

Review Essay

All Made of Tunes: Composers, Music and American Culture

Burton W. Peretti

ALL MADE OF TUNES: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing. By J. Peter Burkholder. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1995.

THE VOICES THAT ARE GONE: Themes in 19th-Century American Popular Song. By Jon W. Finson. New York: Oxford University Press. 1994

THE AMERICAN POPULAR BALLAD OF THE GOLDEN ERA, 1924-1950. By Allen Forte. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1995.

THE MUSIC OF GERSHWIN. By Steven E. Gilbert. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1995.

AMERICAN COMPOSERS AND THEIR PUBLIC: A Critical Look. By Nicholas Tawa. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press. 1995.

American composers have long struggled to reconcile their musical creations with their diverse audiences. Some, of course, have avoided struggle by writing music in hermitic isolation or pandering blatantly to popular fads. For the most part, though, composers for the parlor, Broadway stage, and concert hall

have attempted to accommodate both the demands of their craft and audience tastes. The five books under review explore the history of this complex tripartite relationship. Since all of the authors are musicologists, their work focuses on the musical products of their varied *dramatis personae*. Students of American culture may resist the authors' more technical approaches and observations, but this resistance should be overcome. These studies illuminate the culturally determined content of the music itself and the contexts surrounding it, and invite readers to reexamine certain assumptions about the practice and consumption of American music.

Jon W. Finson's study of nineteenth-century popular song is the most elegant and multifaceted cultural history in the group. Covering the entire nineteenth century, Finson begins by noting how songs composed in America before the Jacksonian era followed British models in their use of "courtly" romantic lyrics (in the vein of Sir Walter Scott) and Italianate musical flourishes. Knights and maidens in serenades kept a chivalric distance from each other, especially in song genres which memorialized dead amours. After 1850, though, proximity, hugging, and kissing rapidly became song subjects, indicating the breakdown of traditional courtship practices. Finson is especially helpful in showing how the music of these songs also showed a new cultural independence from European models, as the new "style include[d] terse melodic periods, an intermixture of lyrical and declamatory vocal writing, a relatively narrow range, and frequent syncopation imitating the natural rhythms of speech" (52). Part I also surveys attitudes toward death and technology in popular song, and how these themes were promoted by a booming sheet-music publishing industry.

Finson argues that by the late 1800s, thematic and lyric "realism" in song had reached its maturity, and that this "indicate[d] a healthy society articulating issues honestly through popular art" (82). However, Part II of his study, by focusing largely on blackface minstrel songs, suggests that the cultural dynamics of song were more complex. Minstrelsy, of course, has become a key topic in American studies, as the intricate ambivalence of the white performers and audiences have come to be seen as a sort of code that programmed future white racial attitudes.¹ Finson tends to stress the linkage between minstrel songs and his other themes, such as when he makes the interesting observation that "the rude comedy of blackface lent itself well to the flippant ease with which Americans had customarily regarded machines in popular song" (151). He also credits minstrels and composers such as Stephen Foster with advancing the "distinctive" American song style: "The short phrases with their syllabic setting of text, the lack of ornaments, the resulting clarity of declamation, the use of dance rhythms, the sporadic but persistent syncopation, and the references to the melodic shapes of folk music produce a [new] vitality . . ." (191) Finson's error comes when he understates the racial element of minstrelsy, emphasizing for example that "much of the humor [and significance] depended on the knowledge that the players on stage were really white men hiding their irreverence behind masks" (198). In

other words, minstrelsy was inherently working-class *charivari*, not particularly dependent on anti-black racism per se. Only here does Finson lose grip of his firm understanding of cultural context; if he can view the Civil War as decisive in the development of “realistic” popular song, could not issues of slavery and race also be considered major influences on composers and the mass “public”? The history of popular music after 1900 would certainly suggest that bloodlines and skintones would continue to obsess publishers, lyricists, promoters, and composers of all races. To be fair, however, Finson does portray familiar ethnic complexities (such as the rise of black “coon song” composers and immigrant stereotypes) with pointed musical examples, as well as fine reproductions of sheet-music covers. American studies seminars can use this wonderfully clear and substantial primer on nineteenth-century song as a point of departure for more sophisticated cultural critiques. The balance of Finson’s narrative is remarkable. The mixture of musical analysis, cultural context, and composer biography struck me as virtually ideal, and I was easily swept up in the elegance of the presentation and the clarity of the argument.

In nineteenth-century America as well as Europe, classical or “art music” composers had more problematic relationships with their audiences. A critical elite writing in genteel journals encouraged them to perceive their work as superior to the songwriters’—and all other—music.² By the late nineteenth century, cultural elites—all-white and male-dominated—blended Emersonian and German idealism to support their view that the opera and symphony were sites of exalted, spiritual musicmaking. Austro-German musical models were considered the paragons of musical taste. American composers and critics studied in Europe, and especially after 1900 they hotly debated the relevance of classical models for their ethnically diverse New-World nation.

Compared with the rather steady rise of popular song after 1830, the story of early American art music is convoluted and tortuous, filled with failed experiments and frustrated careers. Classical composers were weighed down by tradition and critical judgments of their work, and the discourse on concert music constantly proclaimed European “superiority” over American themes and musical materials. While Stephen Foster, Dan Emmett, and George M. Cohan blithely mined their audience’s expectations and mapped its everyday concerns and prejudices in their songs, such pioneering American symphonists as John Knowles Paine and Horatio Parker wrestled with the ghosts of Beethoven, Wagner, Matthew Arnold, and Ralph Waldo Emerson, among others. More often than not, these Yankee musicians produced works modeled on the great Austro-German models.

It is well known that Charles Ives (1874-1954) made the first truly and stunningly original departures from this difficult situation. Even as a student, Ives was apparently unique: while he received a thorough classical music education (at Yale, under Parker), he also continued to value the popular hymn, song, and band music of his youth (some of it described in Finson’s book) as highly as

European models. His early works drew on those melodies and used them effectively in accepted classical forms. Despite his training and position as a prominent church organist in New York, though, Ives lost composing competitions and was neglected by academic employers. In 1902 he began a career in insurance and composed in his spare time, generating a vast catalogue of increasingly original, experimental, and complex works. After a long neglect, by the 1930s American avant-gardists rediscovered the elderly Ives and dubbed him an “American original” who had pioneered native themes and boldly innovative concert forms.

J. Peter Burkholder’s excellent new book does not retrace earlier intellectual biographies of Ives, including his own.³ Rather, it is a musicological study of Ives’s composing practices, particularly his intensive use of other people’s melodies. Burkholder’s work is not the first Ives tune detective’s catalogue, and as exhaustive as it is, it will not settle all arguments. (I am certain that Ives quotes “Dixie,” not the college song “Where, O Where Are the Verdant Freshman?” in the second movement of his Second Symphony.) In Burkholder’s view, Ives’s propensity to use “The Sweet Bye and Bye,” “Columbia, Gem of the Ocean,” and other popular tunes was not a Yankee gimmick or sign that he lacked originality, as even some admirers have claimed. Ives borrowed popular tunes from the beginning of his studies, arranging them and writing variations. Burkholder argues that Ives’s heavy borrowing wedded popular American sources to European models in sophisticated ways, creating a new synthesis that he hoped would resolve the dilemma of the U.S. concert composer. As Burkholder puts it, Ives “asserts the value of the American vernacular tradition in its own right, and he uses the methods of European art music to do that” (247). At the time Ives entered insurance work, he began his hallmark practice of *paraphrasing* melodies, and even more significant, after about 1905 he began to abandon classical forms altogether as frames for his American materials. As the composer noted about his choral work “Yale-Princeton Football Game,” “in picturing the excitement, sounds and songs across the field and grandstand, you could not do it with a nice fugue in C.” But Ives’s later works featured much more than picture-painting Americana, as Burkholder shows; collages, medleys, and more complex methods such as “cumulative settings” were used to create dense and dissonant streams of consciousness, “cloud[s] of memory” such as “Central Park in the Dark, The Fourth of July,” and his masterpiece, the Fourth Symphony.

Burkholder’s study superbly illuminates Ives’s creative processes. Its intensive focus on borrowing procedures, however, may inevitably strike cultural historians as narrow. Maynard Solomon’s 1987 salvo against Ives, claiming that in the 1920s and 1930s the composer added dissonances to early works to win the acclaim of the avant-garde, is brushed aside early in the book; despite Gayle Sherwood’s painstaking manuscript dating efforts, it is still not clear when Ives composed what. Furthermore, Burkholder’s excellent final chapter hints at, but does not address, some of the ideological complexities of Ives’s work and life.

For example, unlike his contemporaries Arthur Farwell and Henry F. Gilbert, he refused to borrow African American or Native American music. These sounds, he claimed, did not belong to his indigenous musical world. Burkholder suggests that Ives might have resisted the tawdry theft of black music that characterized minstrelsy and other popular music traditions, but he did paraphrase Foster's "Massa's in de Cold Ground" at least once. More pointedly, Ives brusquely separated himself from real black traditions. "A composer born in America," he claimed with Gilbert in mind, "may be so interested in 'negro melodies' that he writes a symphony over them. . . . [But] if this composer isn't as deeply interested in the 'cause' as Wendell Phillips was, when he fought his way through that anti-abolitionist crowd at Faneuil Hall, his music is liable to be less American than he wishes" (422). During his mature years, Ives became progressively insulated in the Yankee traditions of his youth, and developed a filiopietistic view of New England forefathers and traditions which nourished his uncompromising art but also cut him off from an increasingly heterogeneous urban culture. (Ives's Theodore Roosevelt-style posing against European "sissy" musicians also became passé after 1920, as male and female grooming and behavior became less polarized.) Using Burkholder's fine study, others might profitably consider how avant-garde strategies such as Ives's might have become unworkably idiosyncratic, because they did not speak in a vital way to a wide and diverse new audience (unlike Ives's other great career innovation, the installment purchase plan for personal life insurance policies).

Ives's career-long musical isolation was a prison house built out of borrowed tunes, Yankee heritage, and America's persistently weak patronage of professional concert composers. Nicholas Tawa's flawed but informative study of United States composers since 1920 depicts entire generations of composers struggling with the same wounding critical scorn, lack of support, cliquishness, and comparisons with Europe that bedeviled Ives. Covering ground already charted by Henry Pleasants and Gilbert Chase, Tawa shows how young composers after World War I did not reject Europe, but rather endorsed the revolutionary modernism of Stravinsky, Schoenberg, and Varèse.⁴ George Antheil, Leo Ornstein, Henry Cowell, and others embraced Futurist and Surrealist aesthetics, Virgil Thomson emulated the proto-minimalism of Eric Satie, and Aaron Copland and Louis Gruenberg (taking cues from Farwell and Gilbert) incorporated jazz into their dissonant early scores. These young artists studied in Paris and espoused forms of postwar rebelliousness. Over the decades, as depressions and wars caused economic and spiritual chaos for international-minded artists, their modernist agendas evolved dramatically. During the populist 1930s and World War II, Copland and others adopted folk-oriented, audience-pleasing music. In the new atomic age, the dominance of science, technology, and professional specialization helped to fuel the rise of what Tawa calls "insular modernism" and the atonal academicism of Roger Sessions and Milton Babbitt. On another front, Asianist "iconoclasts" such as John Cage, Lou Harrison, and Phillip Glass

introduced new musics and philosophy to concert halls. Despite the critical elite's preference for startling innovation, though, neo-romantic "conciliatory composers" such as Howard Hanson, Samuel Barber, David Del Tredici, and John Corigliano maintained a more audience-friendly melodic and tonal tradition.

Tawa covers this wide swath of music history in a short space while managing to include brief investigations of lesser-known composers such as Stephen Albert, John Gruen, and Le Monte Young. The book makes worthwhile observations about the cliquish nature of avant-garde musical movements, developing their own journals, festivals, and standards of quality while competing for meager jobs, resources, and funding. Tawa was an eyewitness to some of this during his long composing and teaching career in Cambridge and Boston, and he provides amusing anecdotes to support his generally hostile view of the avant-garde.

Otherwise, though, his book will disappoint scholars. Tawa's advocacy is largely reserved for the United States mass audience, which he feels is tasteful, eager to hear new music, and genuinely supportive of new concert music rooted in traditional tonality. His allegiance to this "audience's" interests, as well as his scorn for composers who sneer at its alleged ignorance, is clear. This simplistic argument generates more heat than light. As a composer, Tawa seems to appreciate the accomplishments of Schoenberg, Babbitt, Wourinen, and others, but he refuses to evaluate perceptively their ideas and their precarious position in society. Too much of the book is taken up with attacks on composers' usually youthful and relatively insignificant diatribes in little journals against musical conservatism. While Tawa's book has the trappings of a scholarly study and contains much interesting information, its analysis is carelessly vague. He argues that "calculated senselessness, the denial of standards of beauty, and the rejection of established principles of order had permeated several modern artistic circles in Europe [which ones?] by the time of World War I," (206) and evaluates later developments with similar slippery generalizations.

In the end, Tawa's critique becomes a jeremiad on the waning prominence of classical music in American society. It seems to have been stimulated by a distaste for contemporary multiculturalism; typically vague, he laments, "with the sweeping away of boundaries by modern living, the entry of those who hate art music, for one reason or another, has been facilitated" (273). In the 1990s, concert music needs as much articulate defense and promotion as it can get, but Tawa bases his defense on the century-old aesthetic theories of Britain's Matthew Arnold and America's John Sullivan Dwight—paens to "sweetness and light" and German musical idealism. The young Ives considered this rhetoric outdated a century ago. The avant-garde's challenges to the public, and the public's lack of interest in the avant-garde (or even in the more conservative composers Tawa admires), are important topics which deserve careful contextualization. Tawa's resolute defense of middlebrow tastes ignores scholarship by Lawrence Levine, Joan Shelley Rubin, and Joseph Horowitz which shows how the mass audience

has been manipulated by various interests for profit and ideological purposes.⁵ The “democratic” concert music promoted by Tawa is conceptually more problematic than he shows, in this century of commercial mass culture, sugar-coated political propaganda, and postcolonial ethnic turmoil. Tawa’s histories of American musical topics are always full of worthwhile data, but this volume mostly makes him seem like classical music’s answer to Allan Bloom, a cranky traditionalist nostalgic for a culture and concert-music aesthetic which in reality had never stood still or enjoyed universal acclaim.⁶

Finson, Burkholder, Tawa, and even Ives would all agree, though, that the twentieth century presented composers with unparalleled dilemmas and opportunities. As tonal certainties came undone and performers’ virtuosity increased, musical composition became more technically complex; the music business became far more competitive and lucrative; and, as the politics of culture became a topic of mass debate, tunes, lyrics, and symphonies often became fraught with ideological import. The books by Steven E. Gilbert and Allen Forte, focusing on popular song composers of the early 1900s, offer fascinating contrasts to Finson’s work on the earlier songwriting era and the contemporary classical career dilemmas examined by Burkholder and Tawa. The two works share a common ancestry; Gilbert and Forte have co-authored a music-theory text, and Forte edits the Yale series in which the other author’s book appears. Furthermore, they both utilize the Schenkerian method of musicological analysis (which I will describe shortly), which yields important musical insights but also tends to limit the critical scope of their investigations.

Gilbert’s study of the music of George Gershwin keeps a narrow focus on the composer’s spectacularly popular compositions, leaving the reader to glean other information from biographies by Charles Schwarz, Edward Jablonski, and Joan Peyser.⁷ After studying the complex Ives paraphrases and collages reproduced in Burkholder’s book, I was startled anew by the straightforward simplicity of Gershwin’s melodies. Even compared to Ives’s popular sources or the works of Foster or Cohan, Gershwin’s songs were minimal (but by no means simplistic) musical statements. As Gilbert points out, the tunes often featured five or fewer notes, repeated brief and catchy rhythms, and simple rising and falling arcs, but they almost never seem trite, repetitious, or naive. Gershwin’s skills were not primitive; he received adequate early schooling in music theory and remained an eager composition student, although he used new techniques only to enhance the special qualities of his work. Gilbert effectively argues that the extended pieces that appeared beginning in 1924, *Rhapsody in Blue*, *Concerto in F*, and *An American in Paris*, were not clumsy pastiches as some have argued, but unified wholes as carefully constructed as his most successful songs. The *Cuban Overture*, *Second Rhapsody*, and above all *Porgy and Bess* (completed in 1935, two years before Gershwin’s death at age 38) especially reflected the teaching of Joseph Schillinger, an emigre teacher in New York whose “system” of composition influenced an entire generation of band arrangers and composers. (Gilbert

effectively refutes Forte's claim (149) that Schillinger did not "ha[ve] any impact at all on [Gershwin's] music.")

Gilbert's use of the German musicologist Heinrich Schenker's (1868-1935) analytical method allows formal aspects of Gershwin's art to become clear to those who can read music. Schenkerian analysis involves the reduction of compositions to skeletal "sketches" on the musical staff, so that the key notes in melodies and harmonies are highlighted; short motives, fundamental shapes, and patterns of harmony, modulation, voice placement and movement, and heavy reliance on particular notes (or "degrees") of the featured scales are then discerned. Schenker believed this stripped-down structure could reveal the composer's embryonic ideas and yield fresh insights into creativity. Gilbert applies the method effectively to Gershwin's short songs and extended works, and many of his observations reinforced my initial appreciation of Gershwin's clean and seemingly infallible musical taste. For example, Gilbert convincingly shows that the motive of a song that virtually every American knows, "I Got Rhythm," is a four-note scale that winds its way throughout Gershwin's work. In my favorite bit of Gilbert's detective work, he overlays the first two major motifs in Act One of *Porgy and Bess* and finds that their common "intersection" are the four notes of the "I Got Rhythm" motive (187).

Gilbert's analysis gives readers a new appreciation of Gershwin's techniques and motivic consistency. However, the Schenkerian method, by itself, is not likely to satisfy students of Gershwin in American culture. Like the New Criticism in literature, it is wholly absorbed in the internal dynamics and patterns of works, and its formalism coexists uneasily with most current scholars' complex notions of how artists in society are led to create. Gilbert notes that Gershwin had a deep admiration for the intensely formalistic serial method of his Austrian contemporary, Alban Berg, whom he met in 1928, but even Gilbert admits that Gershwin "was probably unaware of Berg's deep-seated love of numbers and symmetry" and that the former's similar predilections were mostly nurtured by Schillinger (206). Beyond this, little is said about a method or system to Gershwin's art or career. Gilbert gives only the barest biographical information, and does not try to tie Gershwin's elegant methods to the exciting New York, Hollywood, and European scenes he experienced.

Gilbert's narrow focus even limits his analysis of the music. The most glaring omission is his almost total neglect of Ira Gershwin, George's brother, lyricist, and lifelong collaborator, whose tidy, businesslike life and linguistically logical mind (recently chronicled by Phillip Furia) decisively contributed to George's successes.⁸ Gilbert analyzes only one Ira Gershwin lyric. Almost as neglected are African American musical influences, which began during Gershwin's 1910s ragtime apprenticeship and grew from his subsequent investigations into the blues, jazz, and Sea Islands music and speech. Surely it is disingenuous of Gilbert to state that the minor third interval (C to E-flat, for example) was merely "important" to Gershwin; this flatted interval was at the

heart of the blues, and became the heart of Gershwin's music as well. The composer's roots in Eastern European Jewish music are only briefly alluded to. Future musicologists and biographers should build on Gilbert's conscientious analysis to connect the music to Gershwin's life, ideas, and milieu, to deepen our understanding of a man who, in his brief life, transcended with seeming ease the limits and divisions of American songwriting and concert-hall cultures.

Allen Forte's formidable study of popular ballad composers from 1924 to 1950 (including Gershwin) takes a broader contextual approach to these works. Forte uses a less rigorous Schenkerian approach than Gilbert, sparing the reader formidable thickets of analysis (although the care both scholars put into analysis seems extraordinary to me). Forte begins with a brief "primer" to his method, explaining the musical components for the lay reader. Unlike Gilbert, he also integrates cultural context into the analysis. He notes that ballads were intended to be dance music; that commercial pressures in the Broadway theater, Hollywood, and song publishing affected the composers' final products; that printed songs must be viewed as incomplete texts, since popular singers rarely followed them scrupulously; and that the jazz tradition of improvising on ballads—which effectively rearticulated them in a blues-dominated idiom—must be considered as well. Analyzing representative ballads of the "Big Six" writers—Jerome Kern, Irving Berlin, Cole Porter, Gershwin, Richard Rodgers, and Harold Arlen—in one chapter each, as well as less dominant ballad writers (such as Hoagy Carmichael, Burton Lane, Kay Swift, and Duke Ellington) in shorter sections, Forte provides biographical sketches and context—musical, commercial, and otherwise—for each song analyzed.

The result is a rich and accessible work. Forte's Schenkerian method suitably situates the writers in larger musical contexts. The African American blues influence is dealt with early and often, and receives proportionately much more treatment in his Gershwin chapter than in Gilbert's book. Regarding "I Got Rhythm," he notes how Gershwin probably derived its special syncopation from the black pianist James P. Johnson's popular 1920s recording, "Runnin' Wild." Above all, Forte pays attention to the lyrics, their meter as well as their content, and offers stimulating critiques of their relationship to the tunes (although at times he seems bent on conducting a running duel with his great predecessor in popular song historiography, Alec Wilder).⁹ The personalities of the great writers emerge: Berlin, unschooled but brash, daring, and outlandishly successful and original as a composer and lyricist; Porter, clean and sophisticated, but increasingly somber and ironic after his 1938 riding accident; Arlen, deeply influenced by black associates at the Cotton Club but also the most heartfelt "romantic" of the major figures; Rodgers, of privileged background and tending to melodic blandness, but astonishingly productive and capable of surprising and subtle innovations. Forte's analytical sketches are lean and manageable for two-finger pianists such as me, and his observations are almost always interesting and significant. Especially important is his finding that the ballad writers routinely

violated classical rules of intervals, voice-leading, and modulation. These were relatively unschooled rule-breakers, free of Ives's and Copland's burdens, who knew the market and had the intelligence and initiative to borrow what sounded good and what "worked" from the European and African traditions. In their achievement, we find the culmination of the songwriting tradition described by Finson and a successful alternative to the unpopular iconoclasm championed by Ives and most of Tawa's subjects. Other major innovators of popular music, such as Ellington, Leonard Bernstein, the Beatles, and Andrew Lloyd Webber, have basically followed this basic path to artistic and commercial success.

Forte's study of popular song, unlike Finson's, is designed more for the conservatory than for American Studies courses. Unfortunately, his well-meaning effort to set the cultural context is sometimes awkward and filled with errors. For example, he tells us a few times that the United States "entered World War II" on 7 December 1941—common knowledge, perhaps, but technically a day early; and in 1946, Olivia De Havilland and John Lund starred in *To Each His Own*, not *The Postman Always Rings Twice* (112). Additionally, not all readers may appreciate Forte's rather loud punning and wordplay ("Writers who refer to *Say it Isn't So* [Berlin] always begin by pointing out that it has no verse. I will refrain from doing that." (96)).

Forte's musical analysis, though, is consistently informative and very fine. Even more important, the book's concept reinforces the major lesson to be gleaned from this crop of musical studies: that the interaction of composers, music, and American society can only be understood by means of multifaceted analyses, carefully crafted for the general reading public, which do justice to the myriad of influences which shape the words and lyrics of diverse works which remain unmistakably American.

Notes

1. See David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of American Working Class* (New York, 1991); Shelly Fisher Fishkin, *Was Huck Black? Mark Twain and African-American Voices* (New York, 1993), and Eric L. Lott, *Love and Theft: Blackface Minstrelsy and the American Working Class* (New York, 1993). On minstrelsy and jazz, see Burton W. Peretti, *The Creation of Jazz: Music, Race, and Culture in Urban America* (Urbana, 1992). Finson's use of the concept of "realism" might have been refined as well; see Kenneth W. Warren, *Black and White Strangers: Race and American Literary Realism* (Chicago, 1993) and Amy Kaplan, *The Social Construction of American Realism* (Chicago, 1988).

2. Nicholas Tawa, *Sweet Songs for Gentle Americans: The Parlor Song in America, 1790-1860* (Bowling Green, 1980); Joseph A. Mussulman, *Music in the Cultured Generation: A Social History of Music in America* (Evanston, Ill., 1971); and Lawrence W. Levine, *Highbrow, Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America* (Cambridge, Mass., 1988), chap. 2.

3. Frank R. Rossiter, *Charles Ives and His America* (New York, 1975); Betty E. Ch'maj, "Sonata For American Studies: Perspectives on Charles Ives," *Prospects*, 4 (Winter 1978), 1-58; J. Peter Burkholder, *Charles Ives: The Ideas Behind the Music* (New Haven, 1985).

4. Henry Pleasants, *The Agony of Modern Music* (New York, 1955) and *Serious Music, and All That Jazz: An Adventure in Music Criticism* (New York, 1969); Gilbert Chase, *America's Music: From the Pilgrims to the Present*, 3d rev. ed. (Urbana, 1987), chaps. 24-32.

5. See Levine, *Highbrow/Lowbrow*, chap. 3; Joan Shelley Rubin, *The Making of Middlebrow Culture* (Chapel Hill, 1992); and Joseph A. Horowitz, *Understanding Toscanini: How He Became an American Culture-God and Created a New Audience For Old Music* (New York, 1987).

6. See Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York, 1987).

7. Charles Schwartz, *Gershwin: His Life and Music* (New York, 1973); Edward Jablonski, *Gershwin: A Biography* (New York, 1987); Joan Peyser, *The Memory of All That: The Life of George Gershwin* (New York, 1993).

8. Phillip Furia, *Ira Gershwin: The Art of the Lyricist* (New York, 1996). See also a perceptive review of Furia by Brad Leithauser, "Here to Stay," *New York Review of Books*, 17 October 1996, 35-38.

9. See Alec Wilder, *American Popular Song: The Great Innovators, 1900-1950*, ed. James T. Maher (New York, 1972).