

ular field which are misleading or plain wrong.”<sup>28</sup> This is perhaps even more true of Blom’s edition, predating as it does the official establishment of film and media studies, at least in an official academic sense. Film music’s previously cited pugilistic reactions to musical disdain confirm how troubling this kind of misunderstanding can be. My point is not merely to find fault with the attitudes expressed in the 1954 edition, however. Stanley Sadie describes the value and validity of those earlier expressions. “We recognize that every age needs its own reference works, not merely to absorb extensions in factual knowledge, but also to represent the attitudes, the interpretations, the perspectives, the philosophies of the time.”<sup>29</sup> Some of the Grove attitudes remain with us and paradoxically, they also suggest ways out of contemporary dilemmas.

The 1927 edition of *Grove’s Dictionary of Music and Musicians* does not have an entry on film music. In that year it was clearly too early to discuss the sound film with any degree of perspective. Still, it must have been well known that film and music, largely lifted from classical domains, had coexisted for thirty years. It may be imagined that the *Grove’s* editors did not wish to dignify that relationship by their notice, especially since it could not have met with their approval. The 1954 edition bears out this suspicion.

Three writers, Ernest Irving, Hans Keller, and Wilfred Mellers, collaborated on the film music entry in the 1954 edition. Irving opens the entry by pointing out that in film exhibition, there was music from the first. “Some of the music was, *of its kind*, excellent in quality. . . .”<sup>30</sup> He says that in silent years music “had to be used” instead of dialogue, in order to make the action readable. Here we find Irving dismissing the music, and even more the film medium itself. There is a subtle intimation that the picture, even motion pictures, were insufficient to the telling of the story, and that conversely music could carry meaning on its own. The first suggestion is mostly not true, and the second contradicts the whole burden of serious music criticism in terms of music’s dalliance with film, that burden being that music is not built for and should not have to carry narrative meaning. Such slightly bilious contradictions occur frequently in the *Grove’s* film music articles. Mention is made of numerous pieces adapted by “tal-