

**Listening for the *Intimsphäre*: Recovering Berlin 1933 through Hans Pfitzner's
Symphony in C-sharp Minor**

Emily MacGregor

On 23 March 1933 Hans Pfitzner's Symphony in C-sharp Minor, Op. 36a, an orchestral transcription of his String Quartet, Op. 36 (1925), was premiered in Munich. The concert took place during the very early weeks of the Nazi administration, coinciding with the date the Enabling Act was passed, when Adolf Hitler's political powers became total. A week later, on 30 March, it was performed again by the Philharmonic Orchestra in Berlin. This article tells the story of that second performance at the Philharmonie, a concert where the effects of new Nazi policy and persecution could be felt in an immediate way, and yet one that has completely slipped from our historical consciousness. According to a witness account of events, ten days prior to the Pfitzner concert the Nazi authorities had threatened scenes of violence at the concert hall if Jewish conductor Bruno Walter's regular concert with the Berlin Philharmonic—part of the “Bruno Walter Series”—were to proceed as usual, triggering Walter's immediate political exile.¹ His replacement by Richard Strauss, who donated his fee to the hard-up orchestra, has been well rehearsed in the secondary literature,² but was certainly not the only concert affected by Walter's exit. Due to conductor “reshuffles” (as they were described in one review) between many of the major north-German concert venues in the wake of Walter's departure,³ at the 30 March Pfitzner concert the composer himself unexpectedly took to the podium at short notice to conduct his new symphony. Although he was not directly stepping in to cover Walter—Eugen Jochum had been on the original billing, but was needed at Leipzig's Gewandhaus to cover the position Walter's exile now left unfilled—the last-minute switch made Walter's absence from the concert circuit plainly apparent.

Hitler's appointment as Chancellor of Germany is one of the most infamous historical junctures in twentieth-century history, yet we still do not understand those chaotic, uncoordinated first weeks following the *Machtergreifung*—the seizure of power on 30 January—as well as we should. This short period is crucial for what it might tell us about the mechanisms at play when we find the mainstream political ground radically shifting, and when an ethical consensus that at one time seemed unshakable is profoundly imperiled by far-right agendas.

This article aims to retrieve some of the fine grain of that incredible, uncertain political moment when nothing was inevitable. What actually happened at this highly politicized, high-profile concert on 30 March? Further, what can we learn about that time and place from close attention to the musical work at the heart of the event, Pfitzner's thoroughly neglected C-sharp Minor Symphony? Figures like Pfitzner, who might today seem marginal to National Socialist history, are precisely those currently in most need of sustained critical attention, because their often bewildering political ambivalences help to sharpen the realities and contradictions of living in the Third Reich.⁴ Reviews of the concert, which received significant exposure from all the major Berlin newspapers and national music journals, uncover shifting currents in music criticism that recursively fed back into the shifts playing out in the political landscape.⁵ After all, history reveals itself through the microhistorical, the peripheral, and the disregarded.

As might be expected, praise flowed freely for a new symphonic work from a major conservative cultural icon: “a new masterpiece,” as the *Berlin Lokal Anzeiger* had it; “without doubt one of Pfitzner's strongest compositions,” in *Melos*.⁶ But that is hardly the main reason this concert and this symphony matter again today. Instead, what offers unique insights into the historical texture of this time and place is more easily overlooked: critics' anxieties about genre.

A symphonic reworking of a string quartet presents a remarkable opportunity to investigate language relating to public and private spheres and spaces within a society in transition to Fascism. Particular kinds of discussion are initiated by the C-sharp Minor Symphony's position as a "boundary-work"⁷ between chamber music and symphony; between private and public space. Particular kinds of musicological conclusions can be drawn here, too. The concert and its reception can be read as a tipping point, at which nineteenth-century symphonic idealism and twentieth-century totalitarianism become visible as intimately entwined. As Karen Painter notes, nothing altered identifiably about symphonic musical language or style when Hitler seized power; instead it was the "ideological valence" that changed.⁸ March 1933 precedes any sedimentation of Nazi symphonic values, but the symphony's reception anticipates their discourses.⁹ This points to a slippery slope between the aesthetics of absolute music and its artistic imperatives, and the collusive anonymization and determinism of totalitarian regimes.

"The era of individualism died once and for all on 30 January," propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels stated in an address the weekend before Pfitzner's Berlin concert. "The individual is being supplanted by the collective of the *Volk*."¹⁰ Yet contemporary appraisals of Pfitzner's symphony suggest strongly that listeners "heard," in ways that undercut Goebbels's assertion, the intimate, subjective space of the string quartet, as if preserved within the orchestral rendering. This essay considers the reshaping of political and aesthetic notions of space in the context of the political transition, mining the reception of Pfitzner's symphonic reorchestration for what it can reveal about how those two kinds of space are intertwined. A critical tenet of Fascist ideology¹¹ closely associated with what Michael Meyer has called "the collectivization of the individual"¹² is the reformulation of the relationship between subjectivity¹³ and public space. Music can participate forcefully in this process. As Margaret Notley has observed, opposing the symphony and public space against chamber music and the subjective associations of the

private sphere was a well-established critical tendency; likewise, in the Berlin reception the respective spatial analogues for the two genres were heavily implied by metaphors of force, space, and containment.¹⁴ Against this specific political background the work provokes a set of questions about the monumentalization of the string quartet's forces, and about transgressing the corresponding real and imagined public and private spaces associated with each genre. Pfitzner's symphony simultaneously contributes to and contests Fascism's ideological remodeling of space, both performing and defying an assimilation of the private into the public. The sense of autonomous subjectivity that Fascist ideology seeks to erase is immanently connected with the essential core of the private sphere—or, to borrow a term from Thomas Burger, the *Intimsphäre*.¹⁵ If the symphony, as the reviews begin to indicate, succeeds in preserving a sense of a private sphere beyond the reaches of political intrusion, then what are the implications for subjective autonomy and agency?

Pfitzner's symphony has only rarely been performed in the years since 1933,¹⁶ and the project here is one without interest in its rehabilitation. Rather, the critical listening to the work that is needed again today falls within a broader theoretical investigation into how music is involved in Fascism's reformulation of the relationship between space and subjectivity, building on work by Reinhold Brinkmann and Alexander Rehding. These scholars have compellingly examined National Socialist constructions of two interlinked aesthetic categories: respectively, the "sublime" and the "monumental."¹⁷ My methodology allies in part with Rehding's directive for understanding the "machinations of monumentalization"; he proposes that examining arrangements—that is, musical material that has undergone some transformative process, in this instance, a symphonic rescoring of a string quartet—might yield "instructive insights on the workings of monumentality."¹⁸ Rehding underlines the stakes for the monumental in National Socialist Germany by paraphrasing Thomas

Mann's shrewd observation on the dangers of monumental music: "Monumental music seems to exude moral authority without specifying the carrier of the authority, or indeed the nature of such morality."¹⁹

A rich literature on musical and cultural life in Germany in the late 1920s and early 1930s undergirds this article. Meyer, Erik Levi, Pamela M. Potter, Stephen Hinton, Michael Kater, and others have supplied historical and critical foundations for work on the late Weimar Republic and on early Fascist Germany, and scholars such as Karen Painter and Bryan Gilliam have explored to what extent symphonic and Nazi ideals converged.²⁰ Sven Oliver Müller has used the Berlin Philharmonic as a case study to establish how the National Socialists used musical culture as "a powerful instrument in consensus politics"; his arguments align with existing work on the concert hall's institutional significance for (re)producing hegemonic groups, identities, and value systems.²¹

The scope here is more tightly defined, taking a key historical moment of political upheaval and excavating a specific concert and musical work for what it uncovers about that moment's ideological messiness, opacity, and inefficiency. Established critical rhetorics had begun to take on new dimensions, shedding light on some of the inconsistencies of Fascism and its roots in existing intellectual trends. The C-sharp Minor Symphony's uncertain genre status, suspended between chamber music and symphony, was a central source of critical tension. Contemporary listeners couched their descriptions of the work in competing terms. They evoked monumentality and the sublime, but also celebrated the symphony's austerity and rejection of decadent orchestral color. Whereas most reviewers applauded the symphony's success, there was nonetheless discomfort about how the work negotiated public and private space. Those musical moments at which contemporary reviewers argued that the work failed to convince as a symphony are analytically examined here in relation to conventional symphonic models, with particular consideration for the public and private sphere discourses closely associated with chamber and symphonic music. Two problematic symphonic-generic junctures in particular caught music critics'

attention: the structure and thematic work of the first movement, and the close of the final movement. Then, in light of this discussion, some language in the reviews warrant broader examination, framed theoretically by idealist Weimar symphonic aesthetics on the one hand, and Brinkmann's and Rehding's work on the Nazi "sublime" and "monumental" on the other. The criticism arguably isolates this concert as a historical moment during which the sands began to shift more decisively between two value systems. It reveals that principles that had once seemed libertarian and utopian all too readily prepared the ground for totalitarian thought.

The Berlin Premiere of Pfitzner's Symphony at the Philharmonie

For Pfitzner, the 30 March concert at the Philharmonie had added significance as the Berlin premiere of his first ever symphony. His reputation in contemporary circles as "the last of the Romantics" was chiefly built on his works for stage, cantatas, and songs.²² Composed during the latter part of 1932 at the age of sixty-three, such a late first foray into the genre may point to self-fashioning after Brahms, a central figure in the German symphonic canon. Brahms turned to symphonies later in life, after making his name in vocal, piano, and chamber music. In any case, this concert would have presented a vital opportunity for Pfitzner to display his work in the sightlines of the new government, channeling the symphonic genre's status as a serious test of a composer's capabilities. From the symphony's conception he had envisaged Berlin as the ideal location for the premiere, indicating the kind of cultural capital the *Hauptstadt* could invest in the work.²³ His concession that it be premiered in Munich a week earlier came only after a generous offer from the mayor to put on an extra, "appropriately 'sensational'" concert for the new symphony, which overrode the composer's reservations about the city outside which he lived, presumably about "wasting" a premiere where his celebrity was strongly assured.²⁴ After these

initial Munich and Berlin concerts, numerous additional performances of the symphony in several German and Austrian cities followed throughout 1933.²⁵

Pfitzner's letters to friends and colleagues from 1933 reveal his concern about his perceived peripheral standing in the Third Reich's artistic hierarchy, particularly in relation to those he saw as in the inner circle, such as composer Strauss and conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler, and that he hoped the new nationalist government would elevate his reputation.²⁶ Indeed, Pfitzner sent Hitler numerous invitations to performances of his works in Berlin during this year, but to no avail, leaving Pfitzner disillusioned.²⁷ Just two weeks before the Berlin concert, on 15 March, Pfitzner wrote to Hitler reminding him of their single meeting in 1923 and asking for Hitler's support in his artistic endeavors.²⁸ Unknown to the composer, Hitler's 1923 visit to Pfitzner in hospital had ignited a loathing for Pfitzner that proved long-lasting: Goebbels remarked in a 1943 diary entry that "the Führer really is very much against Pfitzner since, contrary to all evidence, he thinks him to be a half-Jew."²⁹ Thus Hitler would have nothing to do with Pfitzner, despite the composer's best efforts. Pfitzner's ambivalent relationship to the incumbent regime has been extensively documented elsewhere, but like the timing of his letter to Hitler, much of Pfitzner's behavior in the early months of 1933 seems self-interestedly opportunist.³⁰

Pfitzner's symphony is in four movements, and reorchestrates the string quartet in a literal sense.³¹ C-sharp minor appears too rarely in Pfitzner's compositional output for its use to be merely coincidental, as Johann Peter Vogel comments in his 1991 analysis of the string quartet. He observes musical references to Beethoven's late String Quartet Op. 131, but not to Mahler's Symphony No. 5, the other obviously canonical work in C-sharp minor.³² Briefly, as an orientation for further discussion, the first and second movements are paired, as are the third and fourth movements, and should be performed *attacca* "to underline motivic relationships."³³ Marked "moderato" (*ziemlich ruhig*), the first movement opens in C-sharp minor with—to adopt Vogel's thematic labeling—a sinuously chromatic four-measure

polyphonic “motto” theme for solo woodwinds. In this way, the symphony acknowledges from the outset its debt to chamber music. Yet at the same time, by employing two bassoons and two clarinets, it sets up an aural world with a distinctly orchestral acoustic signature, hinting at the scope of the symphonic forces as yet unheard. The gestural melodic content of the “motto” theme thus articulates some harmonic elements structurally important for the work overall. Nonetheless, it presents a problem area within the symphonic form since, as a curiously circular and static gesture, it resists goal-directed development. Three additional themes are set out in the first movement’s exposition (mm. 5–84), only one of which, the “song theme” (*Gesangsthema*) from mm. 31–75, is in the relative major key of E, playing the role of the second subject. Though a loose sonata structure can be traced, with the song theme (mm. 140–75) reprised in the tonic major, C-sharp, in the recapitulation (mm. 126–83), Vogel demonstrates how it is overlaid with a symmetrical Bartókian bridge structure bookended by the “motto” theme—ABCDCBA—with the two simultaneous forms in tension with each other.³⁴

A scherzo second movement follows, beginning in the subdominant, F-sharp minor. Marked “*sehr schnell*,” the scherzo is energized by solo lines in the clarinet parts, which were described by a contemporary critic as “ironic and grotesque.”³⁵ Other critics noted that this movement gained particularly from the orchestra’s rich color palate.³⁶ At the end of the movement a momentous climax is scored for full orchestra with crashing cymbals (measure 389) before ebbing away to almost nothing, at which point the solo clarinet takes the stage again for a whimsical afterword over a perfect cadence (mm. 408–12). The third movement, “*langsam, ausdrucksvoll*,” is in $\frac{3}{8}$ and initially begins on a G-sharp, the same first note as in the two outer parts of the first movement’s “motto” theme. In spite of this preliminary hint at the dominant, the initially chromatic melodic material leaves the tonal center inconclusive. This arching, “strikingly abstract” arpeggiated sixteenth-note gesture is heard unaccompanied in the first violins and opens by articulating a tritone before then being quasi-

canonically passed between the other string voices (mm. 1–10).³⁷ Yet the chromaticism abruptly gives way to diatonic passages—for instance, centering on D major from mm. 11–14, before falling back into meandering atonality. With a compound time signature, at measure 46 the melodic entry of unison trumpets in C major gestures uncertainly toward the idea of a march. Harp and pizzicato strings mark each of the eighth-note beats under the trumpets’ dotted rhythms. The finale has the performance direction “*ziemlich schnell*.” Beginning in C-sharp minor, and concluding in D-flat major, the enharmonic major equivalent, it can be broken down into five sections. Material from the “motto” theme of the opening four measures of the first movement is echoed in the closing passage (mm. 316–31). By contrast, the string quartet does not make the enharmonic switch, ending instead in the tonic major, C-sharp: this single discrepancy in the orchestral transcription is a significant point to which we will return.

Expectations for the symphony on the night of the Berlin concert would have been high, following the success of the official premiere in Munich the week before. Concluding the concert, Pfitzner’s symphony was heard after Schubert’s Symphony in B Minor and two of Pfitzner’s orchestral songs, “Zorn” (1904) and “Klage” (1915), sung by Hans Reinmar.³⁸ “Klage” was so warmly received it had to be repeated—perhaps, as one reviewer suggested, it amplified timely nationalist sentiments.³⁹ In view of the last-minute switch in conductor from Jochum to Pfitzner, the atmosphere in the hall seems to have been something other than simply anticipatory. All the reviews by the major music journals led with the unexpected conductor swap, suggesting that Walter’s continued absence upstaged the new symphony to some degree. Several journal critics reported the evening of Walter’s exile, when Strauss had stepped in for Walter at the eleventh hour, replacing the expected program with Strauss’s own works. Only the phrase “*anstelle von Bruno Walter*” on the concert program indicated Walter’s unexplained absence from his series.⁴⁰ What is more, Walter’s removal from the billing had met with resistance, requiring

Goebbels's personal intervention for its implementation, and after the Strauss concert Hans Hinkel, leader of the Fighting League for German Culture (Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur, or KfdK)⁴¹ and commissioner in the Ministry of Education, had to justify the events leading to Walter's exile, claiming, "We never prevented this concert, nor did we forbid Bruno Walter, whose real name is Schlesinger to conduct. However, it was impossible to offer the necessary protection."⁴²

It is not difficult to imagine, then, that at the Pfitzner concert the Walter affair was still prominent in audience discussions. So too, perhaps, were political developments vis-à-vis racial policy more generally, if the political topics that sat side-by-side with music commentary in newspaper coverage accurately reflect the thoughts of the concert-going public. In the 31 March issue of the *Berliner Börsen Courier*, for example, the review of the Pfitzner concert was located on the second page of an issue headlined with news of the organized national boycott of Jewish businesses that was to begin the following day.⁴³ This commentary and rhetoric has to be read in dialogue with the political changes and conductor dismissals that flanked it in material documentation of the concert. A similar fate befell several prominent conductors by April 1933: Hermann Scherchen, Heinz Unger, and Joseph Rosenstock all lost their positions around the same time.⁴⁴

Still, the differing ways in which the respective reviewers framed the situation suggests that the attitudes toward Walter's exile circulating among the audience were far from monochrome. Though not one of the critics for the major Berlin newspapers and national music journals clarified the reasons for Walter's departure, and none openly condemned the situation, it seems that the tone was not one of general assent but rather one of studied neutrality. Representative was editor Paul Schwers's (1874–1939) report in the conservative journal *Die Allgemeine Musikzeitung*, which explained simply that one of Jochum's Philharmonic concerts:

was conducted as a special concert by Hans Pfitzner, since Jochum had to conduct the Gewandhaus orchestra in Leipzig in place of Bruno Walter, following his departure for Amsterdam. By this means, Pfitzner got the opportunity to showcase in person his new C-sharp Minor Symphony.⁴⁵

The neutral stances may reflect increasing political pressure and scrutiny of the written word.

Gleichschaltung (coordination) began to be applied to the press almost immediately after the Nazis took power, with the intention of centralizing, standardizing, and unifying printed publications. In February, the day following the Reichstag fire, a presidential decree had mandated the closure of newspapers deemed “politically dangerous.”⁴⁶ It was not until 1936, however, that art criticism—legally termed *Kunstaberachtung*—officially became little more than token praise for works that had already been passed by the censors.⁴⁷ Although in March 1933 no laws had yet been passed controlling aesthetic criticism, and the *Schriftleitergesetz*, which prevented all writers of non-Aryan descent from writing professionally, would not be passed until October of the same year, Nazi policy and the public hounding of prominent intellectuals and musicians like Walter must have had an impact on what music critics deemed wise to put in print.

There were, however, exceptions to the neutral language used by most reviewers. Conservative nationalist critic and composer Fritz Stege (1896–1967) provides a case in point, writing for the Nazi-allied *Zeitschrift für Musik* and commending Strauss and Pfitzner for their short-notice appearances. Strauss in particular was hailed as a hero:

Instead of Bruno Walter, it was Richard Strauss who appeared before the Berlin public, met with great enthusiasm and undeterred by threatening letters from a hate-filled America under the spell of

Jewish influence. Then the conductors were changed again: Hans Pfitzner appeared to help provide the Berlin premiere of his C-sharp Minor Symphony.⁴⁸

If this portrayal was unsurprising, it still disturbs. Yes, Stege was also music critic for the main Nazi mouthpiece the *Völkische Beobachter*, had belonged to the KfdK since 1929, and was reporting in a journal that explicitly opposed “modern” music. But up to this point Stege had always written approvingly of Walter’s Berlin concerts, and *Zeitschrift für Musik* had previously regarded Walter as a great “German” conductor.⁴⁹

Although publicly the journals seemed unable to acknowledge the circumstances surrounding Walter’s exit, many prominent members of the musical community sympathized with Walter privately, expressed in letters after his exile.⁵⁰ Pfitzner too certainly would have supported his friend and colleague,⁵¹ an example of a Jewish artist who, in his opinion, was thoroughly “German,” as “the nature of his disposition and thought throughout his entire life” apparently proved.⁵² Had simultaneous double-city premieres of the symphony in Munich and another city taken place, which was an initial suggestion from Pfitzner to his publisher, Walter would have been the only conductor Pfitzner would have considered to lead the other performance.⁵³ Pfitzner, in his own anti-Semitism, appears to have believed that racial heritage could be neutralized or realigned by cultural assimilation.⁵⁴ Artistic triumph, moreover, proved this assimilation, and for Pfitzner Walter was a case in point.⁵⁵ Yet even if Pfitzner thought that his idea of race was less absolute than it was for Nazi policy, and even though choosing a path of low resistance and acting to protect his own interests does not indicate wholehearted advocacy of the regime,⁵⁶ it ultimately made little difference: the *weltanschauung* of his anti-Semitism, as Joseph Wulf notes, allied with that of the National Socialists.⁵⁷

Symphonic Problems: Exploring the Mechanisms of Monumentality

The review in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, by a critic who published only under the name “Runge,”⁵⁸ was representative of the terms in which many journalists and music critics framed the work, conceptualizing the genre transition spatially, evoking both force and excess, and affording the music a sense of agency: “If one asks oneself why Pfitzner might have undertaken [the reorchestration], the intensifying development of the first movement springs to mind. Here the invention does indeed burst the frame of the string quartet, and demands the sound-world of the orchestra to build up.” But in contrast, Runge conceded that “on the other hand, other parts resist such a superficial, externalized effect; their historically informed use of techniques, pervaded by notions of the sublime, resist the shimmering colors of the orchestra.”⁵⁹ Reviewing the concert for the *Berliner Börsen Courier*, Heinrich Strobel (1898–1970) observed that “despite the great apparatus being used, the symphony has a sound that is austere, cold, in part even unsentimental”. Other passages oppose the shallow monumentalizing effects of the orchestra, instead receding inward: the moral elevation of immanence over external appearance is implicit. He went on to note that “the four voices that constitute the specific sonority of the quartet are preserved.”⁶⁰

Runge and Strobel point us toward the key tension in the reviews: the question about how (and how successfully) the work negotiates the relationship between the two genres, between the external and the immanent, and thus between public and intimate space. Which musical junctures, then, presented a problem to reviewers: at what points did they hear echoes of the string quartet, the pull of the subjective domain, and query the work’s symphonic achievements? Schwerts, writing for *Allgemeine Musikzeitung*, highlights two musical areas highly saturated with symphonic expectation as problematic: “Much of the musical material, particularly in the first movement and the finale, strives against the orchestral guise . . . requiring brute force to be squeezed into a new sonic form.”⁶¹ Analyzing those points—the first

movement and the end of the last movement—might help to disclose how, to use a formulation of Rehding’s, the “mechanisms” of monumentality operate in the transition from string quartet to symphony, before the theoretical implications of monumental symphonic aesthetics are explored further on.⁶²

The most useful analytical source for considering the shift from the aural space of the string quartet to that of a symphony is an essay in the April issue of the progressive journal *Melos* by the young Heidelberg music researcher Karl Wörner (1910–1969). Founded in 1920 to champion new music, *Melos* under the National Socialist government would be renamed *Neues Musikblatt* in 1934 to distance the publication from its avant-gardist past. This issue appeared just before major upheavals at the journal began: in May its politics were reformed, as part of which the progressive—and thus “politically unreliable”—chief editor Hans Mersmann was replaced by the *Berliner Börsen Courier*’s Strobel.⁶³ Prior to the change in editors, Wörner had written critically about reactionary and nationalist political action.⁶⁴

Wörner, echoing Schwerts’s assessment, immediately spotted weaknesses in the symphonic facade:

The least satisfying in its orchestral rendering is the fervent gloom of the first movement. For starters, it does not meet one’s traditional expectations for the first movement of a symphony. It is built from four themes, and the sonata form is merely implied. The themes in themselves contrast too little from one another to have an oppositional effect in the orchestral reworking; their inner complexity [*Differenziertheit*] is much more clearly perceivable when played together by a chamber ensemble.⁶⁵

First movements constitute the symphonic regions in which a number of key generic expectations are set up—note Wörner’s reflections on the importance of contrasting themes and sonata form. However, the movement “does not meet one’s traditional expectations”; he implies that it is compromised by the lingering trace of the string quartet’s presence within. The oppositions musically immanent within and internal to the string quartet’s arching, striving themes do not translate well into the symphonic form, which seems to need more pronounced kinds of musical oppositions between, not within, themes. Even more interesting are the conclusions Wörner draws about what is lost in the transition between the two mediums, namely the subtlety of the “delicate chamber quality” in the “rhapsodic” motivic shapes of the second and fourth themes. Presumably he means the main theme—Vogel’s “Kopfthema” from mm. 5–12, and the “song theme,” mm. 31–75. “Likewise,” he writes, “the themes are stripped of their passionate, urging drive. In the symphony the whole movement appears somewhat uniform and cumbersome.” The brass are an easy target for the blame.⁶⁶

Wörner suggests that the intrinsic delicacy of the themes and the subtlety of their differentiation is swamped by the heavy orchestral setting. Other listeners heard the internal complexity of the movement’s thematic work as strain. As composer Hans Sachße (1891–1960) in the *Zeitschrift für Musik*, preparing readers for the symphony’s performance at the upcoming June 1933 Dortmund Tonkünstlerfest (Sachße had first heard the work at the Munich premiere), put it: “An extreme inner tension emanates right from the first melodic line, which in wide leaps and with poignant exuberance [*mit schmerzlichem Überschwang*] strives for the summit, only to sink back in resignation.”⁶⁷ (See Example 1.)

Example 1.

Opening measures of the first movement of Pfitzner's Symphony in C-sharp Minor, as quoted in Sachße, "Symphonie in cis-moll."

The image shows a musical score for the opening measures of the first movement of Pfitzner's Symphony in C-sharp Minor. The score is written in treble clef, 3/4 time, and C-sharp minor. It consists of three staves. The first staff is marked "Ziemlich ruhig" and "p espress." with a dynamic of "mf" at the end. The second and third staves contain complex rhythmic patterns with many triplets and slurs. The third staff includes an "8va" marking and ends with "u.s.w."

Sachße implies that the opening melody thematizes the futile, powerless struggle of subjective being, centering the movement within the private sphere. This is a reference to the "motto" theme, and it is worth taking a closer look at this passage, since its four solo contrapuntal lines make it such an obvious allusion to chamber musical space. The gestural arcs traced within the theme compress a sequence of key structural tones for the string quartet/symphony overall; this then suggests reading the work as a whole as the unfolding of chamber space into public, symphonic space (see Example 2).⁶⁸

Example 2.

The “motto” theme: the opening four measures of the first movement of Pfitzner’s String Quartet in C-sharp Minor, Op.

36.

Ziemlich ruhig ("moderato")

Violin I
Violin II
Viola
Violoncello

Falling chromatically by a semitone from G-sharp to G-natural, the bass line in the first measure articulates a harmonic motion from i in second inversion to $\sharp V^7$ and foreshadows the importance of the tritone, G-natural, to the work’s harmonic and motivic development. Further semitone descending movement from E-natural to D-sharp in the second half of the same measure anticipates the importance for the work of the second scale degree, D-sharp: D-sharp is also the lowest note of the “motto” theme’s arching gesture. At the beginning of the main theme at measure 5 the second scale degree is stressed once more, this time in the upper line, by falling on the downbeat as a suspension over a melodically elaborated i before resolving to C-sharp. The top range of the upper solo line in the “motto” theme stresses an F-sharp (although it is decorated by creeping up to G-sharp) prefiguring the subdominant tonal area of the second movement, and indeed the ambiguous status of G-sharp as a tonal pivot for the third movement. The subjective metaphors couching this passage suggest that the transition from string quartet to symphony can be expressed in terms that parallel the public rendering or “collectivization” of the individual critical to Fascist ideology.⁶⁹ Yet if the movement’s musical effect is “cumbersome,”⁷⁰

then reading between the lines of the criticism reveals that the symphony does not successfully sublimate the subject's inner world within the mass.

Equally freighted with genre convention are symphonic finales. How they discharge the energy accumulated throughout the symphony's duration back into the silence that borders the work is a major generic issue.⁷¹ Pfitzner's fourth movement was no exception. Although in general terms it was singled out for praise, critics struggled to make sense of the final measures. They seemed unable to square the quasi-cyclical return to the "motto" theme and associated chamber space from the opening of the first movement with what had come before. Wörner, for example, suggested that in this movement the symphonic effect was at its most immediate and thrilling (*unmittelbarsten und packendsten*), but stumbled at the final moments.⁷² He was not alone in doing so—similarly for Sachße in *Zeitschrift für Musik*, a degree of discomfort focused around the final passage of the work.⁷³ Rather than evincing a seamless assimilation of the musical lines into an "outsized" form,⁷⁴ the final passage, particularly from rehearsal number 65, instead seemed to render the otherwise obscured, naturalized monumental scaffolding encasing the string quartet partially visible.

Sachße noted the contrast between symphonic and chamber spheres in the finale movement as a whole: "The finale is a great symphonic closing movement, whose primary theme appears as if intensified into a demonic possession, in order thereafter to seek out a final resting place in spheres of chamber music intimacy [*um dann wieder am Schluß Sphären von kammermusikalischer Intimität aufzusuchen*]"—as at the very beginning of the symphony (see Example 3).⁷⁵

enharmonically equivalent key of D-flat major, but without the performance directions “*wieder zurück*” (as at the beginning) or “*sehr ruhig*” (very still) (Example 5).

Example 4.

Fourth movement of Pfitzner’s String Quartet in C-sharp Minor, Op. 36, rehearsal number 65 to the end.

The image displays a musical score for the fourth movement of Pfitzner's String Quartet in C-sharp Minor, Op. 36, starting at rehearsal number 65. The score is written for four string instruments: Violin I, Violin II, Viola, and Violoncello. The key signature is C-sharp minor (three sharps: F#, C#, G#) and the time signature is common time (C). The first system shows the beginning of the piece with a forte (*ff*) dynamic and a tempo marking of *sehr ruhig*. The music features a complex rhythmic pattern with many triplets. The second system includes performance directions: *wieder zurück* (back again) and *sehr ruhig*. The dynamics in this system range from *mf* (mezzo-forte) to *p* (piano). The third system continues the piece with dynamics of *p* and *pp* (pianissimo). The score is a single system with four staves, each representing a different instrument.

Musical score system 1, measures 1-4. The score is in 3/4 time with a key signature of three sharps (F#, C#, G#). The first staff (treble clef) contains a melodic line with a slur over measures 1-2 and a slur over measures 3-4. The second staff (treble clef) contains a sustained chord. The third staff (bass clef) contains a sustained chord with a dynamic marking of *pp*. The fourth staff (bass clef) contains a triplet of eighth notes in measures 1-2, followed by a rest in measure 3 and a quarter note in measure 4. A *pizz.* marking is present in measure 4.

Musical score system 2, measures 5-8. The first staff (treble clef) contains a melodic line with a slur over measures 5-6 and a slur over measures 7-8. The second staff (treble clef) contains a sustained chord. The third staff (bass clef) contains a sustained chord with a dynamic marking of *pp*. The fourth staff (bass clef) contains a sustained chord with a dynamic marking of *pp*. The word *arco* is written above the first staff in measure 5, and *bleibt pp* is written below the fourth staff in measure 8.

Musical score system 3, measures 9-12. The first staff (treble clef) contains a melodic line with a slur over measures 9-10 and a slur over measures 11-12. The second staff (treble clef) contains a sustained chord with a dynamic marking of *ppp*. The third staff (bass clef) contains a sustained chord with a dynamic marking of *ppp*. The fourth staff (bass clef) contains a sustained chord with a dynamic marking of *ppp*. The word *pp* is written below the first staff in measure 9, and *ppp* is written below the first staff in measure 10.

321

pp

bleibt pp

pp

bleibt pp

p

pizz.

arco

pp

bleibt pp



326

ppp

ppp

ppp

ppp

ppp

(arco)

ppp

In this version Pfitzner calls on far more expanded forces using complete orchestral strings, soft woodwind and horn interjections, full-sounding trombone chords held *pianissimo*, strummed harp gestures, and *pianissimo* timpani that reiterate the plucked offbeat eighth notes in the harps and double basses. Some altered articulations and dynamic markings presumably respond to the increase in instruments. At a superficial level, D-flat major is simply a more straightforward key for woodwind and brass and therefore more suited to symphonic forces. But D-flat major and C-sharp major are not the same thing, and any alteration, even seemingly for convenience, comes with an affective transformation. Historically, C-sharp major had been considered a brighter, harder, more brilliant and remote tonality; in contrast, D-flat's affective associations were less tense, wistful, nostalgic, and introspective.⁷⁷ In Pfitzner's songs, C-sharp minor is the key associated with death, or with an unfulfilled wish for death, as for instance, in *Der Kühne* (1988–9), *Stimme der Sehnsucht* (1905), and *Auf die Morgenröte* (1931), among others.⁷⁸ The change in key untethers the end of Pfitzner's symphony from his string quartet's Beethovenian reference point, as well as from Pfitzner's expressive connection of the tonal center to death, at least in the minor. Nevertheless, the historical associations of the new tonality tie it to another equally ambivalent kind of annihilation. Wagner's *Götterdämmerung* ends in D-flat major; it is the tonal area associated with the new world order as the gods are engulfed by flames and the curtain falls.

At the very end of the movement, the fragmented echoes of the tritonal harmonic tension in the first movement's "motto" theme are heard in the woodwind at mm. 316–17 (I in second inversion with the A-flat in the bass descending to G-natural for IV^7 , followed by V^7) and again from mm. 318–19 in the horns (iv in second inversion followed by VII^7 , then I). In the trombone and string parts, the symphony's structural emphasis on the second scale degree—now E-flat rather than D-sharp—persists from measure 321, when the last fragmentary rendition of the movement's main theme is heard, right up until the final two measures, where the suspension finally resolves. These musical gestures, embodying different levels

of harmonic dissent, and recalling the compressed harmonic potentiality of the first movement—are, in turn, instrumental group by instrumental group, assimilated into what is only ostensibly the tonic major, the tonal world of D-flat. The enharmonicism disrupts the conventional circular “unity” of the symphony’s tonal space. To repurpose a point Thomas Bauman made about the “recapitulation” in the finale of Mahler’s “Resurrection” Symphony, the “new order” represented by this unexpected tonal domain does not allow tonality to play its restorative “symphonic” role.⁷⁹ Instead, the restorative function is fulfilled by the symphony’s genre-spatial circularity, as noted by Sachße, suggesting that Pfitzner’s symphony takes the interplay between genre, subjectivity, and space as its subject matter. But even so, the end of the work does not return to quite the same “spheres of chamber music intimacy” with which the first movement opened. This, the contemporary music criticism makes clear, is an uneasy symphonic conclusion, and such unease strongly indicates the music’s critical potential.

Transforming German Symphonic Aesthetics

As music journalists discussed the musical corners where Pfitzner’s work “failed” as a symphony, it became a valuable historical lightning rod for discourses surrounding the external and the immanent; public and intimate space. Yet asking questions of success or failure may have been to miss the point. For instance, when Sachße talked about the work’s genre-spatial circularity, what he neglected to articulate explicitly was something more radical: that Pfitzner’s symphony—whether Pfitzner meant it to or not—called into question relationships between genre and space, and how subjectivity might be reoriented or even recomposed within them. By insisting on those tensions between musical materials and orchestration, Pfitzner’s symphony itself musically articulated anxieties about the exposition of intimate worlds within the public symphonic form.

But critics will be critics, and question success they of course did. Nonetheless, it is important to stress that any glimmers of uncertainty Pfitzner's symphony raised about genre, genre-space, and even the work's critical potential had little bearing on overall evaluations of the symphony, which by almost all accounts was a triumph. Like the bulk of the critical responses, Stege—in the same *Zeitschrift für Musik* review in which he had shown such obvious delight when Richard Strauss had appeared in Walter's place, “undeterred by threatening letters from a hate-filled America under the spell of Jewish influence”—waxed rhapsodically about the symphony and the accomplishment of the transition between genres:

The development of the orchestral sound-world out of the string quartet is very interesting; the intended deepening and intensification of expression is fully achieved by the composer. The deeply profound work ... left a long-lasting impression.⁸⁰

It is difficult, however, to read “the intended deepening and intensification of expression” and the penetration it implies as innocuous, taking into account its overlap with Nazi revolutionary rhetoric, not to mention the pleasure Stege took in Walter's ousting. Threats of public violence are another kind of “intensification of expression.” Goebbels used a similar kind of spatial-depth metaphor a few months later in a speech at the Philharmonie marking the November 15 opening of the *Reichskulturkammer*. He applauded the National Socialist revolution that was all-encompassing (*eine totale*), and that “took hold of all areas of public life and transformed them fundamentally [*von Grund auf*].”⁸¹ Stege was not the only writer to deploy this sort of metaphor to express the transformative effect of the shift in genre: the reviewer for the *Berliner Tageblatt* declared that the symphony “reveals the work's ethos in its full scope and profundity.”⁸² Although metaphors of depth have a rich history in German philosophical and

aesthetic thought, as Holly Watkins has shown,⁸³ in the context of the evident Nazi sympathies of Stege's review the phrase points to a discomfort pervasive in the criticism about the wider and potentially transformative social implications of the act of reinscribing the string quartet as a symphony. As Goebbels's Philharmonie speech went on, "The revolution has completely changed and formed anew the relationship of the people to one another, the relationship of the people to the state, and their relationship to the whole question of being [*Dasein*]." ⁸⁴ The genre discourses between the two musical forms were distinct, particularly in terms of the kind of implied voice, listeners, and space associated with each. What, then, exactly is the "deepening" process taking place in the transition from string quartet to symphony?

Having looked at how critics at the Berlin concert "heard" subjective chamber space in the symphony, and how that suggests the music as a politically critical domain, the focus now shifts to the question of where and how the process of collusion between Fascist and symphonic values began to take place. The same body of reviews and commentary are illuminating. As was the case to a greater or lesser extent for all symphonies from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Pfitzner's symphony was caught between two competing ideological poles. On one side, reflecting themes woven into critical writing on the genre throughout the nineteenth century, is the symphony as a product of the Enlightenment: an idealist vehicle for a multi-voiced, yet cohesive utopian social order governed by ethical values of individual freedom and autonomy.⁸⁵ On the other is the symphony's monumental ability to overwhelm and absorb the listening subject within the collective, linked to the Kantian aesthetic of the sublime, but repurposed by National Socialist aesthetics.⁸⁶ The music reviews raise several themes marked by both of these symphonic ideologies: in March 1933, so soon after the Nazi takeover, the symphony's reception makes clear that the way in which subjectivity, space, and force are articulated is still contested and plural. Because of its specific historical positioning and how it

negotiates the divide between public and private spheres, Pfitzner's symphony and the commentary surrounding it can shed light on tensions between the transcendental symphonic idealism that continues to inflect the genre on the one hand, and on the other the ideology and rhetoric of the totalitarian National Socialist aesthetic imperatives that would crystallize in the coming months.

Enlightenment idealist values remained decisive for German symphonic aesthetics even toward the end of the First World War, channeling widespread optimism on the political left as the Weimar Republic was established. In his 1918 treatise *Die Sinfonie von Beethoven bis Mahler*, progressive Berlin music critic and theorist Paul Bekker—whose writings Pfitzner had lambasted in a well-known public spat that reinforced Pfitzner's status as an archetypical anti-modernist⁸⁷—located it within libertarian discourses by investing the symphony with utopian Enlightenment ideals of freedom, equality, and brotherhood.⁸⁸ This concise book offers an important perspective that helps reconstruct a wider historical and ideological framework for reading the concert reviews. First and foremost, Bekker claimed that “the motivation for composing a symphony is grounded . . . in the artist's wish to speak to a mass public.”⁸⁹ Bekker wedded the symphonic genre to the optimistic idealization of public space as a site for consensus that Habermas later theorized as the liberal public sphere.⁹⁰ He argued that the ideal symphony, epitomized by Beethoven's works, represents a direct conduit from the composer to the mass listening public, conveying musical ideas whose character requires a vast unfolding of energy (*Kraftentfaltung*) into a correspondingly vast physical space.⁹¹ More than this, the performance of such a symphony is equivalent to “a musical assembly of the people, an assembly in which a shared sentiment, whose expression is reached through the music, is activated and comes alive.”⁹² In contrast, for Bekker the string quartet or piano sonata are suited to very different kinds of musical and tonal ideas, which require far less force of sound and are correspondingly suited to smaller, more intimate spaces.⁹³

In 1933, only fifteen years after Bekker wrote *Die Sinfonie*, the symphonic ideals expressed there could barely have seemed more out of place. In principle Bekker's formulation of symphonic space was in the spirit of creating an egalitarian symphonic listening community comprising all layers of society, unified by faith in principles of ethical freedom. But it is not at all difficult to anticipate how the National Socialist political backdrop together with its totalitarian nation-forming imperatives—the “*Daseinskampf eines Volkes*,” as Goebbels put it, in loaded Heideggerian language⁹⁴—began to corrupt and co-opt this community-forming impulse and rhetoric, anticipating the National Socialist vision of individual subjectivity dissolving within the collective consciousness of the masses, and the vast imagined public spaces of the monumental.⁹⁵ For the degree to which it was informed by Enlightenment values, Bekker's symphonic theory did surprisingly little to preserve the sense of the individual listening subject and his or her autonomy, influenced, perhaps, by ideas prevalent in nineteenth-century philosophies of listening. Nietzsche famously diagnosed the decadence of Wagnerian music culture, claiming that the listening practices it commanded were fundamentally bound up with listeners' desire to submit to “the sublime, the profound, the overwhelming.”⁹⁶ And at this Pfitzner concert in particular, political circumstances put an insidious gloss on Bekker's conjectures about the appropriate amount of force required by symphonic ideas. Furthermore, Walter's underscored absence darkly recalled Bekker's proposition that such musical ideas command a particular imagined space and that they are generated from the conception of a particular kind of community. In March 1933 the limits of that “community” had been suddenly and strikingly redefined against constructions of racial purity.

The idea that in the string quartet some kind of surplus in the musical material was poised to “burst” the frame, structure, or fabric of the chamber form recurred throughout the reception—the phrase most frequently used by critics (for instance, Runge, the *Berliner Lokal Anzeiger*'s Walter Abendroth (1896-1973), and *Die Musik*'s Oscar von Pander (1883-1968)) was “*den Rahmen sprengen*” (to burst the

frame).⁹⁷ For many listeners, the musical content embodied a sense of pent-up, even violent excess barely contained by the conceptual space of the string quartet medium. Implied in the bursting of the string quartet's frame is Bekker's idea of the symphonic compulsion to speak to the masses, because ideas generated by an idealized image of a symphonic space and symphonic community would exceed a chamber form. These modes of thinking governing symphonic space are aligned to some extent with Bekker's theorization of the symphony as an agent capable of determining a specific space, and with this, an idealized image of a particular listening public. Yet Bekker's "*Kraftentfaltung*" suggests an uncomfortable parallel with what Goebbels called "*die Volkwerdung*" in his November 1933 Philharmonie address—that is, the Hegelian coming-into-being of the German people—and its *Lebensraum* ("living space") corollary adopted by the Nazis as a fundamental justification for their geographical expansionism.⁹⁸ Influenced by Social Darwinism, *Lebensraum* doctrine asserted the natural rights of the Aryan race to prosper by settling in new territories.⁹⁹ Symphonies, as these writers seem to claim, have their own proper domain; according to the expansionist ideology of *Lebensraum*, so too do the German people.

For a totalitarian ideology that elevated the state above all else, the construction of a unified national imaginary was vital. The symphonic genre occupied a privileged place in such Nazi myth-making. Throughout the Third Reich, the Nazis exploited the symphony as a genre for ceremonial purposes at large concerts and over the radio. As Meyer observes, the "collectivization of the individual" essential to National Socialist ideology was symbolized "by the decline of the *Lied* and the rise of the large orchestra."¹⁰⁰ The dominant aesthetic for National Socialist Germany was the lofty transcendentalism of the monumental, "with its grandiosity, lavishness, and spirituality."¹⁰¹ One aspect of the symphony's importance to the National Socialists, then, relates to the hierarchical social and spatial organization of the symphony orchestra. Gathered around the central figure of the conductor, the

large collective of musicians needed to perform a symphony worked as one musical body, which perfectly models Nazi ideology and the paternal authority of the *Führerprinzip* (leader principle) in particular.¹⁰² The other aspect was the symphony's monumental aesthetic, and had to do with the supposed overwhelming effect of the music on the listener.

The symphonic genre's status historically as an archetype "for the experience of the sublime" points to a further theoretical perspective to inform our reading of the reviews, because shifting discourses relating to the sublime shed light on the changing status of the listening subject in totalitarian ideology.¹⁰³ The sublime, Brinkmann argues, "categorizes the experience of vast, monumental, overpowering objects."¹⁰⁴ Kant's *Critique of Judgment* proposed that the ability to experience the sublime was a property of the subject, asserting the individual's ability to "exert self-determination and a state of autonomy, that is, to control the sublime."¹⁰⁵ Yet, as Brinkmann explains, the sublime was ideologically recast under the National Socialists, relocating it within the monumental object itself. In this way, National Socialist aesthetic thought removed the aspect of the sublime that affirms the sovereignty of human subjectivity; the individual is radically reformulated in relation to the sublime, and in relationship to the collective, "the *Gemeinschaft*, the *Volk*."¹⁰⁶ Brinkmann puts it elegantly: "What remains is the overwhelming power of the great or monumental, of the collective will, to which the subject must submit."¹⁰⁷ Rehding expounds the spatial dimension to the sublime or monumental, drawing on Heinrich Bessler's and Arnold Schering's aesthetic theories of the mid to late 1930s: the monumental in Nazi Germany is embroiled with the creation of expansive virtual spaces in relation to which the individual disintegrates.¹⁰⁸ As he explains, "The central concern of [monumental] musical space is not with meaning but with presence [the subsequent intellectual reflection on the experience of which] remains a void to be filled with political content."¹⁰⁹ Thus Rehding identifies the theatrical appearance of agency as one of monumentality's central trappings.¹¹⁰ In effect, and as Painter similarly

notes, National Socialist ideologues imbued the sublime musical object with “a kind of subjectivity”; critically, this included the agency to wield force over the listening subject.¹¹¹ Pfitzner himself invoked an aligned narrative that positioned the musical work as an agent driving the reorchestration independent of its composer-creator. Writing to his publisher in 1932 about his intentions to rework the string quartet for symphony orchestra, Pfitzner claimed that it was the structure and sound world of the string quartet that demanded, from an artistic perspective, the reworking as a symphony.¹¹²

Reviewers went further. In *Die Musik*, Otto Steinhagen endowed the C-sharp Minor Symphony with the power to overwhelm the listening subject. “Those who do not back away from immersing themselves in the exhausting tension of such a demanding musical experience will not be blinded by it, but in fact enlightened.”¹¹³ *Die Musik*, one of the most influential journals on the German market, was well respected for its balanced political spectrum of opinion pieces from distinguished members of the musical establishment, but degenerated into a vehicle for official propaganda starting in the June 1933 issue, which led with an address from Goebbels.¹¹⁴ “Enlightened” does not quite capture the German imagery, however; those who submit to the musical experience are literally “made seeing for the world of the Self.”¹¹⁵ Although “immersion” in the symphony is presented as emancipatory, listeners’ autonomy is actually being restricted. Steinhagen spells out the mechanism of the sublime as reconceived by National Socialist ideologues, and to disguise the sleight of hand, he uses flattery. The listener is courageous. This plays into a strategy in emerging National Socialist discourses that appealed to notions of strength, duty, and freedom to collectivize the private sphere: “the world of the Self.” For instance, in an article titled “Was ist Kultur” in the July 1933 issue of *Neue Literatur*, Fritz Rotosky wrote: “The individual must be absorbed by the community with his soul in order to fulfill his innermost calling ... to do what is in his power ... makes a man free, in spite of having taken orders. He is free because he wants to obey.”¹¹⁶

This shared interiority is Meyer’s “collectivization of the individual”: the eradication of the private subject and, alongside it, subjective agency, autonomy, and freedom of thought. So too is Walter’s absence, which signals how the private sphere is wrenched out into the public context of the concert hall, and suggests the violent public disciplining of those individuals considered deviant: recall Goebbels’s revolution that took hold of “all areas of public life and transformed them fundamentally.” How we saw Stege frame the genre transition earlier—“the intended deepening and intensification of expression”—takes on further grim significance. Racist violence was beginning to be embedded as a mechanism structuring the public sphere. And the private sphere was beginning, alongside allied issues like family and religion, to be forcibly pulled out into the public. Set against such brutalizing discipline of spaces both real and imagined, the material resistance against this genre shift implied by Stege’s phrase—a resistance that it nevertheless overcomes—sounds especially loaded. Through that phrase, any sense of boundary between symphony and string quartet is physically overpowered, co-opting the private sphere to make it assume a public character. As the studied neutrality of most of the responses to Walter’s exile in the symphony’s reception seems to show, language that publicly affirmed the private, and the autonomy of the individual subject, was losing traction.

A Threshold Moment for Symphonic Aesthetics

Although the first few months after the Fascist takeover were chaotic for music and musical institutions, and although the emergence of a National Socialist discourse on music was “piecemeal” at best,¹¹⁷ the reception of Pfitzner’s symphony over the numerous additional performances throughout 1933 nonetheless offers a view of how symphonic aesthetics increasingly fostered National Socialist values. In March *Zeitschrift für Musik*’s review of the premiere in Munich by Wilhelm Zentner (1893–1982) deployed rhetoric connotative of Germanic ethnic superiority: “The work is pervaded right into its very

last fibers by Pfitzner's blood and spirit."¹¹⁸ At the Berlin premiere the following week the *Berliner Börsen Courier* echoed such sentiment, hailing the work as "filled with a deep and authentic Romantic sensibility; it is the expression of a personality in which contemplative, brooding and sensitive qualities synthesize uniquely."¹¹⁹ As the year progressed the alignment with nationalist ideologies that linked idealist traditions of interiority and spirituality to ethnic purity became increasingly explicit. In the August edition of *Zeitschrift für Musik*, its former editor-in-chief and influential anti-modernist Alfred Heuß (1877–1934) described the performance at the Dortmund Tonkünstlerfest as the festival's high point, "about which nothing further need be said, other than that it allowed us fleetingly to feel the breath of the beyond and recognize music once more as an art of metaphysics."¹²⁰ By October, reviewing a concert in Dessau, *Zeitschrift für Musik* claimed the C-sharp Minor Symphony, "reflected all depths of the German soul."¹²¹ All these excerpts indicate the heritage of Nazi symphonic aesthetics in Romantic *völkisch* discourses, and evince a sense of a collectivized interiority that is closely linked to (or perhaps subordinated under) Pfitzner's paternal authorial subjectivity.

In Berlin in March 1933, however, things looked less deterministic. Though an appreciation of what it meant to participate in the concert and listen to Pfitzner's new symphony cannot of course be fully reconstructed here, the initial reviews do convey a keen idea of how contemporary listeners experienced the simultaneous presence of both genres and the musical tensions this caused. Music, and the symphonic genre in particular, as these reviews show, can be a persuasive tool in the Fascist reformulation of the relationship between subjectivity and space. But it can also oppose it. And, as these reviews also show, the music of Pfitzner's symphony seemed politically elusive. By resisting the reorchestration and conventional symphonic-generic markers, particularly in the first and fourth movements, Pfitzner's work also foregrounded an *Intimsphäre* that countered totalitarianism's goal of rendering the subject fully public.¹²² The tension critics noted between an internalized musical idea and

the physical symphonic manifestation meant that, ultimately, this symphonic work was unable to subsume the subjects and delicate voices of the string quartet into the monumental mass, demonstrating discomfort about the coexistence and manipulation of public and private space. In a sense, the C-sharp Minor Symphony retained what Adorno later called chamber music's "critical" function, driven by the "premises of autonomy and independence extending all the way into the compositional ramifications of chamber music."¹²³ Arguing along similarly Adornian lines, how this work frustrated critics' expectations of symphonic "expansiveness" and "decor" indicated a political dimension that opposed Fascist erasure of the subjective element.¹²⁴ And in revealing to some listeners, if only briefly, the monumental scaffolding that jarred with the musical material, the symphony staked out a point of ideological conflict and uncertainty within the first few haphazard weeks of Fascist Germany.

We need to understand how the far right's discourses take hold, why they are so persuasive, why they continue to compel. But to do so we need a better grasp of those moments when history still hung in the balance. Pfitzner's C-sharp Minor Symphony raised musical questions that mirrored vital political ones about the changing relationship between subjective interiority and the collectivized, political sphere. It tells us about how critics responded to those questions; how in March 1933 ideas about space and its reformulation were still contingent and contested. It points to where exactly the slippages between value systems were taking place. And, perhaps most important, in doing all these things it urges us to integrate listening deep within our inquiries wherever we find the political center ground falling away. Close attention is needed not only to music but to how people listen—and to what they listen for and against.

I would like to thank Peter Franklin, Daniel M. Grimley, Amanda Hsieh, Chris May, Roger Parker, Hannah Proctor, Christabel Stirling, Amy Tobin, and Imaobong Umoren, as well as the editors and anonymous reviewer at *The Musical Quarterly*, for their valuable commentary on earlier versions, and extend further thanks to Liv-Birte Buchmann, Elaine Fitz Gibbon, Linus Schumacher, and Sebastian Wedler for consulting on my translations of the German sources. This article was developed from material presented at the Hearing Landscape Critically conference in Stellenbosch, South Africa, in September 2013, and was shaped by the many enriching conversations that resulted there. Thanks also to J. P. E. Harper-Scott, Benjamin M. Korstvedt, and Anne C. Shreffler for related discussion and suggestions. Much of this research was made possible by the Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst, and I am grateful to Albrecht Riethmüller, and to the staff at both the Staatliches Institut für Musikforschung and the Archive of the Berlin Philharmonic for enabling my work in Berlin. This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 705104.



¹ This account of the events surrounding Walter’s exile comes from the memoirs of Edith Stargardt-Wolff, who had been due to inherit the concert agency responsible for the Berlin Philharmonic’s engagements. Edith Stargardt-Wolff, *Wegbereiter grosser Musiker* (Berlin: Bote & G. Bock, 1954), 276–77, cited in: Erik S. Ryding and Rebecca Pechefsky, *Bruno Walter: A World Elsewhere* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 220.

² Coverage of Strauss’s 20 March concert at the Berlin Philharmonic is extensive. See, for example: Michael Walter, *Richard Strauss und seine Zeit* (Laaber: Laaber, 2000), 360–62; Raymond Holden, *Richard Strauss: A Musical Life* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011), 152; Michael Kennedy, “Taking Walter’s Place,” chap. 20 in *Richard Strauss: Man, Musician, Enigma* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 269–79; Pamela M. Potter, “Richard Strauss and the National Socialists: The Debate and Its Relevance,” in *Richard Strauss: New Perspectives on the Composer and his Work*, ed. Bryan Gilliam (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992), 93–113, 94–95; Michael Meyer, *The Politics of Music in the Third Reich* (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), 23–24; Erik Levi, *Music in the Third Reich* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), 42–43.

³ “Umbesetzungen,” Otto Steinhagen, “Das Musikleben der Gegenwart: Berlin,” *Die Musik* 25, no. 8 (1933): 619.

⁴ For a discussion of Pfitzner's ambivalent politics and his divisiveness, see Jens Malte Fischer, "The Very German Fate of a Composer: Hans Pfitzner," in Michael H. Kater and Albrecht Riethmüller, eds., *Music and Nazism: Art Under Tyranny, 1933–1945* (Laaber: Laaber, 2003), 75–89, 88.

⁵ After all, as Benjamin Korstvedt contends, pointing to a sea-change in disciplinary methodology in recent decades, "There is now little danger of supposing, let alone seriously arguing, that music criticism expressed little more than matters of musical taste and objective artistic judgment." Korstvedt, "Reading Music Criticism Beyond the Fin-de-Siècle Vienna Paradigm," *The Musical Quarterly* 94 (2011): 156–210, 166.

⁶ "Wir danken dem Meister für ein neues Gipfelwerk seines im deutschen Kunstleben der Gegenwart so schwerwiegenden Schaffens." Walter Abendroth, "Pfitzner-Abend der Philharmoniker," *Berliner Lokal Anzeiger*, 31 March 1933. "Das Streichquartett, bzw. die Sinfonie ist ohne Zweifel eine der stärksten Kompositionen Pfitzners." Karl Wörner, "Hans Pfitzners Sinfonie in cis," *Melos* 12 (1933): 133.

⁷ "Grenzwerte," *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 1933, 24/25, 16 June 1933, 335.

⁸ Karen Painter, *Symphonic Aspirations: German Music and Politics, 1900–1945* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 217.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 219. Painter has described the first two years of the Nazi government as an uncertain period of "inconsistent scrambling" in cultural life.

¹⁰ "Am 30. Januar ist endgültig die Zeit des Individualismus gestorben. ... Das Einzelindividuum wird ersetzt durch die Gemeinschaft des Volkes." Address given at the Berlin Haus des Rundfunks ("Die zukünftige Arbeit und Gestaltung des deutschen Rundfunks"), in Helmut Heiber, ed., *Goebbels Reden 1932–45* (Düsseldorf: Gondrom, 1991), 82–107, 82.

¹¹ While the definition and methodological viability of a congruous "Fascist ideology" is the subject of ongoing debate, Fascism scholarship from the 1990s onward has seen the emergence of a so-called New Consensus. This intersection of perspectives, first identified by Roger Griffin, crystallizes around the idea of "interpreting fascism as a unique ideological articulation of radical revolutionary nationalism, 'third way' politics and holistic social organization." See Aristotle A. Kallis, "Fascist Ideology—the Quest for the 'Fascist Minimum,'" in *The Fascism Reader*, ed. Kallis (London: Routledge, 2003), 145–47.

¹² Meyer, *The Politics of Music in the Third Reich*, 8.

¹³ The problem of "subjectivity" was a prevalent theme in the work of many Weimar writers, philosophers, and social critics. In particular, they reflected on the unity and coherence of the modern subject, its moral structures, and its autonomy and its

relationship to the mass or collective, or to the state. See, for example, Siegfried Kracauer, *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*, trans. and ed. Thomas Y. Levin (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995). Martin Heidegger's holistic ontology of *Dasein* proposed an alternative to Cartesian conception of the self. See Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson (Oxford: Blackwell, 1967). For a meditation on state violence, law, freedom, and agency, see Walter Benjamin, "Critique of Violence," in *Selected Writings*, ed. Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings, vol. 1: *1913–1928* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1996), 236–52, esp. 241–42. Benjamin's critical reflections seem particularly salient in the context of an increasingly violent state and police force. Other Weimar essays addressing these themes include Hans Zehrer, "The Revolution of the Intelligentsia," in *The Weimar Republic Sourcebook*, ed. Anton Kaes, Martin Jay, and Edward Dimendberg, 295–97, originally published as "Die Revolution der Intelligenz," *Die Tat* 21 (1929): 486–507; as well as Karl Mannheim, "Ideology and Utopia," in *The Weimar Republic Sourcebook*, ed. Kaes et al., 297–300, originally published in *Ideologie und Utopie* (Bonn: Cohen, 1929), 121–30.

¹⁴ Margaret Notley, *Lateness and Brahms: Music and Culture in the Twilight of Viennese Liberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 156–60. Notley notes that "the metaphor of symphony as public oration (versus string quartet as conversation) was already current during Beethoven's lifetime" (159), citing Ludwig Finscher, "Symphonie," in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 2nd ed., ed. Finscher (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1998), vol. 9, columns 56–58. Also incisive for this discussion is Theodor W. Adorno's sociological analysis of the public and private distinctions between chamber and symphonic music, in "Chamber Music," and "Conductor and Orchestra," chaps. 6 and 7 in *Introduction to the Sociology of Music*, trans. E. B. Ashton [Ernst Basch] (New York: Continuum, 1989), 85–103 and 104–17.

¹⁵ Thomas Burger's definition of an *Intimsphäre* as "the core of a person's private sphere which by law, tact, and convention is shielded from intrusion" illuminates the way in which these ideas are enmeshed. See Burger, translator's note in *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, by Jürgen Habermas, trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989), xvi.

¹⁶ See Fischer, "The Very German Fate of a Composer," 76.

¹⁷ See Reinhold Brinkmann, "The Distorted Sublime: Music and National Socialist Ideology—A Sketch," in Kater and Riethmüller, *Music and Nazism*, 43–63; Alexander Rehding, *Music and Monumentality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 8.

¹⁸ Rehding, *Music and Monumentality*, 15–16.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 8.

²⁰ See, for example, Meyer, *The Politics of Music in the Third Reich*; Levi, *Music in the Third Reich*; Levi, *Mozart and the Nazis: How the Third Reich Abused a Cultural Icon* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010); Michael H. Kater, *Composers of the Nazi Era: Eight Portraits* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Pamela M. Potter, *Most German of the Arts: Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler's Reich* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); Stephen Hinton, *The Idea of Gebrauchsmusik: A Study of Musical Aesthetics in the Weimar Republic with Particular Reference to the Works of Paul Hindemith* (New York: Garland, 1989); Hinton, *Weill's Musical Theater: Stages of Reform* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012); Fritz Trümpi, *The Political Orchestra: The Vienna and Berlin Philharmonics During the Third Reich* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2016); Benjamin G. Martin, *The Nazi-Fascist New Order for European Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016); Painter, *Symphonic Aspirations*; Bryan Gilliam, "The Annexation of Anton Bruckner: Nazi Revisionism and the Politics of Appropriation," *The Musical Quarterly* 78 (1994): 584–604.

²¹ See Sven Oliver Müller, "Political Pleasures with Old Emotions?: Performances of the Berlin Philharmonic in the Second World War," *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 43 (2012): 35–52, 38. For the political role of the concert hall more generally, see also Christopher Small, *Musicking* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1998).

²² "Le 'dernier des Romantiques,'" E. d. W., "Lettre de Berlin," *La Revue musicale* 14 (1933): 378.

²³ In correspondence with his publisher, initially Pfitzner indicated that he wanted to conduct the premiere himself, but not in Munich—"perhaps in Berlin." Letter to Otto Fürstner, 7 July 1932, in Hans Erich Pfitzner and Bernhard Adamy, *Briefe* (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1991), 599.

²⁴ "Natürlich würde dieses Konzert von Seiten der Stadt [Munich] entsprechend 'aufgemacht' werden." Letter to Fürstner, 8 September 1932, *ibid.*, 608–9.

²⁵ Other performances during 1933 took place in Dortmund (at the 1933 Tonkünstlerfest), Darmstadt, Düsseldorf, Wiesbaden, Bonn, Dessau, and Vienna. Pfitzner canceled the performance that had been planned for the summer Salzburger Festspiele, in line with National Socialist policy in relation to Austria. How far Pfitzner was politically pressured into doing so however, is unclear. See further discussion in Birgit Jürgens, "Pfitzners Wirken und seine Position im Nationalsozialismus—Ambivalenzen, Worte, Taten," chap. 4 in *"Deutsche Musik"—das Verhältnis von Ästhetik und Politik bei Hans Pfitzner* (Hildesheim: George Olms Verlag, 2009), 163–273, esp. 229–51.

²⁶ Evidence of Pfitzner's hopes for the improvement of his situation under the National Socialists, and the subsequent injustice he perceived at his marginalization can be found in several of his letters. Pfitzner's letter to Hitler, 15 March 1933,

immediately after he came into power is telling: “Bei Ihnen brauche ich wohl nicht erst zu fragen, ob Sie wissen, wer ich bin, vielmehr nehme ich an, daß Sie sich der—mir unvergeßlichen—Stunde erinnern, wo Sie mich im Schwabinger Krankenhause besuchten. Wer wie Sie ein ‘Kunstgewogener’ ist, wird mich verstehen und gleich mir gegen Ungerechtigkeit kämpfen, meine Handlungsweise billigen und mich mit der Macht, die in Ihren Händen liegt, in meinen Bestrebungen unterstützen.” (I needn’t ask whether you remember who I am; rather, I assume that you recall that hour — unforgettable to me — when you visited me in hospital in Schwabing. Whoever is, as you are, serious about art, will understand me, and, fight, as I do, against injustice, endorse my work, and use the power that lies in your hands to support me in my ambitions.) (ibid., 621–22). A letter to Viktor Junk, 5 December 1933, reveals Strauss and Furtwängler as the obvious figures of comparison: “Von allen großen Namen der Musik [bin] ich der einzige ... der noch nicht einmal in eine würdige Stellung gesetzt wird, geschweige denn zu hohen Ehren aufsteigt, wie die Herren Richard Strauss und Wilhelm Furtwängler” (Of all the great names in music I am the only one ... who has not been given a worthy position, let alone received higher honors, such as have been conferred to Richard Strauss and Wilhelm Furtwängler) (643). See also letter to Margaritta Jüttner-Fischer, 5 October 1933, in which, following several canceled performances of Pfitzner’s works, he writes about his disappointment and frustration with his experiences in the new Reich: “Für das große Opfer, welches ich durch meine Salzburger Absage gebracht habe, habe ich nur Undank gehabt. ... Das ist meine Stellung im Dritten Reich, wo ich eigentlich, wenn es nach Verdienst ginge, eine Art musikalischer Kaiser sein sollte” (I have received only ingratitude for the great sacrifice I made by canceling my appearance in Salzburg. ... That is my position in the Third Reich where, were it all based on merit, I should be a kind of musical emperor) (639-40).

²⁷ See, for example, letter to Felix Wolfes, 5 December 1933: “Hitler hat trotz mehrmaliger Einladung nicht eine einzige meiner Veranstaltungen besucht, sitzt aber jeden Abend in einem anderen Konzert oder Oper, so während eben dieser Zeit in Rheingold, Walküre, Arabella, Butterfly, Backhaus-Klavierabend, Liederabend Maria Müller, Arienabend des Welttenors Gigli u.s.w.” (Hitler has not attended a single of my events, despite repeated invitations, but can be found every night at another concert or opera, as during this period as Rhinegold, Walkure, Arabella, Butterfly, the Backhaus piano recital, Maria Müller’s song recital, the aria concert by the world-famous tenor Gigli etc.). Ibid., 645.

²⁸ Ibid., 621–22.

²⁹ Much more can be found on the relationship of Pfitzner to Hitler in Kater, *Composers of the Nazi Era*, 218–19.

³⁰ Pfitzner’s complex relationship with the National Socialist authorities is thoroughly discussed in, for example, ibid.; John Williamson, *The Music of Hans Pfitzner* (Oxford: Clarendon University Press, 1992), esp. chap. 8, “An Inner Emigration?”

301–48; Sabine Busch, *Hans Pfitzner und der Nationalsozialismus* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2001); Jürgens, “*Deutsche Musik*”; Fischer, “The Very German Fate of a Composer.”

³¹ Readers unfamiliar with Pfitzner’s C-sharp Minor String Quartet, Op. 36, and Symphony Op. 36a might find Johann Peter Vogel’s detailed formal and harmonic analysis of the string quartet useful, given the formal identity between the two pieces. His work has provided an important point of reference for the overview of the symphony here. See Vogel, *Hans Pfitzner: Streichquartett Cis-Moll Op. 36* (Munich: Fink Verlag, 1991).

³² *Ibid.*, 10–12.

³³ “um den motivischen Zusammenhang sinnfällig zu machen.” See Pfitzner’s remark at the end of the first movement in the string quartet score: Hans Pfitzner, *Quartett in Cis-moll für 2 Violinen, Viola und Violoncello Opus 36* (Berlin: Adolph Fürstner, 1925), 18; see also Vogel, *Hans Pfitzner: Streichquartett Cis-Moll Op. 36*, 13.

³⁴ Vogel, *Hans Pfitzner: Streichquartett Cis-Moll Op. 36*, 15–16.

³⁵ “ironish, groteske Hauptthema.” Wörner, “Hans Pfitzners Sinfonie in cis,” 133.

³⁶ “der scherzoartige zweite Satz ... gewinn[t] überzeugend durch die reiche Farbenpalette des Orchesters.” Paul Schwes, “Aus dem Berliner Musikleben,” in *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 1933, 7 April 1933, 207; see also comments by “Runge” in *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*: “Dem Scherzo ist die Umarbeitung gut bekommen ... es hat sich an äußere Wirkung sehr gewonnen.” It is likely that this was Otto Runge, the former editor of *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* under its previous name, *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, from 1902 to 1917. Runge, “Pfitzner dirigiert seine neue Symphonie,” *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 31 March 1933. However, in the absence of stronger evidence, the possibility should be kept open that the review was written by the violinist Nerina Runge (b. 1891), the daughter of physicist Carl Runge, and who was also known as Nina Courant after her marriage to the mathematician Richard Courant in 1919. She is the only living music professional in 1933 with the surname “Runge” in the online portal Deutsche Biographie. See “Nerina Runge,” <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz109061.html#indexcontent>.

³⁷ Wörner, “Hans Pfitzners Sinfonie in cis,” 134; “auffallend abstrakt.”

³⁸ Berlin, Stiftung Berliner Philharmoniker, “Konzerte der Berliner Philharmoniker 1932–1934 (In- und Ausland)”, Peter Muck, *100 Jahre Berliner Philharmonisches Orchester* (Schneider: Tutzing 1982), digitized and revised for the Stiftung Berliner Philharmoniker, March 2013. Unfortunately, there are no programs for this concert in the Berlin Philharmonic archive; much pre-1944 material was lost after the Philharmonie—at its former site on Bernburgerstraße—was destroyed by Allied bombing.

³⁹ See Abendroth, “Pfitzner-Abend der Philharmoniker.”

⁴⁰ Berlin, Stiftung Berliner Philharmoniker, 20 March 1933, P 1933 20.3, concert program.

⁴¹ An organization aiming to protect German cultural values and challenge modernist art, founded by Alfred Rosenberg in 1929.

⁴² “Wir haben niemals dieses Konzert verboten oder Bruno Walter, der eigentlich Schlesinger heißt, untersagt, zu dirigieren. Allerdings ist es uns unmöglich gewesen, für das Konzert etwa noch Saalschutz zu stellen,” *Berlin Lokal-Anzeiger*, 5 April 1933; quoted in Joseph Wulf, *Musik im Dritten Reich: Eine Dokumentation* (Gütersloh: Rowohlt, 1966), 23. This translation is Meyer’s; he discusses the cancellation of Walter’s March Philharmonie appearance with reference to Wulf’s work in *The Politics of Music in the Third Reich*, 43.

⁴³ Heinrich Strobel, “Pfitzner dirigiert,” *Berliner Börsen-Courier*, 31 March 1933.

⁴⁴ All of these dismissals were reported in the April issue of *Die Musik*. See Meyer, *The Politics of Music in the Third Reich*, 32.

⁴⁵ “Eins der Eugen Jochum zustehenden Konzerte der Philharmoniker wurde als Sonderkonzert von Hans Pfitzner geleitet, weil Jochum im Leipziger Gewandhaus zu dirigieren hatte an Stelle des nach Amsterdam abgeflogenen Bruno Walter. Pfitzner fand auf diese Weise Gelegenheit, seine neue cis-moll persönlich vorzuführen.” Schwerts, “Aus dem Berliner Musikleben,” 207. Some commentators, reviewing several concerts in one report, remarked on both high-profile changes of conductor in the past few weeks together. *Die Musik* cited a broader reshuffle of conductors as having affected this concert, emphasising Strauss’s and Pfitzner’s appearances over Walter’s and Jochum’s respective absences from Berlin. How the conductor swaps were paired suggested the circumstances of both absences were routine and comparable. The neutrality of tone is insidious, recasting events positively: “Umbesetzungen fügten es, daß kurz nacheinander zwei der führenden deutschen Komponisten am Dirigentenpult der Philharmoniker standen: Richard Strauß dirigierte seine *Domestica*, Hans Pfitzner seine neue cis-moll-Sinfonie, eine Umarbeitung seines bekannten, vor acht Jahren erschienenen Streichquartetts. Strauß sprang für Bruno Walter ein, die Pfitzner-Sinfonie sollte ursprünglich Eugen Jochum machen.” Steinhagen, “Das Musikleben der Gegenwart: Berlin,” 619. Less neutral was the report in the *Berliner Lokal Anzeiger* by Nazi composer, music critic, musicologist, and author Walter Abendroth (1896-1973). He noted that, because of the reorganization, Berliners had the opportunity to see “the two greatest living representatives of German music” take the baton at the Philharmonic within a few days of each other: “Merkwürdiger Parallelfall: Vorige Woche erschien Richard Strauß in der Philharmonie als Ersatzmann für Bruno Walter, gestern Hans Pfitzner für Eugen Jochum, der im Leipziger Gewandhaus Walter vertreten

mußte. So hatten wir Gelegenheit, innerhalb weniger Tage die beiden größten lebenden Repräsentanten der deutschen Musik—zugleich Verkörperungen der beiden entgegengesetzten Pole musikalischen Schöpfertums—als Konzertdirigenten und Interpreten eigener Werke an der Spitze unserer Philharmoniker zu sehen.” Abendroth, “Pfitzner-Abend der Philharmoniker.”

⁴⁶ See Painter, *Symphonic Aspirations*, 209.

⁴⁷ Even then, scholars have debated the degree to which music criticism was affected in practical terms by the new law. Fabian R. Lovisa, for example, has suggested that the impact of the *Kritikverbotes* on music criticism has largely been overestimated. See Lovisa, *Musikkritik im Nationalsozialismus: Die Rolle deutschsprachiger Musikzeitschriften 1920–1945* (Laaber: Laaber, 1993), 18 and 197–208.

⁴⁸ “Anstelle von Bruno Walter fand sich, mit Jubel begrüßt, Meister Richard Strauß ein, der sich nicht durch Drohbrieve aus dem jüdisch verhetzten Amerika hat abschrecken lassen, vor das Berliner Publikum zu treten. Die Dirigenten wechselten: Hans Pfitzner erschien, um seiner cis-moll-Sinfonie zu ihrer Berliner Erstaufführung zu verhelfen.” Fritz Stege, “Berliner Musik,” *Zeitschrift für Musik* 5 (1933): 458. Abendroth, unsurprisingly, depicted the switch in conductors in a similarly jubilant tone: “Langanhaltender Beifall entläßt den Meister, den wir auch als ideal fachlichen, geistvollen Dirigenten gerne öfter heir begrüßen würden.” (Extensive applause accompanied the master’s descent from the podium, a conductor of such professionalism and inspiration that we would be delighted to welcome him here more often.) Abendroth, “Pfitzner-Abend der Philharmoniker.”

⁴⁹ Ryding and Pechefsky, *Bruno Walter*, 223.

⁵⁰ See further discussion in *ibid.*, 224.

⁵¹ For a detailed exploration of the relationship between Pfitzner and Walter, particularly after 1933, see Hans Rudolf Vaget, “‘Der gute, alte Antisemitismus’: Hans Pfitzner, Bruno Walter und der Holocaust,” in *Bruckner-Probleme: Internationales Kolloquium 7–9 Oktober 1996 in Berlin*, ed. Albrecht Riethmüller (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999), 215–32.

⁵² Bruno Walter “hat ... durch sein ganzes Leben bewiesen, daß er auch in seiner Gesinnung und seiner ganzen geistigen Struktur ein Deutscher ist.” Letter to Carl-Friedrich Goerdeler, 10 September 1932, Pfitzner and Adamy, *Briefe*, 611.

⁵³ “Sollte eine andere Stadt für eine *gleichzeitige* Uraufführung ausersehen werden, so könnte als Dirigent nur Bruno Walter in Betracht kommen.” Original emphasis. Letter to Fürstner, 8 September 1932, *ibid.*, 609.

⁵⁴ See, for example, Vaget, “‘Der gute, alte Antisemitismus’”; Jürgens, “*Deutsche Musik*”; Williamson, “An Inner Emigration?”; Kater, *Composers of the Nazi Era*; Busch, *Hans Pfitzner und der Nationalsozialismus*; Fischer, “The Very German Fate of a Composer: Hans Pfitzner.”

⁵⁵ Indeed, Pfitzner’s assessment of Walter as “ein Deutscher” originates from a letter he wrote to the mayor of Leipzig, Carl-Friedrich Goerdeler, in September 1932 strongly recommending that the Jewish heritage of the opera director Otto Erhardt should not stand in the way of his appointment at the Leipzig Stadttheater, which he describes as a “socio-ethical” issue: “Nun ist die Sache aber wichtig genug: in allgemeiner, spezieller, künstlerischer und menschlicher, ich möchte sagen sozialetischer Hinsicht.” Note Pfitzner’s use of the italicized word “Künstler”: “Ich will Ihnen gegenüber meine Empfehlung des *Künstlers* Dr Erhardt etwas näher ausführen.” Pfitzner and Adamy, *Briefe*, 609–11. In addition Pfitzner petitioned in this year for the release of his Jewish friend and mentor Paul Nikolaus Cossman from Stadelheim prison, at not inconsiderable risk to himself, as Williamson notes in “An Inner Emigration?,” 322–23. Busch, in *Hans Pfitzner und der Nationalsozialismus*, 123–30, furnishes more detailed commentary on Pfitzner’s and Cossman’s relationship and on Pfitzner’s petitioning on Cossman’s behalf from his initial arrest in 1933 to his death in hospital in Theresienstadt concentration camp in 1942.

⁵⁶ For a general reflection on the treatment and development of notions of consent and coercion in Fascism scholarship, particularly in relation to choice and constraint, see Roberta Pergher and Guilia Albanese, “Historians, Fascism, and Italian Society: Mapping the Limits of Consent,” in *In the Society of Fascists: Acclamation, Acquiescence, and Agency in Mussolini’s Italy*, ed. Pergher and Albanese (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

⁵⁷ Wulf, *Musik im Dritten Reich*, 334.

⁵⁸ As discussed above, this was probably Otto Runge.

⁵⁹ “Fragt man sich, warum Pfitzner sie vorgenommen haben mag, so drängt sich zuerst der Gedanke an die großartig aufwachsende Durchführung des ersten Satzes auf. Hier sprengt die Erfindung tatsächlich den Rahmen des Streichquartetts und verlangt nach der Wuchs des Orchesters.... Andere Partien wieder sträuben sich gerade gegen solche äußere Wirkung. Ihre In-sich-Gelehrtheit und Unsinnlichkeit scheut vor dem Farbenglanz des Orchesters zurück.” Runge, “Pfitzner dirigiert seine neue Symphonie.” The multifaceted word “unsinnlich” and its nominal form “Unsinnlichkeit” presents an interesting problem to the translator, which I have dealt with differently depending on the context. “Unsinnlich”, derived from “Sinn,” meaning “sense,” variously suggests something being “unsensuous”, but also “ungraspable” or “intangible”; in addition, though less commonly, it can imply “Unsinn” (“nonsense”). It also evokes the sublime; that which is beyond logic, the

tangible, or the knowable, and this has informed how I have translated “Unsinnlichkeit” here: “pervaded by notions of the sublime.”

⁶⁰ “Trotz des großen Apparats, der aufgewendet wird, hat die Sinfonie eine herbe, unsinnliche, nicht selten sogar harte Klanglichkeit.... Das vierstimmige Klangbild des Quartetts bleibt durchweg gewahrt.” Strobel, “Pfitzner dirigiert.”

⁶¹ The original reads: “Breite Teile, vor allem im Anfangssatz und auch im Finale, widerstreben durchaus der orchestralen Einkleidung; sie sind rein quartettmäßig erfunden und durchgeführt und lassen sich nur mit Zwang in eine andere Klangform pressen.” Schwers, “Aus dem Berliner Musikleben,” 207.

⁶² Rehding, *Music and Monumentality*, 9.

⁶³ Strobel’s Jewish wife, Hilde Betty Levy, perhaps made Strobel a surprising choice for replacement editor.

⁶⁴ For instance, in the December 1932 issues of *Melos* he had spoken out against the increasingly pervasive reactionary “modern political and cultural campaigns and slogans” that had led to the closure of the world-renowned Dessau Bauhaus. See Meyer, *The Politics of Music in the Third Reich*, 29. Later, after serving in the *Wehrdienst* and imprisonment by U.S. forces during the war, Wörner became head editor at Schott’s journal department, a post he held from 1955 to 1959.

⁶⁵ “Orchestral am wenigsten befriedigend ist der leidenschaftlich düstere erste Satz. Er entspricht zunächst nicht dem, was man traditionell von dem ersten Satz als dem Hauptsatz einer Sinfonie erwartet. Er baut sich auf vier Themen auf, die Sonatenform ist nur angedeutet. Die Themen sind in sich zu wenig kontrastierend, um in der Orchesterbearbeitung gegensätzlich zu wirken, während ihre innere Differenziertheit beim kammermusikalischen Zusammenspiel viel stärker empfunden wird.” Wörner, “Hans Pfitzners Sinfonie in cis,” 133.

⁶⁶ “Das zweite und vierte Thema hat einen geradezu rhapsodischen Charakter. [...] Das Figurenwerk hat beständig etwas kammermusikalisch filigranartiges. Diese Feinheiten gehen im Orchester verloren. Gleichzeitig wird den Themen ihr leidenschaftlicher drängender Impetus genommen. In der Sinfonie wirkt der ganze Satz, wuchs durch die Behandlung des Blechs als Füllstimmen, etwas uniform und schwerfällig.” Ibid.

⁶⁷ “Eine ungeheure innere Spannung geht gleich von der ersten Melodielinien aus, die in weiten Sprüngen mit schmerzlichem Überschwang dem Höhepunkt zustrebt, um resigniert zurückzusinken.” Hans Sachße, “Hans Pfitzner: Symphonie in cis-moll,” *Zeitschrift für Musik* 6 (1933): 559–61, 560. It is also worth mentioning that the ebb and flow of energy implied here strikingly recalls Ernst Kurth’s symphonic wave discourse from his two-volume *Bruckner* of 1925, influenced by scientific-technological thought. See Ernst Kurth, *Selected Writings*, ed. and trans. Lee A. Rothfarb (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

-
- ⁶⁸ I have presented the string quartet scoring here to make reading the harmonic relationships more straightforward: in the symphonic rendering, the violin lines are taken by two clarinets in A, and the viola and violoncello lines are given to two bassoons. Hans Pfitzner, *Quartett in Cis-moll für 2 Violinen, Viola und Violoncello, opus 36* (Berlin: Adolph Fürstner Verlag, 1925), 1.
- ⁶⁹ Meyer, *The Politics of Music in the Third Reich*, 8.
- ⁷⁰ Wörner, “Hans Pfitzners Sinfonie in cis,” 133.
- ⁷¹ Michael Talbot, *The Finale in Western Instrumental Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 6.
- ⁷² “Der zweite und der letzte Satz des Streichquartettes kommt von sich aus einer Instrumentierung am meisten entgegen. Und hier ist auch der Eindruck der Sinfonie am unmittelbarsten und packendsten.” Wörner, “Hans Pfitzners Sinfonie in cis,” 132.
- ⁷³ Sachße, “Symphonie in cis-moll,” 561.
- ⁷⁴ See Rehding, *Music and Monumentality*, 5.
- ⁷⁵ Sachße, “Symphonie in cis-moll,” 561.
- ⁷⁶ “Der Schluß des Finales ist dagegen kammermusikalisch intim. Er verliert durch die Instrumentierung seinen nachdenklichen, beschaulich lyrischen Charakter.” Wörner, “Hans Pfitzners Sinfonie in cis,” 133.
- ⁷⁷ Rita Steblin elucidates the mid-nineteenth-century “psychological association of ever-increasing strength and brightness (or, conversely, weakness and sombreness) with the number of sharps and flats.” See Steblin, *A History of Key Characteristics in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1996), esp. 103–33.
- ⁷⁸ Richard Mercier has explored the association of specific keys with ideas or emotions in Pfitzner’s songs. As he shows, all six of Pfitzner’s songs that begin in C-sharp minor are thematically concerned with death. See Mercier, *The Songs of Hans Pfitzner: A Guide and Study* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998), 1–3; see also Vogel, *Streichquartett Cis-Moll*, 12.
- ⁷⁹ Thomas Bauman, “Mahler in a New Key: Genre and the ‘Resurrection’ Finale,” *Journal of Musicology* 23 (2006): 468–85, 479–80.
- ⁸⁰ “Die Entwicklung des orchestralen Klangbildes aus dem Streichquartettsatz ist hochinteressant, die beabsichtigte Vertiefung des Ausdrucks ist dem Komponist voll und ganz gelungen, das tief schürfende Werk ... hinterließ einen nachhaltigen Eindruck.” Stege, “Berliner Musik,” 458.

⁸¹ “Die Revolution, die wir gemacht haben, ist eine totale. Sie hat alle Gebiete des öffentlichen Lebens erfaßt und von Grund auf umgestaltet.” Heiber, *Goebbels Reden 1932–45*, 131.

⁸² “Ein sehr seltener Fall, dass die Thematik stark und tragend genug ist, die Erweiterung der Form, die Bereicherung des klanglichen Ausdrucks nicht nur zuzulassen, sondern damit das Ethos erst in seinem ganzen Ernst und seiner Tiefe offenbar zu machen.” L. Bd, “Im Rundfunk: Hans Pfitzners Sinfonie Cis-moll,” *Berliner Tageblatt*, 1 April 1933.

⁸³ Holly Watkins, *Metaphors of Depth in German Musical Thought from E. T. A. Hoffmann to Arnold Schoenberg* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

⁸⁴ “Sie hat die Beziehungen der Menschen untereinander, die Beziehungen der Menschen zum Staat und zu den Fragen des Daseins vollkommen geändert und neu geformt.” Heiber, *Goebbels Reden*, 131. Here Goebbels gestures at Heidegger’s ontology of *Dasein*. The mode of being represented by *Dasein* is by definition interconnected with other selves, and indeed modes of relating to the self are profoundly determined by going through “Others.” See Heidegger, *Being and Time*, esp. chap. 4 of part 1, “Being-In-The-World as Being-With and Being-One’s-Self: The ‘They,’” 149–68.

⁸⁵ See, for example, Mark Evan Bonds, *Music as Thought: Listening to the Symphony in the Age of Beethoven* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006). In particular, chapter 4 deals with the symphony’s role in philosophical representation of the relationship between the individual and society: “Listening to the Aesthetic State: Cosmopolitanism,” 63–78.

⁸⁶ See “Listening to Truth: Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony,” chap. 3 in *ibid.*, 44–62.

⁸⁷ Pfitzner publicly attacked Bekker’s 1911 book on Beethoven in his acerbic 1920 essay, *Die neue Aesthetik der musikalischen Impotenz* (Munich: Verlag der Süddeutschen Monatshefte, 1920). See also Paul Bekker, *Beethoven*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, 1912). For further discussion, see, for example, Jürgens, “Die Politisierung der ‘Einfallssästhetik’: Erster Weltkrieg und Weimarer Republik,” chap. 3 in *“Deutsche Musik,”* 72–162.

⁸⁸ Bekker was not necessarily arguing for these as eternal values invoked by the symphony. Rather, his historically situated analysis also argued that the close association of the symphony with these values was contingent upon the genre’s maturity coinciding with the intellectual climate and democratic ideals of the period spanning from the French Revolution through to the end of the Napoleonic Wars. See Bekker, *Die Sinfonie von Beethoven bis Mahler* (Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, 1918), 16.

⁸⁹ “Die Ursache des sinfonischen Schaffens liegt ... in dem Bedürfnis des Künstlers, zu einem Massenpublikum zu sprechen.” *Ibid.*, 12–13.

⁹⁰ See *ibid.* The connection between the symphony and Habermas's liberal public sphere has been developed by both Notley and Korstvedt. See Notley, *Lateness and Brahms*, 156–60; see also Korstvedt, "Beyond the Fin-de-Siècle Vienna Paradigm," 172; as well as Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*.

⁹¹ Bekker, *Die Sinfonie*, 11.

⁹² "Die Aufführung einer Sinfonie [ist] gleichbedeutend mit einer musikalischen Volksversammlung, einer Volksversammlung, in der ein durch die Musik zum Ausbruch gelangendes Gemeingefühl lebendig und tätig wird." *Ibid.*, 15.

⁹³ See *ibid.*, 8–11.

⁹⁴ Heiber, *Goebbels Reden*, 131.

⁹⁵ See Rehding's discussion of Albert Speer's monumental "light cathedrals" in Rehding, *Music and Monumentality*, 173.

⁹⁶ See Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Case of Wagner: Nietzsche Contra Wagner and Selected Aphorisms*, 3rd ed., trans. Anthony M. Ludovici (Gloucestershire: Dodo Press, 2008), 10.

⁹⁷ The metaphor can be found in the reviews in *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, *Allgemeine Musikzeitung*, *Berliner Lokal Anzeiger*, and *Die Musik* respectively. Runge, "Pfitzner dirigiert seine neue Symphonie": "Hier sprengt die Erfindung tatsächlich den Rahmen des Streichquartetts und verlangt nach der Wuchs des Orchesters." (*Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*). "Sie birgt in der kammermusikalischen Gestalt Ausdruckswerte, die das gegebene Klanggefüge sprengen möchten," *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 1933, 24/25, 16 June 1933, 335. Abendroth, "Pfitzner-Abend der Philharmoniker": "Jeder Musikalische aber wird jetzt hören, wie vieles, was in der Urfassung den Rahmen des Kammermusikalischen zu sprengen drohte, im Orchestersatz erst seine Erfüllung findet." (*Berliner Lokal Anzeiger*). "Es [droht] in der Intensität und Wucht seines Ausdrucks inhaltlich den Rahmen eines Streichquartetts zu sprengen," Oscar von Pander, "München," *Die Musik* 25 (1933): 628.

⁹⁸ "Der Sinn *der* Revolution, die *wir* gemacht haben, ist die Volkwerdung der deutschen Nation. Diese Volkwerdung zwar zweitausend Jahre lang die Sehnsucht aller guten Deutschen." (The meaning of *the* revolution, that *we* have created, is the coming into being of the German people as a nation. This, indeed, [has been] the yearning of all good Germans for two thousand years.) Original emphasis. Heiber, *Goebbels Reden*, 133. See also Rehding's discussion of the political resonances of *Lebensraum*, a term that was used by musicologist Heinrich Bessler to evoke a musical monumentality determined by the expansive physical spaces it filled. Rehding, *Music and Monumentality*, 174–75.

⁹⁹ A more detailed exploration of *Lebensraum* ideology is provided as part of Paolo Giaccaria and Claudio Minca's discussion of the "bio-geo-political nature of Hitler's geographies." See "For a Tentative Spatial Theory of the Third Reich,"

in *Hitler's Geographies: The Spatialities of the Third Reich*, eds. Giaccaria and Minca (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2016), 19–44.

¹⁰⁰ Meyer, *The Politics of Music in the Third Reich*, 9.

¹⁰¹ Gilliam, “The Annexation of Anton Bruckner,” 591.

¹⁰² For discussion of the orchestra’s symbolic role in Nazi Germany, see Painter, *Symphonic Aspirations*, esp. 214–15.

¹⁰³ Brinkmann, “The Distorted Sublime,” 49.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 44.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 47.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 48.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 47.

¹⁰⁸ See Rehding, “Faustian Descents,” chap. 6 in *Music and Monumentality*, 169–96, esp. 173–80. He cites Arnold Schering, “Über den Begriff des Monumentalen in der Musik,” *Von großen Meistern in der Musik* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1935); and Heinrich Bessler, “Musik und Raum,” in *Musik und Bild: Festschrift Max Seiffert*, ed. Bessler (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1938).

¹⁰⁹ Rehding, *Music and Monumentality*, 180.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹¹¹ Painter, *Symphonic Aspirations*, 240.

¹¹² “Künstlerisch betrachtet fordert die Struktur und die Klangwelt dieses Stückes zur Behandlung als Sinfonie gerade zu heraus.” Letter to Fürstner, 17 June 1932, Pfitzner and Adamy, *Briefe*, 595. In a later letter Pfitzner reiterated this argument: the reorchestration was necessary because both harmony and form—indeed, the whole structure of the quartet—invited the shaping (*Gestaltung*) as symphony: “Denn ... fordert die Harmonik sowohl als wie die Form, kurz, die ganze Struktur des Quartetts direkt zur Gestaltung als Sinfonie auf.” Letter to Fürstner, 29 June 1932, *ibid.*, 597. Pfitzner was perhaps at his most candid—and theatrically fatalist—about his limited aesthetic claims for the work in a letter to his longtime friend Margaritta Jüttner-Fischer, 25 February 1933. The symphony is presented as a tragic manifestation of his creative impotence: “Leider bist Du in einem großen optimistischen Irrtum befangen, wenn Du annimmst, daß die Sinfonie ein Originalwerk ist und in der letzten Zeit konzipiert und ausgearbeitet worden ist, daß also der Quell noch springt. Er springt nicht mehr. *Die Sinfonie ist eine Bearbeitung meines Streichquartettes in cis moll für Orchester.*” (Unfortunately, if you assume that the symphony is an original work, newly conceived and realized—that, in other words, the source still flows—your optimism has left you

greatly mistaken. It flows no longer. *The symphony is a reworking for orchestra of my string quartet in C-sharp Minor.*)

Pfitzner's emphasis, *ibid.*, 619.

¹¹³ “Wer die bis zur Erschöpfung reichende Anspannung des Mitgehens nicht scheut, den blendet sie nicht, macht ihn aber sehend für die Welt eines Eigenen.” Steinhagen, “Berlin,” 619.

¹¹⁴ See Meyer, *The Politics of Music in the Third Reich*, 34. For a more detailed analysis of *Die Musik* as a publication complicit in the *Gleichschaltung* in National Socialist Germany, see Lovisa, *Musikkritik im Nationalsozialismus*, 21–39.

¹¹⁵ Steinhagen, “Berlin,” 619.

¹¹⁶ Fritz Rotosky, “Was ist Kultur,” *Neue Literatur* (July 1933): 380, found in Meyer, *The Politics of Music in the Third Reich*, 25–26.

¹¹⁷ Meyer, *The Politics of Music in the Third Reich*, 209.

¹¹⁸ “Das Werk, bis in die letzte Faser vom Blut und Geiste Pfitzners durchwallt,” Wilhelm Zentner, “Konzert und Oper: München,” *Zeitschrift für Musik* 5 (1933): 503–4.

¹¹⁹ “[Das Werk] ist erfüllt von einer tiefen und echten romantischen Gesinnung, es ist Ausdruck einer Persönlichkeit, in der sich Besinnliches, Grüblerisches und Empfindung eigenartig mischen.” Strobel, “Pfitzner dirigiert.”

¹²⁰ The original reads: “Über die weiter nichts gesagt sein soll, als daß sie wieder einmal den Atem einer Kunst des Metaphysischen verspüren ließ.” Alfred Heuß, “Vom Tonkünstlerfest in Dortmund und noch wichtigeren Dingen,” *Zeitschrift für Musik* 8 (1933): 808.

¹²¹ “Ein ganzer Abend war Hans Pfitzner gewidmet, dessen erhabene Chorfantasie ‘Das dunkle Reich’ und die zergrübelte, schwer verständliche cis-moll Sinfonie op. 36 a alle Tiefen der deutschen Seele widerspiegeln,” Hans-Georg Bonte, “Dessau,” *Zeitschrift für Musik* 10 (October 1933): 1054.

¹²² As noted above, Burger defines an *Intimsphäre* as “the core of a person’s private sphere which by law, tact, and convention is shielded from intrusion.” See Burger, translator’s note in *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, xvi.

¹²³ Adorno, *Introduction to the Sociology of Music*, 100.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 96.