Journal of the Society for American Music (2015), Volume 9, Number 4, pp. 455–462.
 doi:10.1017/S1752196315000371

Overview I

BERNDT OSTENDORF AND WOLFGANG RATHERT

"How does one review a monument?" Richard Crawford wondered when he sat down to review the first *AmeriGrove* in 1987; it puts "the conventional notion of a review to the test."[1] Some thirty years later, with the new *AmeriGrove* twice the size of the first edition and with the U.S. soundscape becoming more global and hybrid by the day, the challenge has increased for the potential reviewer. Indeed, how do you review a collective enterprise with up to 1500 authors and 9300 entries (some old, some new) along a timeline of some 350 years? For a professional insider like Richard Crawford the test was tough enough, but to assess its virtues and faults from a European perch, it is positively daunting, particularly when post-national, global crosscurrents continue to inspire a constantly evolving U.S. musical scene.

One way to begin is to define one's position in relation to the subject matter, American music, both in terms of personal experience and professional socialization. The musical biography of Berndt Ostendorf, the older member of our team, is instructive. He was born in the rural boondocks of North Germany. Although far away from urban musical life—the next city was twenty-five miles away—he grew up in a musical family with an upright piano (mildly out of tune). All his siblings learned to play an instrument, and after work and on weekends there was a lot of singing, from *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* to Schubert lieder. Despite such rigorous exposure to the German tradition, both folk and classical, he can safely say that his encounter with U.S. popular music, especially jazz, played the single most important role in his postwar socialization. His first encounter with American music came in 1951 when his oldest brother (who had served as a jazz-inspired troop entertainer in the German army on the Russian front) brought home two shellac records, "Flamingo" by Earl Bostic and "Jumping with Symphony Sid" by Oscar Peterson. This music had an impact similar to a religious conversion, and he sought out more of it. Luckily, his home was within reach of the American Forces Network station, and he could listen to the midday jazz program *Luncheon in München* and also to the America-inspired music broadcasts of the British Forces Network. He was also in reach of the powerful Voice of America transmitter and, hence, could tune within on shortwave to Willis Conover's *Music USA*. By the mid-1950s, he had graduated to Charlie Parker, Dizzy Gillespie, Bud Powell, and Max Roach and had become a bebop snob, a vernacular avant-gardist, for whom Parker ranked on a level with Bach and Beethoven. It was a music that was viscerally different from the German musical heritage, so our answer to an initial question, "Is American music exceptional?" is yes. For young Europeans (East and West)

[1] Richard Crawford, "Amerigrove's Pedigree: On *The New Grove Dictionary of American Music*," *College Music Symposium* 27 (1987): 174–75. Because the second edition builds on the first, Crawford's review serves as an excellent introduction to the evolution of American musicology up to 1986.

who cut their musical teeth in the fifties and sixties, it was. And it is precisely this American propulsive drive and these nearly intangible differences from the normative traditions of Europe to which *AmeriGrove II* assigns greater recognition: the informal choreography of U.S. musical practice.

The attraction of U.S. music, particularly its popular variety, lay in the fact that it projected a sense of freedom of personal expression; there was an adversarial edge to it that encouraged a skeptical attitude towards authority, which in Germany was still defined by the Nazi experience and by the attendant old boy networks. U.S. vernacular music, both enterprising and transgressive, was a way of pushing at the boundaries of current tacit norms. (There had been a brief and turbulent wave of Americanism during the Weimar Republic.) It was a Cold War musical reeducation that, in contrast to political propaganda, actually worked. U.S. music put him on a career track to become a professor of American studies whose appreciation of U.S. history was invigorated by a passion for its musical culture. In sum, our musical socialization was ruled by and was based on that very difference between European and American musical performance. U.S. music, particularly jazz, but increasingly also the classical avant-garde, presented a privileged point of entry into questions of U.S. national identity, and it helped energize American studies as a new discipline.

The information on popular music provided by *AmeriGrove II* covers a broad range of genres and narratives. There are solid, fact-filled entries on institutions, archives, libraries, periodicals, and individual musicians, but also useful historical subject entries and surveys (minstrelsy, jazz, popular music, civil rights movement, rock, wars), discussions of theoretical concepts (commodification, race, ethnicity, critical musicology, globalization, hybridity), and surveys of regional and urban centers of musical production (Boston, Chicago, New Orleans, New York, San Francisco). Unavoidably, there is significant overlap in subject areas, most noticeably in—and between—popular music and African American music. The survey article on popular music, authored by a team including (the late) Charles Hamm, Robert Walser, Jacqueline Warwick, and Charles Hiroshi Garrett, exhaustively covers the entire evolution, place, and social status of informal music making from British origins to nineteenth-century parlor music and minstrelsy; to Tin Pan Alley, race records, rock, heavy metal, rap, and hip hop; and ending in a multiplicity of styles and genres in the age of iPod portability and global hybridity. The survey article on African American music is by a single author, Guthrie P. Ramsey, but additionally there are literally hundreds of entries on individual aspects of African American music. The quality, as a rule, is outstanding, which reflects the health of the discipline, as exemplified by Edward Berlin's entry on ragtime, George E. Lewis on improvisation, Lewis Porter on John Coltrane, Scott DeVeaux on bop, and the survey article on jazz. Noteworthy is the inclusion of European specialists such as Wolfram Knauer (of the Darmstadt Jazz Institute), who covers a number of jazz musicians.

Much has changed in the last thirty or so years. Before the first edition of *AmeriGrove* came out in 1986, academic focus was primarily on classical music. There was some recognition of jazz and folk music, but relatively little on multicultural diversity in popular music. The encompassing classical paradigms and categories were still firmly in place. Equally lean was the treatment of regions and cities whose

coverage concerned mostly classical music. The current expansion of the original edition proceeded by enlisting additional authors to update the more canonical and traditional scholarship. Project editor Mark Clague explains, "There was someone who was responsible for the more traditional, canonical knowledge about a city and its institutions—symphonies, opera companies, libraries, music schools, etcetera. Then we'd get a separate person, often younger, trained in a different approach about what music could be and they looked at dance clubs, record companies, popular music traditions, ethnic choirs—they captured the diversity of music making that is in the U.S. and filled in major gaps in our knowledge, often doing new and pioneering work."[2] This editorial strategy had the side effect of rejuvenating the discipline, although the more canonical work still maintains its centrality. Meanwhile, some of the newer articles in cultural theory are genuinely cutting edge.

AmeriGrove II gathers the harvest of two sea changes in the theory and practice of musicology. First, it reflects the development of the discipline of musicology to include new specializations, as demonstrated by the varied expertise of the editors. Second, and importantly, it reflects the growing convergence between musicology and American cultural history. Since the sixties, scholars in U.S. history, anthropology, and American studies have privileged the field of music as a point of entry to questions about America's cultural identity, exploring the dialectic between past significance and present meaning, between text and performance, between tradition and individual talent, between self-authentication and outside ascription, between a common symbolic universe and a politics of difference, between free exercise and the discipline of normative constraints. The new cultural history of U.S. music combines close musical analysis with consideration of relevant social, cultural, and political dynamics; in the process, the field is mapping soundscapes and their relation to political power. Behind it all, the question lurks: what makes American music tick? what is the unconscious choreography of American styles and genres?

Editor-in-Chief Charles Hiroshi Garrett led the team of scholars charged with updating *AmeriGrove.* His initial plan had been to serve as coeditor with Richard Crawford, one of the leading scholars in the field of American music.[3] Crawford opted out, however, in order to concentrate on other projects, including a biography of George Gershwin, and turned the editorship over to younger colleagues. (For *AmeriGrove II*, he authored a superb bio-entry on Gershwin). Garrett's research and teaching interests focus on American music of the twentieth century, including jazz, racial/ethnic representations, and cultural theory. He is the author of a book that could serve as a motto of the collective effort, *Struggling to Define a Nation: American Music and the Twentieth Century,* and he is a former student of H. Wiley Hitchcock, who was coeditor of the original *AmeriGrove.*[4] Hence, there is

[2] Marilou Carlin, "Long Overdue Revision of New Grove Dictionary of American Music," *The Cutting Edge* (19 September 2012): 3, online edition http://www.thecuttingedgenews.com/index.php?article=76041.

[3] "In Conversation: Charles Hiroshi Garrett, AmeriGrove Editor in Chief," *Oxford Reference*, http://www.oxfordreference.com/page/amerigrove/in-conversation-charles-hiroshi-garrett-amerigrove-editor-in-chief.

[4] Charles Hiroshi Garrett, *Struggling to Define a Nation: American Music and the Twentieth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008).

generational continuity, a laying on of hands from master to apprentice, just as in the classical craft tradition. The work began in 2006 with project editor Mark Clague from the School of Music, Theatre, and Dance at the University of Michigan. A team of ten senior and twenty-five contributing editors, who were top scholars in the field, helped update the list of topics and decide what to include and what to ignore.

A special challenge was the treatment of so-called "serious" music. Since 1986, when *AmeriGrove I* was published, understandings of what constitutes music and its historiography in the United States have expanded to encompass a wide range of distinct and hybrid musical traditions. *AmeriGrove I* positioned the two subworlds of serious and popular music as discrete and stable categories by implicitly disregarding the ambiguous role of the avant-garde. The result was a sober and reliable representation of historical facts; the authors and editors largely resisted the temptation of aesthetic value judgments, even if some promising perspectives were only briefly addressed or important names missing.[5] *AmeriGrove II* embraces new perspectives on the contemporary historiography of American music, exemplified by George Lewis's bracing statement that "the frontier, the maverick, democracy, exceptionalism, human rights, class, race, sexuality, as well as the peculiar workings–out of mobility in the U.S. context—(. . .) are our questions."[6]

The boundary maintenance of serious music in the first edition has now given way to a more ambitious approach, which has led to some paradoxical consequences. Notably, we get brilliant, state-of-the-art essays on the formative figures of U.S. music history since 1900, written by leading Anglo-American musicologists and scholars: for example, Bernstein (Paul Laird and David Schiff); Cage (James Pritchett); Carter (David Schiff); Cowell (David Nicholls and Joel Sachs); Glass (Edward Strickland); Ives (Peter Burkholder); Reich (Paul Griffiths); Rochberg (Austin Clarkson, et al.); Varèse (Paul Griffiths); and Wolpe (Austin Clarkson). While they impressively demonstrate the overriding importance of American modernism for twentieth-century music history, they dodge the questions raised by Lewis, particularly in regard to the relationship between the United States and Europe. If we assume that the contexts and preconditions of a transatlantic history of music were in place at least since Varèse's arrival in the United States in 1915, this avoidance appears more than accidental. The tendency towards hagiography in some of the core articles could be interpreted as resistance to overly theory-laden discourses of postmodernism; however, it also reveals a strikingly canonical view of U.S. modernism, including the experimental and avant-garde tradition, thus presenting a parallel to the ideology of an immortal European "classical" heritage—in a sense, a disguised form of American exceptionalism. The Ives scholar Gayle Sherwood

[5] The absence of an entry on Gustav Mahler was probably a blunder. Joseph Horowitz has more than made up for it in the new edition. His illuminating article on the phenomenon of Wagnerism in the United States is also noteworthy.

[6] George E. Lewis, "Americanist Musicology and Nomadic Noise," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 64, no. 3 (2011): 694. Lewis was one of five scholars who contributed to the colloquy led by Garrett and Carol Oja (who served as a member of the *AmeriGrove* Advisory Board). Charles Hiroshi Garrett and Carol J. Oja, "Colloquy: Studying U.S. Music in the Twenty-First Century," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 64, no. 3 (2011): 689–719.

Magee argues that the persistence of the old inferiority complex of American music lurks behind such an inversion.[7] That other approaches are possible is demonstrated by Sabine Feisst in her outstanding entry on Arnold Schoenberg. In order to give the reader a comprehensive idea of the really important issues, she dares to venture into the labyrinth(s) of contextualization and of transatlantic crosscurrents—the latter traced back to the years before World War I and not, following more conventional estimates, to Schoenberg's emigration to the United States in 1934. (Disappointing, in contrast, is the obviously unaltered entry on Artur Schnabel, which thus completely ignores the impressive, mostly German-language scholarship of the last two decades.) Michael Beckerman's entry on Dvořák, likewise, is a model of an intelligent assessment. He demonstrates what may happen when a "naïve" work of art such as the *Symphony of the New World*, which, aesthetically speaking, could be called regressive—a romantic cliché of Herder's *The Voice of Peoples in Song* (1773)—appears at the right time and place.

As might be expected, the subject entries come closest to meet Lewis's call for innovation. The entries on "Aleatory" (Paul Griffiths); "Chamber music" (Leonard Burkat with Gilbert Ross, and Frank J. Oteri); and, above all, the outstanding essay on "Experimental music" (Cecilia Sun) represent state of the art musicology. They deal with a plethora of radically different works of art, the forces of social history, the history of technology, and the apparently inexhaustible dynamics of musical crosscurrents within and beyond the United States. If requests for the digital edition may be suggested (apart from the correction of a considerable number of small mistakes), it would be for more entries of this type, preferably with a historical spin. How about entries on the "Gilded Age," the "New Deal," and, in the spirit of inclusivity, "transatlantic crosscurrents"?[8]

If one were to name just one comprehensive editorial policy of *AmeriGrove II*, it would be inclusivity. Leafing through the eight volumes, one comes away impressed by the vast panorama that covers many areas and epochs of U.S. music from elite avant-gardes to Muzak. In his 1987 review, Crawford praised *AmeriGrove I* for its ecological completeness.[9] This ecological embrace also characterizes the second edition. It involves, first of all, a redefinition of national belonging and an incorporation into the mainstream of what in the previous dispensation were called "subcultures" or "countercultures." The second important editorial policy follows from the first: the determination to set informal music-making on an equal footing with art music. Here, the increasing recognition of vernacular traditions implies a move from musical hierarchies toward a horizontal and egalitarian recognition, from clearly staked out musical boundaries to increasing overlap, hybridity, and fusion. A prime example is the change in the treatment of country music. The first edition had ninety entries, the new has three hundred on individual country artists,

[7] Gayle Sherwood Magee, "Rethinking Social Class and American Music," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 64, no. 3 (2011): 696–97.

[8] Carol J. Oja, Anne C. Shreffler, Felix Meyer, and Wolfgang Rathert, eds., *Crosscurrents: European and American Music in Interaction, 1900–2000* (Proceedings of the Conferences at Cambridge, Mass. 2008, and Munich 2009) (Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2014).

[9] Crawford, "Amerigrove's Pedigree," 172.

plus an updated and expanded overview, as Garrett points out in the Preface (1:viii). Yet, regrettably, an entry on Eddie Miller, creator of the unique and odd "country opera" *The Legend of Johnny Brown* (1966), is missing.

All told, the ruling paradigm at work in *AmeriGrove II* is a politics of recognition, which Nancy Fraser has named the chief political agenda of the late twentieth century.[10] In this, the developmental trajectory of U.S. music follows the First Amendment's dual treatment of religion, which has energized American culture in general: the First Amendment favors the free exercise of individual expression and disfavors the establishment of any kind of collective norm or hierarchy. This dialectical tension creates a populist energy (including a tyranny of expectation) that inspires most of the entries: each pursuit of happiness, however mediocre the musical result, is recognized as a valid expression of basic democratic rights of individuals.

One gets the impression that *AmeriGrove II*'s policy of inclusivity becomes more generous as we approach the present and that current popular forms are the winner. For example, Invisible Skratch Piklz and many current pop artists are recognized, but pianist James Booker does not rate an entry, although his white disciple Harry Connick, Jr., does. *AmeriGrove II*'s inclusivity also involves a new willingness to accept the normative power of the factual: the second edition describes what is there and does not aspire to some national ideal or utopia that still needs to be reached. The result is not one grand narrative of an exceptionalist national history, but many different narratives and viewpoints. If there is such a thing as "American" music, it is a hybrid blend of many traditions. Accordingly, as Project Editor Clague explains, *AmeriGrove II* shifts the attention from state to process. The United States, he avers, is "a place of transplantation. Most people are from somewhere else."

Hence there is much cultural interaction, synthesis, collision, chemical reaction, borrowing and exchanging between different traditions. The expressed goal of the dictionary is capturing some of the excitement: "the cultural magic that really defines American life."[11] Doing so involves not just composers, compositions, texts, masterpieces, or canonical works, but also the in-between, the cracks, the tensions—or, as we would put it, "the hidden choreography" and the "tacit rules of performance." The question remains: how far should inclusivity and the politics of recognition extend, and when does it devolve into triviality? What musics should be included, what artists and musics ignored? Clearly, there is room for disagreement, and particularly from a European perspective, some omissions do not make sense, as will be discussed below.

The enormous achievement of *AmeriGrove II* deserves our admiration, and it prompts a feeling of gratitude in the user. The mere joy of handling the handsome set and the richness of its content are overwhelming. The scholarship gathered in the eight volumes will set the standard for years to come. Hence, our particular reaction as European users borders on enthusiasm. But such an ambitious labor of love is always vulnerable to attack, leading to our list of minor complaints from a

[10] "From Redistribution to Recognition: Dilemmas of Justice in a Post-Socialist Age," *The New Left Review*, 1st series, 212 (July/August 1995), 68.
[11] Carlin, "Long Overdue Revision."

European perspective. A general weakness is the edition's hesitant treatment of U.S. exceptionalism and the national politics of music. There is an entry on "political music," but it does not do justice to the larger interface between global politics and U.S. music or to the political salience of music and its global distribution. The political import of the color line as a motor of compensatory creativity is also de-emphasized. Both black studies and American studies are currently under political attack, as are programs in music. It seems that editors and authors are somewhat ashamed of the central question of exceptionalism and of the latent question of cultural imperialism; however, what composer Arthur Farwell wrote in 1915 still holds: "What a new world, with new processes and new ideals, will do with the tractable and still unformed art of music; what will arise from the contact of this art with our unprecedented democracy—these are the questions of deepest import in our musical life in the United States."[12]

For us the question remains: Why is American popular music so popular the world over, and how does that relate to global politics?[13] A recent article in the British *Guardian* affirms the growing salience of music and politics, as does the journal *Music and Politics*, now into its eighth year.[14] H. Wiley Hitchcock in the entry on "musicology" names politics as the crucial research interest of the future. Here, the individual articles are often ahead of the overall editorial policy.

A prominent example of such neglect of the political dimension is the omission of freemasonry. Not only were European composers such as Mozart and Felix Mendelssohn members, but also Louis Moreau Gottschalk, Louis Armstrong, Count Basie, Duke Ellington, Lionel Hampton, Paul Whiteman, John Philip Sousa, Al Jolson, Leopold Damrosch, Irving Berlin, Eubie Blake, and W.C. Handy. Particularly among African American musicians, membership in the Prince Hall Lodge was a must. But no mention of membership is made in the bio-entries on Sousa, Whiteman, Ellington, or Damrosch. The masonic principle of secrecy is successfully replicated and maintained by ignoring this rich lode. If mixture is the key to the U.S. house of music, the current possibilities of cultural theory are not exhausted. There is an entry on hybridity as part of the cultural turn but none on creolization or on indigenization, although both concepts play a big role in many of the new entries, including those on African American music, theoretical discourses, and ethnomusicological concepts.

The question of including non-Americans who were important for the U.S. jazz debate and its transatlantic crosscurrents should also be mentioned. Hugues Panassié and André Hodeir are included but not Sim Copans (an American living in Paris). There is no recognition of Jan Gabarek, Albert Mangelsdorff, or Peter Brötzmann, although they were important within the U.S. market, nor is there any mention (except in the jazz history bibliography) of Joachim Ernst Berendt, whose

[12] Arthur Farwell and W. Dermot Darby, eds. *Music in America* (New York: National Society of Music, 1915), vii.

[13] Berndt Ostendorf, "Why is American Popular Culture So Popular? A View from Europe," *Amerikastudien* 46, no. 3 (2001): 339–66.

[14] Tom Service, "But music and politics have always mixed," *The Guardian*, 21 September 2011, http://www.theguardian.com/music/tomserviceblog/2011/sep/21/music-and-politics-must-mix.

history of jazz was influential in the United States, as was his turbulent debate with Theodor W. Adorno over jazz. On the classical side, there are quite a few omissions that one could challenge, such as the German-American musicologists Carl Engel and Hugo Leichtentritt (both were covered in *AmeriGrove I*). There is no entry on Bertolt Brecht, although his influence is recognized in many individual articles; his sidekick Hanns Eisler appears in Grove Music Online. In the folk category, we missed Lawrence Gellert, an early collector of African American music, and Lan Adomian, both of whom played a role in the Marxist thirties. No mention is made of Nancy Cunard, whose 1933 anthology *Negro* contained a remarkable set of articles on music by George Antheil and Robert Goffin. Cunard is mentioned briefly in entries on the spiritual and the Harlem Renaissance, but her work for the promotion of African American music and musicians deserves further recognition.[15]

To a European, one of the most surprising omissions is the lack of an entry for Voice of America (VoA), whose program *Music USA* reached a global audience of 100 million listeners from the 1940s until 1995. According to John Chancellor, it was the "single most effective instrument" of the U.S. State Department, a sonic weapon in the Cold War.[16] Its chief broadcaster, Willis Conover, is mentioned briefly in the article on the Cold War, but he does not merit an individual entry, although his contribution to the globalization of jazz was enormous. Leonard Feather, who preceded him at VoA, is recognized, but Symphony Sid (Sid Torin/Tarnopol), who cooperated with Feather, is ignored. European American music seems to us a problematic category, leading to an entry that is somewhat lean (e.g., the section on German American music is not terribly informative) and necessarily heterogeneous (German and Cajun music in one survey?). There is also the question of giving equal space in the entry to musical traditions originating in small and big countries, such as the Baltics, Greece, and France. This seems to us an instance of excessive egalitarianism.

This edition will be the last hardcopy version of *AmeriGrove*, alas, but it is now online, a gain in accessibility but also a loss. There is an element of haptic *jouissance* involved when handling this handsome monument to collective scholarship, buttressed by a feeling of gratitude in being able to share the cultural capital of U.S. music. But, then, it is so much more convenient to work with the online edition. Online, *AmeriGrove II* has one solid defense against obsolescence: the promise of constant revisions, updates, and improvements.

[15] Nancy Cunard, ed. *Negro: An Anthology* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing, 1970).

[16] Terence M. Ripmaster, *Willis Conover: Broadcasting Jazz to the World* (New York, Lincoln, Shanghai: iUniverse, 2007), 27.