

critiqued, both by the films and by their scores. Even when these composers do write for long-form commercial narratives, the results reveal anew how wide-ranging apparently conventional film music can be and always has been. It is a long way from *Zero de Conduite* or *Henry V* to *King Kong*, or from *King Kong* to *Kings Row*. All through the history of film music conversation we see the need to expand and sometimes to reject the standard accounts.

Nevertheless the music-institutional take on film music is still powerfully informed by these standard takes, and more particularly by two basic narratives. They are the Hollywood myth of its classic film composers being heir to and working abundantly within the Romantic tradition, and the Groveian rejection of that myth, along with its resulting and reacting caricature of rampant film philistinism. But neither of these stories fully reflect the realities, or are adequate to the roots that gave rise, and that continue to give rise, to film compositional activity.

Even the softened 1980 account continues to reflect the old prejudice, especially in the area that is most pertinent to the present discussion, and which in some way summarizes the attitude of much of the academic music community toward the movies. This concerns the functional use of concert music in film. According to the 1980 article there are three ways that this is done. First, there are illustrations of concert music in pictorial terms (e.g., Jean Mitry, *Fantasia*). Second are its uses by filmmakers “not primarily interested in the music,” as in Delius’s “Appalachia”—and Mendelssohn’s “Midsummer” overture—clipped by Herbert Stothart for *The Yearling*, or Tiomkin’s borrowing of “The Merry Widow Waltz” in *Shadow of a Doubt*. Finally there is a more dire kind of appropriation. “There was no . . . extra-musical justification for David Lean’s interpolation of Rachmaninov’s “Second Piano Concerto” throughout his film of Noel Coward’s *Brief Encounter*, and the use of existing music in such a context may be found distracting or even offensive.”⁴⁹ This remarkably cranky expression quite willfully ignores a great deal of vigorous critical comment on this particular film, evidently to affirm, after all the attempts at understanding and fair consideration, exclusivity, and snobbery.

Who, then, are these elitists? Why are these generations of