

## 1 | Between Europe and America: Kurt Weill's Symphony in a Suitcase

On 21 March 1933, Kurt Weill fled Berlin, having heard he was on a Nazi blacklist following a wave of arrests of prominent intellectuals that coincided with the Reichstag fire in late February. In his single suitcase was a completed draft of the opening movement of his Second Symphony (or *Symphonic Fantasy*), his first effort at large-scale instrumental composition in ten years, and what would prove to be his final symphonic composition.<sup>1</sup> A commission from the eminent Parisian music patron Princesse Edmond de Polignac in 1932 and originally destined to be premiered in her private salon, it represented the tentative promise of further work in France. Perhaps this was what in part determined his course to Paris. Visiting the previous year, he had been warmly received as the latest bright young thing from Germany. In Berlin he had been hiding out at the home of the couple Caspar and Erika Neher – the former Weill's colleague, the latter Weill's lover – since the beginning of March. Whether Caspar was aware of his wife's liaison with Weill is unclear. The couple drove him across the border; it is hard to imagine the emotional charge in the vehicle.

One of the many people to be tossed out of the political maelstrom of Berlin 1933, Weill then completed his symphony in exile on the outskirts of Paris in 1934, drawing on material from his stage works. According to conventional music-historical scripts, Weill, the socialist and populist theatre composer internationally famed for his works with Bertolt Brecht, should have been an unlikely contributor to this genre; he was negotiating territory historically considered the pinnacle of 'high art' music and home to Beethoven, Brahms, and Bruckner, a genre encumbered by specifically Germanic idealist nationalism, at least since its reception by nineteenth-century ideologues.<sup>2</sup> What is more, the work is challenging for Weill

<sup>1</sup> The history of the work's title – and associated questions about its genre status – will be discussed in more depth further on. Throughout this book, the work will be referred to as Symphony No. 2; however, note that the official title *Fantaisie symphonique* or Symphony No. 2 has recently been agreed in preparation for the forthcoming Kurt Weill Edition.

<sup>2</sup> For discussion of the nationalistic ideological colouring of the symphony in early nineteenth-century critical reception, see Sanna Pederson, 'A. B. Marx, Berlin Concert Life and German National Identity', *19th-Century Music* 18 (1994–5): 87–107; Celia Applegate, 'How German Is

biographers.<sup>3</sup> As a salon commission from a wealthy heiress, the symphony was written for a bourgeois world that Weill had previously critiqued.<sup>4</sup> The *Symphony No. 2* provokes several questions: why, suddenly and seemingly uncharacteristically, write a *symphony* of all things?<sup>5</sup> And why, to put a finer point on it, at this precise moment turn to the symphonic genre as the darkening German political regime precipitated his escape?

From a broad perspective, this is a book concerned with symphonies in the interwar period. Its more specific concern, though, is how people imagined selfhood in and around a specific year. It argues that, given the symphony's lively intellectual history of entanglement with ideas of the self (or selves), it is a genre uniquely placed to illuminate what thinking about people's sense of self meant in 1933, at a moment of great international insecurity. By taking a number of symphonies composed or premiered in 1933 and applying a transnational lens, it is possible to reclaim some of the fine grain of the cultural and political landscapes of that incredible, uncertain historical moment. The book begins by tracing the international journey of Weill's symphony in exile from its conception to its transatlantic

It? Nationalism and the Idea of Serious Music in the Early Nineteenth Century', *19th-Century Music* 21 (1998): 274–96.

<sup>3</sup> Weill's Second Symphony has received only limited critical attention compared to much of his *oeuvre*, being the subject of only a handful of studies to date: Robert Bailey, 'Musical Language and Formal Design in Weill's Symphonies', in *A Stranger Here Myself: Kurt Weill-Studien*, ed. Kim H. Kowalke and Horst Edler (Hindelsheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1993), 207–15; Christian Kuhnt, "'Das Gegenteil von Pastorale': Anmerkungen zu Kurt Weills 2. Sinfonie', in *Exilmusik: Komposition während der NS-Zeit*, ed. Frederich Geiger and Thomas Schäfer (Hamburg: von Bockel, 1999), 315–32; Jürgen Schebera, 'Amsterdam, 11. Oktober 1934: Einiges zur Uraufführung von Weills *Sinfonie Nr. 2*', in *Kurt Weill-Studien*, ed. Nils Grosch, Joachim Lucchesi, and Jürgen Schebera (Stuttgart: M & P Verlag für Wissenschaft und Forschung, 1996), 109–18; Misako Ohta, 'Kurt Weill und Gustav Mahler: Der Komponist Weill als Nachfolger Mahlers', *Gakushūin Daigaku kenkyū ronshū* 2 (1998): 39–58.

<sup>4</sup> See Ronald Taylor, *Kurt Weill: Composer in a Divided World* (London: Simon & Schuster, 1991), 203.

<sup>5</sup> As far as it is possible to infer from the available primary sources, it seems Polignac only commissioned a work for orchestra, and that it was Weill's decision to write a symphony. Sylvia Kahan supplies the most authoritative range of primary sources illuminating this issue. She cites a letter from Weill to his publisher of 7 November 1932 (emphasis added): 'I have . . . received from the Princess Polignac a commission to write her *an orchestra work* to be premiered at her house and to be dedicated to her.' See Sylvia Kahan, *Music's Modern Muse: A Life of Winnaretta Singer Princesse de Polignac* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2003), 292. In her footnotes she mentions a letter from Weill to Lotte Lenya of 29 November 1932 in which Weill writes (emphasis added): '*The symphony* is coming along. La Polignac has already paid me 5,000 francs.' Cited in *Speak Low (When You Speak Love): The Letters of Kurt Weill and Lotte Lenya*, trans. and ed. Kim H. Kowalke and Lys Symonnette (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1996), 105. Kahan, *Music's Modern Muse*, 489.

premieres. The present chapter thus serves two functions: it is both the book's initial case study and its introduction, weaving in and out of the two registers. Then, via a series of five other main symphonic case studies, the book will revisit the Symphony No. 2's international settings to build a sense of the stakes for the genre in those places. The chapters traverse Berlin, Paris, and a slightly more fluid US East Coast nexus centring on New York and Boston, with pit stops in Mexico City and Chicago, to consider some music that today is hardly known, whether by concertgoers or the bulk of musicologists: Hans Pfitzner's Symphony in C# minor, Roy Harris's *Symphony 1933*, Florence Price's Symphony in E minor, Aaron Copland's *Short Symphony*, and Arthur Honegger's *Mouvement symphonique n° 3*.

Subjectivity will be a recurrent term in this volume. It is taken to mean a sense of selfhood or consciousness that operates at both individual and collective levels – something that symphonies and symphonic discourse (here meaning written commentary responding to symphonic music) grappled with throughout the nineteenth century and beyond. Alongside illuminating subjectivity in 1933, a central claim is that these largely forgotten symphonies and the specific cultural anxieties they produce offer insights into how people thought about an area with close ideological links to subjectivity – namely, political and aesthetic notions of space.

The nation-state, itself a particular kind of imagined space, has strongly orientated much existing scholarship on symphonies.<sup>6</sup> Symphonies are taught as German or Russian, or American or French, for example. Weill's symphony forms the starting point for this volume because the nation-state so evidently fails it as a hermeneutic frame. A work that reveals the symphony circa 1933 as swept up in political events which had a global reach, Weill's symphony demonstrates clearly that the genre at this time was an international phenomenon. Yet, while looking globally, the composers I consider simultaneously held a critical mirror to their local contexts. Furthermore, Weill's symphony puts a focus on the Germanic aesthetic and philosophical heritage that was the genre's ideological centre of gravity – and, in so doing, on how that heritage policed contemporary

<sup>6</sup> For some, it has acted as a hermeneutic limit; for more recent work, it has been a more porous and flexible construct. See, for instance, Andrew Deruchie, *The French Symphony at the Fin de Siècle: Style, Culture, and the Symphonic Tradition* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2013). Although centred on the United States, Douglas W. Shadle's exploration of the nineteenth-century American symphony has an explicit transnational dimension, however; see Shadle, *Orchestrating the Nation: The Nineteenth-Century American Symphonic Enterprise* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016).

ideas about symphonies, particularly about who was allowed to compose them. I suggest that only if we widen our viewfinder beyond the nation-state and bring these works from 1933 into contact with one another can we understand the deep anxieties they reveal about the genre, and what its instability at this time tells us about corresponding ideas of selfhood and space. After all, this was an era characterised by international mobility and displacement, exchange of ideas and cultures across borders, globalised uncertainty, and international antagonism, when politics brimmed with anxieties about space, personal freedom, and international boundaries. Just what was the symphony in 1933? And what do we think it is today?

When Weill used material from his own expressly political stage works in his symphony, he underlined the genre's status in the early twentieth century as something far beyond a purely musical object. The symphonic genre was a tool of political critique, both embedded within and sceptical of social discourses about exile, high art, internationalism, political reform, and popular culture. These social discourses were transformative for modern notions of subjectivity. In some ways, Weill's work foregrounds the genre's typically modern self-awareness. The symphonic genre itself had become a vehicle by which to reflect at a distance on both the suffocating geographical determinism and the nationalist self-aggrandising that had come to plague it, as well as to lampoon symphonic monumentalism's role in establishing political hegemonies.

Since the genre was no longer one that could sustain the nineteenth century's unabashed idealism, to decide to write a symphony in 1933 was necessarily to negotiate social discourses about mass tastes and markets. Previous scholars have suggested that Weill's work was simply a swiftly turned-out money-maker at a time of dire financial need.<sup>7</sup> His assets in Germany, of course, had been frozen, so the economic case must have been intense. But there is also a sense in which the work seems profoundly sincere. The symphonic genre retained much of its allure and prestige as the litmus test of a composer's capabilities: to what extent, then, was the

<sup>7</sup> See Ronald Sanders, *The Days Grow Short: The Life and Music of Kurt Weill* (New York: Limelight Editions, 1985), 203; Kahan, *Music's Modern Muse*, 309, 311; Schebera, 'Amsterdam', 109. Sanders suggests money was a major motivating factor for the symphony. Kahan highlights Weill's letters to Lenya in which he refers to the money he was being paid for the symphony (or waiting to be paid: Weill wrote, 'That beast [Polignac] hasn't given me my money' and 'I'm ready to string her up on one of the pipes of her organ if she doesn't give me my money'), citing Kowalke and Symonnette, *Speak Low*, 104–7 and 111–14. Kahan does not overtly suggest it was a major drive, however. Schebera positions money as important for Weill in this period, but he does not suggest that any financial motivations implied the work's superficiality.

work a conscious transition of musical register and a bid for elevated respect and recognition? Having studied with Ferruccio Busoni, Weill had credentials that rivalled those of any of his more 'serious' orchestral composer contemporaries, and, as he confided cryptically to Lotte Lenya the day after he finished the sketch, he was confident about the work: 'I'm very happy that I can also do something like this better than the others.'<sup>8</sup> Considering the fraught political context and the work's lengthy gestation – uncharacteristically protracted for Weill – some commentators have suggested that his self-quotation from stage works with an overt socialist agenda points towards a reading of the symphony as a powerful social commentary on changing relations between citizens and the State.<sup>9</sup> Why shouldn't this be commensurate with the genre's historically lofty ideals? It is hardly incompatible with financial motivation. Yet, if secondary literature on Weill's work at large has resisted such an interpretation, then this is revealing about the remarkable persistence of twentieth-century perceptions of true symphonic idealism as decontextualised, universal, and, above all, divorced from quotidian economic imperatives.

In the work's programme note, Weill took a playful and non-committal position on the musical content of his symphony, despite its flagrant borrowing from the stage. Perhaps this was a knowing gesture towards just some of these problematics of absolute music – after all, absolute music has always been a category steeped in ideology.<sup>10</sup> As Weill explained:

It is not possible for me to comment on the content of the work since it was conceived as pure musical form. But perhaps a Parisian friend of mine was right when she suggested that an appropriate title would be a word that expressed the opposite of 'pastoral', should such a word exist. I do not know.<sup>11</sup>

Weill's remarks, particularly the reference to 'pastoral', also hint at the work's clear dialogue with the Germanic symphonic tradition. Following

<sup>8</sup> Letter from Weill to Lotte Lenya, 16 December 1933, in Kowalke and Symonnette, *Speak Low*, 107.

<sup>9</sup> The following sources endorse a political reading of the symphony, challenging pervasive characterisations of the work that suggest it was simply a popular crowd-pleaser or a superficial sideline contribution to Weill's theatrically orientated *oeuvre* and ideology. See Kuhnt, 'Das Gegenteil von Pastorale'; Schebera, 'Amsterdam'; Stephen Johnson, 'After Mahler: The Central European Symphony in the Twentieth Century', in *A Guide to the Symphony*, ed. Robert Layton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 382–401.

<sup>10</sup> Mark Evan Bonds, *Music as Thought: Listening to the Symphony in the Age of Beethoven* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); Laurenz Lütteken, *Sinfonie als Bekenntnis: Zürcher Festspiel-Symposium 2010* (Kassel: Baerenreiter, 2011), 8–9.

<sup>11</sup> Kurt Weill, programme note in Programme of the Subscription Concert (Bruno Walter/Concertgebouw Orchestra), 11 October 1934 (hereafter Concertgebouw Programme Note).

eighteenth-century classical symphonic models, the symphony is in three movements – Sonata (*Sostenuto – Allegro molto*), Largo (titled ‘Cortège’, referencing the funereal slow movement of Beethoven’s *Eroica*), and Rondo (*Allegro vivace*) – and is unified by motivic interactions (described by one commentator as ‘Lisztian thematic transformations’<sup>12</sup>). These, however, are disguised on the surface level by a sense of disjunction (bear in mind the theatrical *Verfremdungseffekt* developed with Brecht) resulting from the abrupt succession of orchestral gestures and almost cinematic cuts between diverse musical materials that reference multiple historical and contemporary forms. Indeed, Weill’s integration of dance structures, march, sonata form, Cortège, and lyrical song invites comparison with Mahler’s famed all-embracing attitude to the symphony.<sup>13</sup> Adorno’s commentary on Mahler could equally apply to Weill: ‘All categories are eroded . . . none are established within unproblematic limits. Their dissolution does not arise from a lack of articulation but revises it: neither the distinct nor the blurred is defined conclusively; both are in suspension.’<sup>14</sup> Also noteworthy – and again referencing the Mahlerian model – is the bittersweet humour with which the work is invested (Adorno calls its Mahlerian instantiation ‘gallows humour’):<sup>15</sup> the grotesquerie of the trombone and woodwind glissandos; the faux-militant trumpet fanfares; the impossibly quick triplet motif of the closing bars.<sup>16</sup> The bald repetition of the march for winds in the final movement creates a particular moment of generic fluidity, manipulating the forces present in the orchestra to create a popular-sounding marching band. Given that commentators have hypothesised that the march alludes to the paradox of the menacing yet ludicrous appearance of ‘goosestepping Nazis’, does the repetition critique the mindlessness of political complicity and critique popular forms as

<sup>12</sup> Douglas Jarman, *Kurt Weill: An Illustrated Biography* (London: Orbis, 1982), 94. See also Bailey, ‘Musical Language’. Bailey provides an analysis of the symphony’s first movement, examining its motivic unity.

<sup>13</sup> Plenty of commentators have done the same, or drawn up other seemingly Mahlerian influences on the work: see, for example, Antony Beaumont, booklet accompanying Kurt Weill, Die Deutsche Kammerphilharmonie Bremen, cond. Antony Beaumont, *Symphony No. 1, Quodlibet, Symphony No. 2*, CD, Chandos Records Ltd, 2006, CHSA 5046, 12; Ohta, ‘Kurt Weill und Gustav Mahler’; Jarman, *Kurt Weill*, 95; Jürgen Schebera, *Kurt Weill: An Illustrated Life*, trans. Caroline Murphy (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 223.

<sup>14</sup> Theodor W. Adorno, *Mahler: A Musical Physiognomy*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 23.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> As Stephen Johnson writes in reference to Weill’s Second Symphony, ‘we should not forget we are dealing with an accomplished ironist here: one who, no less than Mahler, could use popular styles to poignant, disturbing or even downright brutal effect’. Johnson, ‘After Mahler’, 391.

channels of mass propaganda?<sup>17</sup> A question mark similarly hangs over the C major ending. To tack on a gesture towards notions of purity and simplicity is farcical, and seems to function in the same way as Igor Stravinsky's critique of C major and the assumptions it carries in *Symphony in C* (1938–40). Sibelius's *Symphony No. 7* of 1924 notwithstanding, that no symphony could really end in C major with a straight face by 1934 confirms the self-consciousness that haunted the genre.

Initially, a premiere for the symphony was not forthcoming. It was not until August 1934 that Bruno Walter, exiled from Berlin in the same week as Weill, agreed to take up the symphony for performance (under pressure from Weill's advocate and pupil from Berlin Maurice Abravanel).<sup>18</sup> (The events surrounding Walter's exile from Berlin are given further attention in Chapter 2.) Walter was quick to get the ball rolling; the inaugural performance took place in Amsterdam on 11 October 1934, with immediate subsequent performances in The Hague and Rotterdam.<sup>19</sup> A few weeks later, Walter took the work to the United States, presenting it at Carnegie Hall in New York on 13 and 14 December. Weill could not have hoped for a more prestigious opening for his first piece of absolute music in ten years; as he wrote to Lenya, 'I'm afraid the gods will be envious' (the 'envy of the gods' being a jinx).<sup>20</sup> Early insecurities about his ability to develop the right style ('den richtigen Stil') for an orchestral work were long forgotten.<sup>21</sup> After attending the rehearsal for the performance at Amsterdam's Concertgebouw, he appeared to have every reason to remain buoyant, reporting to Lenya: 'Just a quick note. The rehearsal [of the Second Symphony] was wonderful. Walter does it marvellously and everyone is really enthusiastic, especially the *entire orchestra!* It's a good piece and sounds fantastic.'<sup>22</sup>

<sup>17</sup> For example, Beaumont, booklet accompanying Kurt Weill, *Symphony No. 1, Quodlibet, Symphony No. 2*, CD, 12.

<sup>18</sup> See Schebera, 'Amsterdam', 110–11. On 7 June 1934, Walter wrote to Abravanel that he of course had enormous interest in listening to Weill's symphony. Weill-Lenya, series 47.

<sup>19</sup> Atypically for a Polignac commission, the promised private salon performance did not take place until after the premiere. The work was finally performed in the large music room, avenue Henri-Martin, on 24 June 1935. See Kahan, *Music's Modern Muse*, 328.

<sup>20</sup> Schebera, 'Amsterdam', 111.

<sup>21</sup> Kuhnt, 'Das Gegenteil von Pastorale', 318. Kuhnt quotes a letter from Weill to Universal Edition, found photocopied at Weill-Lenya.

<sup>22</sup> Letter from Weill to Lenya, 10 October 1934, in Kowalke and Symonette, *Speak Low*, 145. This letter is frequently cited to confirm Weill's positive attitude to the symphony. See, for example, Kowalke, *Kurt Weill in Europe* (Michigan: Ann Arbor, 1979), 86; Schebera, *Kurt Weill*, 223; Schebera, 'Amsterdam', 114; Bailey, 'Musical Language', 207; Taylor, *Kurt Weill*, 203.

### 'I Had Prepared Myself for Much Worse Things!'

Weill's optimism, however, was misplaced. He misjudged the complex and restrictive discourses used to police the symphonic genre. The work animated and agitated reviewers, provoking divisive and inconsistent responses, and, if anything, it seemed his *Dreigroschenoper* success stacked the odds against his symphony's chances.<sup>23</sup> Juxtaposed in the programme with Brahms's Fourth Symphony, a mainstay of the repertoire, the yardstick against which Weill's symphony was to be measured was especially diminishing. The reviewer for *Eemlanden* reported snidely: 'That was not so bad! I had prepared myself for much worse things! . . . Modern, very modern, but funny and fluent, and without sentimentality.'<sup>24</sup> For the most part, however, critics came down even harder on Weill, and a Maastricht newspaper spelled out some major and recurrent qualms:

Kurt Weill is the composer of the *Dreigroschenoper*, and I fear that will remain his fate for years to come. It is no disgrace, of course, though it would be better for him to accept it, rather than attempting to force his talent in this pretty hopeless direction. Because, to be honest, Weill's *Symphonische Symphonie* is not much more than a number of expanded songs. The result? Rather ridiculous. And not only is the song style ill-fitted to symphonic forms; the nature of Weill's music is little suited to absolute music. Weill is a man of the theatre . . .<sup>25</sup>

As many questions as the reception raises about the nature of Weill's music, it raises still more about the nature of 'absolute' music. Ultimately, these questions about nature or character seem to point to insidious underlying questions and assumptions about Weill himself – and to judgements about the kinds of people who listened to his music. When, as we will see towards the end of this chapter, the reviewers gendered his 'popular' music as feminine to argue it did not belong in the concert hall, when they criticised his supposedly superficial thematic development, and when they questioned his motivations for writing a symphony, these critics were not reacting solely to aspects of 'pure' music; rather, they were responding to social discourses relating to Weill's popular status and fame, political discourses linked to the socialist message of *Die Dreigroschenoper*, racial

<sup>23</sup> The only existing research that has been done on this body of reviews is in a German-language article by Schebera. See Schebera, 'Amsterdam', especially 116.

<sup>24</sup> H. F. K., 'Belangrijke nieuwe muziek in het Concertgebouw: Serge Prokofieff en Kurt Weill', *Eemlanden*, 12 October 1934 (trans. Liselotte Snijders).

<sup>25</sup> 'Weill en Prokofieff – Symphonie in Songs – Prokofieffs derde pianoconcert', *Maast.* (Maastricht newspaper?), 12 October 1934 (trans. Josephine Kahn).



discourses bound up with his Jewish heritage, and to the perceived internationalism of Weill's musical voice (at odds with symphonic, and specifically Germanic, nationalism). What is more, the reviewers did so while communicating their unease about Amsterdam's fringe relationship to Germanic symphonic culture: cultural anxiety about being on the margins.

Crucially, as will be shown by the critical reception of Weill's symphony in Amsterdam, the story of the Weill premiere indicates how symphonies and their discursive contexts blur the borders of those aesthetic, subjective-interior, and political spaces where subjectivity plays out and in relation to which it is reflexively assembled. Yet, since existing literature on symphonies and their discursive contexts in this period lacks a comparative perspective, we begin on the back foot, ill-equipped to approach the Amsterdam reviews, and still less able to compare their subtleties with the reception of Weill's work in New York a few weeks later, where a whole raft of different localised histories and concerns – not to mention attitudes towards Germany – were at play. As the reception begins to disrupt inherited conceits about the symphonic genre's universality, it reveals that serious foundational work piecing together a fuller, more globalised picture of symphonic discourse is still required.

### The Symphony in 1933

Weill's Symphony No. 2, Pfitzner's Symphony in C# minor, Harris's *Symphony 1933*, Copland's *Short Symphony*, Honegger's *Mouvement symphonique n° 3*, and Price's Symphony in E minor make up a constellation of works that complement one another aesthetically, ideologically, and biographically, overlapping and contrasting in complex and unexpected ways. Together, they hatch more finely a sense of what it is that we are dealing with when we talk about 'the symphony' in the interwar period, and specifically in the pivotal year 1933, when Germany pulled the trigger on a political upheaval whose shockwaves would be felt globally through the twentieth century and beyond. They capture a keener sense of the era and communicate a more capacious vision for the symphonic genre than previous studies. Steering away from the mode of aesthetic survey, as this volume explores how the genre uncovers localised ideas about subjectivity, space, and exclusion, it pursues connections with diverse cultural and political areas: fascism, liberal ideologies, exile, gender, race, imagined geographies, post-colonial anxieties, as well as recording technology, ballet, Classical Greek sculpture, Weimar dialectics, Pan-Americanism.

The kaleidoscopic scope of the symphony's cultural history becomes a way of illuminating the book's central themes.

The transnational dimension here is vital. This book spotlights how fundamentally a transnational perspective is needed fully to understand both the symphonic genre and the localised political and social issues shaping the written discourse emerging in response to symphonies in the years around 1933. Far from a hermetically sealed, purely musical topic, as many previous studies have characterised the genre, in 1933 the symphony was clearly an interdisciplinary phenomenon and a window onto the cultural and political contours of the moment.<sup>26</sup> The focus, therefore, is at times less on the musical works themselves than it is on what the *idea* of the symphony and people's responses to it tell us about the works' settings. I am interested in the symphony as a locus around which a set of critical rhetorics and discourses continually re-emerge and are reconstructed.

Utopian Enlightenment (and typically Germanic) philosophical narratives about sovereignty and space have long been wedded to the symphonic genre. In 1933, political developments applied particular pressure to them, often taking them to breaking point. The year in which Hitler took power and the Great Depression reached its peak, 1933 was a fraught one for politics and economics, concentrating far-reaching social questions that intersect with 'symphonic' issues about selfhood, society, power, and spatial expansionism. This points to the symphony's darker, authoritarian side: to think of the symphony is often to conjure connotations of nationalistic power display or monumentality. Indeed, symphonic ideals have proved flexible allies for both free will and totalitarianism at different times and in

<sup>26</sup> The literature concerning symphonies, frequently in the mode of aesthetic survey, is very large, but for a selection of relevant studies see, for instance, Christopher Ballantine, *Twentieth Century Symphony* (London: Dobson, 1983); A. Peter Brown, *The Symphonic Repertoire*, vol. 3A *The European Symphony ca. 1800–ca. 1930: Germany and the Nordic Countries*, vol. 3B *The European Symphony ca. 1800–ca. 1930: Great Britain, Russia, and France*, vol. 4 *The Second Golden Age of the Viennese Symphony: Brahms, Bruckner, Dvořák, Mahler, and Selected Contemporaries* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002–7); Louise Cuyler, *The Symphony* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973); Manuel Gervink, *Die Symphonie in Deutschland und Österreich in der Zeit zwischen den beiden Weltkriegen* (Regensburg: G. Bosse, 1984); Layton, *Guide to the Symphony*; Lütteken, *Sinfonie als Bekenntnis*; Wolfgang Osthoff and Giseler Schubert, *Symphonik 1930–1950: Gattungsgeschichtliche und analytische Beiträge* (Mainz: Schott, 2003); Robert Simpson, *The Symphony: Elgar to the Present Day* (Aylesbury: Penguin Books, 1967); Wolfram Steinbeck and Christoph von Blumröder, *Die Sinfonie im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 2002); Richard Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music*, vol. 3 *The Nineteenth Century*, vol. 4 *The Early Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) (hereafter *OHWM*); Arnold Whittall, *Music Since the First World War* (London: Dent, 1977); Arnold Whittall, *Musical Composition in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).