. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Touma, Habib Hassan. 1996. *The Music of the Arabs*. Translated by Schwartz, L. Portland, OR: Amadeus Press.
- Wendt, Caroline Card. 2000. "North Africa: An Introduction." In *The Garland Handbook of African Music*, edited by Ruth M. Stone, 188–203. New York: Garland Publishing.