

work-centered analyses and national music histories to take stock of such recent theoretical developments, it helps breach a gap between musicology and other disciplines. This move should guarantee a readership for the book that is broader than the one implied in the title.

The Invention of "Folk Music" and "Art Music" ranges over an impressive range of topics. Readers looking for insights into mid-eighteenth- and early-to-mid-nineteenth-century views on conjectural history, exoticism, language, early anthropology, and a host of other topics will be gratified. While extensive footnotes help orient the reader here, regrettably, the book lacks a bibliography that would have made it more usable still. Gelbart's remains, however, a very fine book that wants to be widely read—by musicologists, ethnomusicologists, and literary scholars interested in pursuing the historical interconnections between their fields. The book shows us in detail how the peripheral was once central but it also provides a model for understanding the persistence of such oppositions.

VANESSA AGNEW

Jerome Kern, by Stephen Banfield. Foreword by Geoffrey Block. Yale Broadway Masters. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2006. xii, 375 pp.

Oklahoma! The Making of an American Musical, by Tim Carter. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2007. xix, 327 pp.

Sigmund Romberg, by William A. Everett. Foreword by Geoffrey Block. Yale Broadway Masters. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2007. xix, 362 pp.

Frank Loesser, by Thomas L. Riis. Foreword by Geoffrey Block. Yale Broadway Masters. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2008. xix, 332 pp.

In the Prologue to William Everett's recent biography of Sigmund Romberg, the author mentions an episode in the television series *House*, during which a snippet of Romberg's music is intoned by "Golden-Globe Winning" actor Hugh Laurie (p. 2).¹ It is interesting that this little bit of pop-culture notoriety somehow seems to situate Romberg's music as *au courant* and therefore an appropriate subject for a modern biography from Yale University Press (as well as being somewhat unusual for Dr. House, whose musical tastes tend to classic rock). Everett's volume is one of four recent books from Yale, three of which

1. For a further discussion of this book, see my review in *ARSC Journal* 40 (2009): 63–64. I have adapted some sentences and phrases from that review here.

form part of the “Broadway Masters” series—a title that evokes rather old-fashioned principles of canon-building—and all filling important lacunae emerging from a second generation of musical theater scholarship. Noted expert Geoffrey Block edits the series, which seeks to introduce both scholars and students to an area of American musical research that has become something of a growth industry of late. Yale’s editorial statement about the series predicts that

each [volume] will reflect the individuality of its subject and author, but certain elements will be consistent, including a biographical survey, at least one chapter devoted to a single show, an assessment of each subject’s historical and artistic legacy, an authoritative work-list, and a selected discography. While some may bristle at the word “master,” we think the rubric Yale Broadway Masters well serves a series that focuses on the individual and collective accomplishments of American musical theater’s greatest practitioners. Although most of the project volumes single out composers, we hope to find room for a representative sample of masterful [there’s that word again] lyricists, librettists, directors, and choreographers who also richly deserve scholarly consideration commensurate with their popular acclaim and treasured places in our hearts and imaginations.²

That Yale has devoted a series of volumes to Broadway composers (half a dozen already, with a forthcoming one on Bernstein by Carol Oja) is yet one more sign that this repertoire is now being taken seriously by a discipline that has only relatively recently accorded it serious scholarly respect. And, even with the plethora of emerging critical and interdisciplinary approaches to musical theater, there is still a great deal of historical and documentary ground-work needed in this field, and these volumes along with others in the series do that important work. The telling phrase, though, is that the series gives scholarly attention commensurate with the composers’ “popular acclaim and treasured places in our hearts and imaginations.” It is this tension between nostalgic hagiography and revisionist myth busting, alongside a scholarly stance aimed at a moving-target readership, that makes these volumes a particularly revealing snapshot of where the field now stands and points up the obstacles facing scholars of the musical.

To understand this intellectual landscape, it would be helpful to recognize that musical-theater scholarship is to musicology or American music studies what American music was to musicology when some intrepid scholars formed the Sonneck Society (now the Society for American Music, SAM) in 1975. Although there are musical theater sessions at both AMS and SAM national meetings, the group of musicologists who are invested in this repertoire have started to gain their own kind of momentum and accordingly have staged a few of their own gatherings, notably a conference on the American and British musical that Stephen Banfield put together in Bristol, a symposium on

2. Yale University Press website, <http://yalepress.yale.edu/yupbooks/SeriesPage.asp?series=95> (consulted 26 September 2009).

“Broadway in 1957” organized by Paul Laird at the University of Kansas, and a gathering at UCLA in 2007 which brought together the major players in this field. A recently established refereed journal provides something of a dedicated organ for those pursuing research in this genre.³

Musical theater has enjoyed an explosion of interest in the last decade or so, with new literature amassing so quickly and in such variety that it defies classification as one scholarly subgenre. A volume like Stephen Banfield’s landmark study on Stephen Sondheim (complete with an impressive array of analytical methodologies) stands beside books like Scott McMillin’s theater-based *The Musical as Drama* and John Clum’s *Something for the Boys: Musical Theater and Gay Culture*, or D. A. Miller’s *Place for Us: Essay on the Broadway Musical* (the latter doing for musical theater much what Wayne Koestenbaum’s *The Queen’s Throat: Opera, Homosexuality and the Mystery of Desire* did for opera, providing rich ethnographies of a particular demographic audience for the genre).⁴ Although the same could arguably be said of opera studies, musical theater tends to attract commentary from a wider variety of camps than any other genre I can think of: scholars from theater and cultural studies; Americanists; practitioners of musical theater; and aficionados who live and breathe this repertoire, its stars, its songs, and its trivia like the devotees of almost no other musical genre. The diversity of approaches is reflected in a diversity of intended audiences: everyone from the music theorist interested in Broadway song-forms to the musicologist who needs to teach a musical theater course, from theater mavens to the cultural historian who wants to see how musical theater fits into larger issues in the United States. No wonder, then, that the Yale Broadway Masters series attempts to offer something to many different types of readers.

Dr. House aside, William Everett’s study of Sigmund Romberg (best remembered today for *The Student Prince* and *The Desert Song*) sets the stage for many of the musical theater works discussed in the other volumes under consideration here and brings some of these issues more sharply into focus. Romberg is the least familiar household name of these Broadway “Masters,” although he was arguably among the most prolific and successful composers of the 1920s. Reasons he has not been treated in significant detail in the literature, as Everett points out, relate to his status as an émigré composer, the fact that his works are operettas (read: light entertainment), and that the majority

3. *Studies in Musical Theatre*, now in its third year, is edited by Dominic Symonds and George Burrows.

4. Stephen Banfield, *Sondheim’s Broadway Musicals* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993); Scott McMillin, *The Musical as Drama: A Study of the Principles and Conventions Behind Musical Shows from Kern to Sondheim* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006); John M. Clum, *Something for the Boys: Musical Theater and Gay Culture* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1999); D. A. Miller, *Place for Us: Essay on the Broadway Musical* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998); Wayne Koestenbaum, *The Queen’s Throat: Opera, Homosexuality and the Mystery of Desire* (New York: Poseidon Press, 1993).

of his output comes before *Show Boat*, that watershed work that separates musical theater history into “pre”- and “post”- eras that similarly coincide with narratives of modernism, progress, and evolution within musical theater. The scholarship tends to polarize around composers coming from the two largest centers for its production, New York and London, and so those (like Kern) who are part of both of those scenes end up with a somewhat stacked deck in the area of perceived importance, while the work of émigré composers like Romberg (and Kurt Weill, although he has the imprimatur of a substantial European art-music career as well) doesn’t quite align as comfortably with our ideas of the American (or, alternatively British) musical. The primacy of musicals as reflections of American identity and experience (see Raymond Knapp’s two recent volumes)⁵ means that those who enter the culture mid-stream from a European career produce works that are not so self-consciously American in their methods or subject matter; they don’t fit into the canon as snugly. This makes Everett’s work all the more important, as it seeks to redefine musical theater as a somewhat more international than strictly American phenomenon. Everett presents something of a life-and-works narrative but emphasizes Romberg as the progenitor of two strains or archetypes of operetta based on subject matter and plot type. Instead of focusing on one or two of Romberg’s most famous works, Everett frames his discussion around different kinds of plots and the musical styles that grow from them. This focus on the conceptual underpinnings of this brand of musical theater contributes to our understanding of operetta (and early-century musical theater contexts), a departure from the more descriptive style that one might expect from an introductory book of this kind. Indeed, as the author of the first large scholarly study of the composer, Everett has some myth busting to do, and he corrects biographical discrepancies between Romberg’s life and its portrayal in popular culture. Specifically, Elliott Arnold’s book *Deep in My Heart* and the MGM film of the same name⁶ have been the predominant sources of biographical information on the composer, and Everett sets the record straight on this count. The replacement of hagiography with sound historical research is what will make this book most valuable to the more casual historian of musical theater or of this period in American musical history in general. This volume comes closer than others in the series to presenting a scholarship “worn lightly” (as Yale’s publicity puts it), yet one that still provides a general overview of these composers and their milieux.

Thomas Riis’s book on Frank Loesser is also appropriately aimed at an audience who might have some familiarity with Loesser’s works but is not neces-

5. Raymond Knapp, *The American Musical and the Formation of National Identity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), and *The American Musical and the Performance of Personal Identity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

6. Elliott Arnold, *Deep in My Heart: A Story Based on the Life of Sigmund Romberg* (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1949); and *Deep in My Heart*, film dir. by Stanley Donen (MGM Pictures, 1954).

sarily conversant with the history of musical theater. To break up and enrich the discussion, he adds long asides, like the one surveying the history of film-musical production, that fill in some of the gaps for those who are experts on the stage musical exclusively. Although the most prominent chapter of the book (as promised by the editors of the series) is devoted to one work—in this case Loesser’s best-known show, *Guys and Dolls*—Riis gives the less famous musicals equally rich historical treatment. His discussion of *How to Succeed in Business Without Really Trying* is a highlight of the book; the author always links his discussion to other musicals of the time and makes sense of the composer’s career, not always an easy task with creative artists working in theater. Riis balances the narrative by bringing together musical analysis, plot synopsis, and contemporary theater reviews. Particularly useful is the discussion of songs according to their function, recognizing that in musical theater, song types often relate to specific dramatic purposes. Riis faces the same challenges as do the other authors in this series: how to avoid crafting simply a chronological narrative while covering a number of different musicals in one volume, and writing in the wake of a few older or unreliable biographies and memoirs whose facts need to be verified or disproven. As modern scholars, all these authors seek to debunk myths and untruths that have crept into the lore of musical theater, but at the same time they need to support the image of their subjects as “Broadway Masters.” Riis does not oversell Loesser, but like most of these authors he wants to paint his composer as at least as large as life, if not a mite larger. In Loesser’s case, we meet a wunderkind who was primarily self-taught, a masterful businessman adept with financial as well as musical issues, and a mentor who influenced and helped other Broadway composers. Certainly, a light dusting of hagiography is not unexpected in the first major scholarly works on these composers, but the ideal of “mastery” creates unnecessary tensions when expectations of what “serious” modern composers do rub up against some of the realities of composing for the commercial theater. Broadway composers, for instance, rarely orchestrate their own works; that this important task goes to one or a number of musicians who specialize in this field already might demote many of these composers in the eyes of specialists in art music for whom orchestration (including texture, figuration, etc.) is one of the defining features of a “real” composer. Along those lines, Riis mentions just a few pages from the end of the book that Loesser “freely pilfered ideas large and small as it suited him, while being careful not to break the copyright laws” (p. 255). Although we may perhaps thank Adorno for our stringent expectations of how serious composers in the twentieth century should manifest originality, the field hasn’t been entirely able to free itself from his influence, and so moments like this in the text will stand out to specialists and nonspecialists alike.

Stephen Banfield’s volume on Jerome Kern evinces an impressive fluency with Kern, musical theater history, and its social and cultural contexts, both British and American. Like most of the authors in this Broadway Masters

series, Banfield must rely on sources that, in general, are not widely available or usable. He has lamented that musical theater materials have been treated as ephemeral and rarely archived or preserved diligently. Banfield is not alone in this, as many musical theater historians face almost insurmountable odds in getting their hands on reliable sources. One might imagine that the availability of material on musicals must be commensurate with their popularity, especially relatively recent works. However, much musical theater history is fragmentary at best and rests on often inaccurate popular biographies or unreliable and biased oral histories. Even for more prominent musicals, many of the most important documents have been lost. By way of example, the Museum of the City of New York holds costumes and other materials that widely document Weill's *Lady in the Dark*, while *West Side Story*'s costumes and sets were so worn out in touring productions that they were discarded; later revivals of that show had to rely on photographs to reconstruct it. Popularity can unravel the historical evidence of a production as efficiently as indifference.

Such is the twilight existence of musicals: too popular to need scholarship, too light to warrant it. Banfield knows this all too well: "Why scholarly apparatus is deemed anathema to such musical theater critiques is therefore a mystery, but it affects many of them," he writes, "and this has queered the pitch for whole generations of scholars who are accordingly supposed to be in the know about the primary source repositories without the help of a documentary trail" (p. 5). Despite this seeming disclaimer, Banfield displays an impressive mastery of the sources at his disposal, with extreme attention to detail (every show is painstakingly annotated with the date of production and the theater in which it played, for instance) and a deep immersion in the musical theater repertoire of Kern's time. He provides extensive commentary on plot, character, and music of a wide variety of musicals by not only Kern but also others, and his provision of musical incipits for the melodies (and where he can, the harmonies) of Kern's songs from diverse contexts is sufficient to allow the reader to make his or her decisions about the material. This is scholarship at its best, weaving together important ideas on Kern's oeuvre couched in a narrative that amply details each show and a large number of the composer's individual songs. His chapter dedicated to *Show Boat* sidesteps some of the more controversial and timely issues that the musical raises, providing instead discussion of how music functions in the drama. Yes, this approach meets the aim of the series to introduce the work of the composer to possibly new audiences and allow them to draw their own conclusions. However, the things that make *Show Boat* controversial are also those that make it rich and complex, and one wishes Banfield would address them a little more directly. However, he is no crabbed positivist—Banfield shows a keen awareness of larger issues—the power of the star, the allure of spectacle, and the relative masculinization of the world of musical theater, its dissemination, and its consumption. This volume presents a model of what a series like this can provide the reader, whether specialist or neophyte.

By far the most intriguing of the publications under review here is Tim Carter's *Oklahoma! The Making of an American Musical*, also from Yale although not explicitly for the Broadway Masters series. Carter has established his impressive scholarly career on Monteverdi and early Italian opera, with some excursions into Mozart, so this is a surprising turn from his established field of study. The volume seeks to tell a detailed history of the first collaboration between Rodgers and Hammerstein and the musical that has become canonic in the repertoire. Carter picks up, on a higher scholarly level, where the Keith Garebian books on the "making of" various Broadway musicals (*West Side Story*, *Gypsy*, *Cabaret*, and *Guys and Dolls* among others)⁷ left off. As might be expected from a scholar of seventeenth-century repertoire, Carter takes an approach focusing heavily on archival documents, availing himself of the formidable collections at the Library of Congress (the Oscar Hammerstein II collection and Richard Rodgers collection) as well as the Theatre Guild archives at the Yale Collection of American Literature. Indeed, the book contains a vital and helpful appendix discussing these collections in detail. Carter's virtuosic handling of archival materials, forming the basis of an astonishingly detailed narrative account, sets his study apart. For instance, he provides information on the numerous cast changes and salary levels as well as box office receipts for different weeks of the show, a feat that required painstaking perusal of dense financial and contractual information; Carter also makes connections particularly between theatrical works and the people who populate them on and off stage to a number of degrees of separation. Although the book promises to do some myth busting, what we mostly garner here is a fascinating picture of how *Oklahoma!* would have emerged if some of the elements were changed: Groucho Marx was at one time considered for the role of Ali Hakim, for example, and Robert Alton as choreographer. It is intriguing to imagine *Oklahoma!* with even small changes in casting or personnel. On another note, Kurt Weill was a possible composer for *Liliom*—what a different *Carousel* that would have been!

Naturally, then, one sees the historian's hand at work here, the scholar trying to arrive at a cohesive narrative from different, often competing strands of information. A discussion of the circumstances surrounding the musical's dream ballet, for example, attempts to discover the truth in conflicting accounts by the collaborating artists. However, one of the primary and perhaps distinctive traits of musical theater is that the collaborative process is often so fraught with competing demands that each collaborator's account leads away from any sense of consensus, not toward it. What emerges is not a clearer view of the given musical, but how differently the collaborators see "their" show (no matter how much lip service they pay to organic unity or all writing the

7. Keith Garebian, *The Making of "Gypsy"* (Oakville, ON, and Buffalo, NY: Mosaic Press, 1998); idem, *The Making of "West Side Story"* (Oakville, ON, and Buffalo, NY: Mosaic Press, 1998); idem, *The Making of "Cabaret"* (Toronto, Paris, and New York: Mosaic Press, 1999); and idem, *The Making of "Guys and Dolls"* (Oakville, ON, and Buffalo, NY: Mosaic Press, 2002).

same work). This book is organized mostly as a chronological narrative, which Carter unfolds through analysis of different drafts of the “book” interspersed with letters and other documents by the authors of the musical. Indeed, he is able to form out of very diverse material a readable history of the show that reconciles sometimes problematic newspaper reportage with primary documents from planning, casting, and production sessions by the creators. This is not a simple task. His appendix A, a timeline of *Oklahoma!*, provides one of the most detailed such treatments I have seen in musical theater literature.

Chapter 5, on “reading” *Oklahoma!*, is one that many readers will look forward to in a book of this kind, but although Carter makes some interesting and trenchant observations here, this section would benefit most from scholarship more deeply rooted in critical and historical contexts. Carter brings to this discussion ideas from his scholarship on early opera, a unique and rarely developed perspective on the musical. For example, he writes about plagal and authentic divisions of the octave and how they might be applied to a melodic analysis of songs in the show and presumably musical theater songs in general (p. 115). Similarly, later in the book he links the pastoral topoi of Tasso and Shakespeare to some of *Oklahoma!*'s themes. Although the popular-music scholar might bristle at such sixteenth- and seventeenth-century incursions into the world of twentieth-century musical theater, Carter's devotion to the topic and his attention to historiographical concerns elsewhere make these moments seem intriguing rather than elitist or irrelevant. Indeed, one would like him to expand on these ideas which seem to appear out of nowhere. A book entirely on “*Oklahoma!* as Pastoral” might seem too narrow or perhaps too precious, but that is exactly the kind of second- or third-generation scholarship on musical theater to which one hopes all this work is leading. I would urge a more Americanist bent, following up on some of Raymond Knapp's work in his two books on the American musical (previously cited), and links to other popular music trends of the time.

For all that Carter ultimately does for *Oklahoma!*, though, he begins as an apologist for musical theater. The very first words of Chapter 1 ask, “Why write a book on *Oklahoma!*? Because it is a landmark in the Broadway musical, because it is a glorious show, and because it raises important issues about the genre, the theater, and its times. Why write a scholarly book on *Oklahoma!*?—because it has never been done, and because musicals are no less worthy of serious treatment than any other art form” (p. 1). I cannot imagine Carter, or any other scholar for that matter, starting a book on one of Mozart's operas by asking, “Why a book on *Idomeneo?*” even if the answer were ultimately because it has never been done or because it is a glorious opera. Although this sentence may shed light on why Carter has written a book on a topic we do not expect from him, it feels a little as though he is defending why he, as a musicologist specializing in Western art music, is spending time on the American musical. I do not doubt his sincerity and passion in pursuing this very important and relevant research (and he has certainly done

the work), but framing it this way almost puts musical theater scholarship back a decade. We all acknowledged some time ago that musical theater was worthy of scholarly study, didn't we? Do we need a distinguished scholar from outside the field to corroborate this before we can believe it? Or, more tellingly, do we desire the sanction and authentication of our musicological traditions to validate theater works as worthy of serious scholarship? It seems a particularly unusual opening stance for a book whose publisher has already produced several installments in its Yale Broadway Masters series, with more on the way. However, it gets at the issues of self-esteem from which musical theater scholarship still suffers. That said, there's no intellectual slumming here—Carter takes the work, and especially its collaborative process, very seriously and writes a history of *Oklahoma!* that will find a permanent place in the scholarly literature on the musical.

The one overarching issue I see in all the volumes under discussion here is audience. For whom are these books written? Given that musical theater scholars stand somewhat outside both the mainstream of popular music studies and the scholarly tradition of art music, and that the Yale Broadway Masters series ostensibly “aims to introduce both general readers and students to major figures in Broadway theater . . . [by offering] serious scholarly books that wear their scholarship lightly,” the target readership of these books is ambiguous by Yale's definition and undefined in practice.⁸ Students would no doubt be overwhelmed by the large number of works mentioned in, say, Banfield's volume, many of which are unavailable for score study and are not part of any readily available recorded or performed repertoire (how many could put their hands on *Sunny*, for example, or *Toot-Toot?*). Indeed, much of his book suggests that the reader bring at least a passing acquaintance with many of Kern's works, and although Banfield provides plot summary for many, still others would leave a neophyte behind. Banfield's melodic shorthand (necessary, as he could not possibly reproduce in notation the many musical details he includes in the book) will leave a few readers in the dust, too. Although the audience for Banfield's book presumably includes musicologists who can easily grasp the analyses, in Riis's book on Loesser there is a two-sentence paragraph explaining the differences between a major and a minor scale (p. 202), and at another point he gives the birth and death dates of J. S. Bach (p. 66), as though the composer were being introduced to the reader for the first time. If the target readers for this volume don't know who Bach is or what a major or minor scale is, the Roman-numeral analysis included in Banfield's text and his frequent invocation of the classical canon would decidedly snow them under. This is not a critique of either of these authors, who obviously have brought to their subjects a methodology and a way of communicating it which they find appropriate to their intended audiences. Rather, it is an editorial issue for the

8. On the Yale University Press website, see note 2.

whole series that raises the question of who reads these volumes and for what purpose.

Where does this leave us? The four books under discussion forge paths in an expanding world of musical theater scholarship, but all in their own way still shore themselves up against what they imagine might be a hostile, dismissive, uncomprehending, or perhaps unscholarly audience. They do this, primarily, by occasionally invoking the great German masters, a strange gambit in this post-“new musicology” generation. Wagner (particularly his *Meistersinger*) finds his way into Banfield’s narrative at a number of junctures (pp. 125, 198, 216), and the author also mentions *Der Rosenkavalier* (and Puccini, pp. 121, 154) while Riis writes about the *Gesamtkunstwerk* (p. xiii) and the “*Beggar’s Opera* of Broadway” (*Guys and Dolls*, as described by Kenneth Tynan, p. 79). An aspiration to opera, to the serious, to “Art,” supposedly—gives these works the imprimatur they require to deserve scholarly attention and respect. A certain nodding and bowing to the classical canon and its value system pops up throughout all these volumes, and one wonders, in the twenty-first century, why. All the authors are trying to find, it seems, the relationship between “Broadway” and “Masters” in this Broadway Masters series. A balance must be struck between composer as artist and composer as businessman (a factor for both Loesser and Kern). Block, in his forward, describes Loesser’s shows as “making audiences laugh while connoisseurs marvel at their imagination” (p. xi), and Banfield reflects on the tunes that a person could hum today but admits that our familiarity with them “militates against thinking about them” (p. 2). It is a tall order for any composer to be both widely beloved and masterful where it counts—and what happens to those who are not “treasured . . . in our hearts and imaginations,” who are perhaps intricate but not hummable, singable but not intellectual? Banfield places Kern in a trajectory that includes Gershwin and Rodgers, all leading inevitably to the big S, the undisputed master, Stephen Sondheim. But if popularity in box office terms and hummability are the recipe for Broadway Masterdom, Sondheim would get a failing grade compared to most of these composers. Are these tensions between the popular and the serious within the field of musical theater itself, then, at the root of some of the dichotomies, the equivocation, and ultimately, the defensiveness that crops up here and there in these volumes? Or is it that we are not quite ready to wrest some of these composers from their “treasured places in our hearts and imaginations”? Part of writing the history of any composer means debunking the myths that have grown up around the person and the music, but there is a certain fantasy about Broadway that makes us want to resist that very process. If we can free this repertoire from the shadow of Adorno, our insecurities, our nostalgia, and our modernist expectations, then perhaps the next phase of musical theater scholarship, brazenly unmodified, gloriously unapologetic, and intellectually uncompromising, will continue what this generation has begun.