

music scholars rather than those of informed amateurs and performers.”²⁵

This partial change can be seen in many ways, and it has a number of important consequences. A colleague noted that Sir George “undertook his task in the spirit of a lover of beauty rather than in that of an antagonist.” As D. W. Krummel observed, however, this open sentiment was eventually succeeded by a more adversarial one, and later editions gave themselves over increasingly to “invidious comparisons” and value judgments.²⁶ This antagonism was complex and not universal, but it can be at least partly ascribed to an increase in scholarly specialization, and to the elitism that sometimes goes with it, as I discussed in my first chapter.

Such elitism is not an absolute, however, but rather exists in relation to the things it purports to rise above. More important in this context than the severities of advanced scholarship are the dangers such severity opposes. The Eric Blom-edited 1954 *Grove's* is the location of the most invidious comparisons cited by Krummel, and its areas of opprobrium are predictable and significant.

Desmond Shawe-Taylor observes that the 1954 edition was particularly poor, and even parochial, in its coverage of ethnic and popular music. Richard Hill, in a contemporary review, described its tone as “insularity with a vengeance.” Stanley Sadie goes so far as to call the 1954 *Grove's* xenophobic.²⁷ Nowhere is this attitude more evident than in the discussion on film music, which appears to be heard as ethnic (read *American*) and popular in the worst ways. Why the withering disapproval? There were, of course, valid musicological objections. But additionally, Sir George’s amateur’s love of beauty, and of communicating its pleasures, were no longer admissible when popular beauties had become so dangerous, and its aficionados had gone so far astray.

From the perspective of the film music writers, George Grove’s music-for-the-people utopianism was no longer possible. In film music the beauties loved by amateurs—overwhelmingly the people composing and appreciating this music—could only be answered by antagonism.

Shawe-Taylor suggests that in using the *New Grove* specifically, “everyone is sure to come across details in his own partic-