Exploring Musical Neoclassicism in the Changing Political Climate of Interwar Europe

Valérie Dufour
FNRS-Université libre de Bruxelles

Massimiliano Locanto
Università degli Studi di Salerno

Did the musical neoclassicism of the 1920s emerge as an artistic response to the political and social upheavals of post-World War I Europe? Attempts to define musical styles never escape the pitfalls of complexity, ambiguity, and subjectivity inherent in the exercise, and the definition of neoclassicism is no exception. Moreover, exploring the often elusive relationships between a development in musical composition and the ideas circulating in socio-political life is always a difficult undertaking. Adopting a comparative perspective on the dissemination of neoclassicism across different European countries – particularly in those where it has received relatively little scholarly attention – can therefore help refine its definition by revealing both common trajectories and context-specific divergences.

In this introductory chapter, we aim to identify some of the key questions that have shaped the discourse on neoclassicism, while highlighting how the essays in the present issue can contribute to this discussion by broadening the perspective to include regions that have usually been overlooked and by means of new approaches based on digital tools for querying repertoires and databases – that, in recent years, have been reshaping the landscape of archival research.

ARCHIVAL NOTES
Sources Studies in Twentieth- and Twenty-First-Century Music, No. 9 (2024)

ISSN 2499-832X

DEFINITIONAL CHALLENGES OF MUSICAL NEOCLASSICISM

Although the term 'neoclassicism' has been widely used in twentieth-century music historiography to refer to a coherent group of compositions mostly from the interwar period for which the meaning of the term may appear quite clear and intuitive, its definition proves elusive in practice, as it encompasses complex aesthetic, cultural, and political dimensions that are difficult to disentangle. Even Stravinsky, often regarded as the spearhead of the movement, was at times sceptical about the label's relevance. Initially, he endorsed the term, linking its use to a renewed focus on the 'formal substance' of a work.[1] In later years, however, he often rejected it, at times describing it as 'a label that means nothing whatever'.[2]

Much of the difficulty in defining neoclassicism stems from the lack of a single, universally accepted concept of 'classical' in music to which the so-called 'neo-classical' could be related.[3] It is worth noting, for instance, that if 'classical' were understood as the Viennese Classical style of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, the term 'neoclassicism', as James Tobin observes, should be considered 'a misnomer', since composers most frequently associated with this label, such as Stravinsky or Hindemith, only occasionally adopted the formal, stylistic, and compositional aspects typical of that style.[4] Rather, much of their neoclassical output could be placed within a predominantly 'neo-Baroque' framework, but they drew on a wide range of historical models, from late Renaissance to nineteenth century. More broadly, the notion itself that drawing on musical models from the past is essential for a composition to qualify as 'neoclassical' is misleading. As Richard Taruskin has demonstrated long ago, the use of structural features from earlier works and the borrowing of musical forms, techniques, and idioms from earlier periods (a literal 'back to…') is neither a defining nor a necessary condition for neoclassical music.[5]

Another potentially misleading assumption is the belief that there existed a single, clearly identifiable 'neoclassical style'.[6] Music in entirely different styles can plausibly be classified as neoclassical; which is like saying that 'one neoclassicism never existed, neither geographically nor within the same country'.[7] Nor can it be maintained that there ever existed a single, unambiguous 'neoclassical aesthetic' to which the considerable diversity of compositional approaches might be consistently reduced. As Hermann Danuser argues, '[neoclassicism] is not a new aesthetic concept' and one cannot 'elaborate a single concept of neoclassicism within which the elements would all fall into place', so that 'it is preferable to adopt an open form of presentation that allows a description of the individual traits of neoclassicism'.[8]

Thus, if a common thread is to be identified across the various neoclassical experiences, it lies less in a well-defined aesthetic 'paradigm' than in a broader aesthetic 'posture' shaped by the ideological, cultural, and political conditions of the interwar period. It functioned as a response to a widespread sense of the need to restore 'order' to a world viewed as chaotic and decadent. It called for a return to 'classical values' such as clarity and balance, in opposition to the perceived excesses and decadence of late Romanticism – including both German Expressionism and French Impressionism and Symbolism[9] – and the turmoil of war, implicitly understood as interconnected symptoms of cultural and political disarray. Such an ideological framework found a clear and renowned formulation in Jean Cocteau's 1926 slogan '*Rappel à l'ordre*': a recalling cry against Romanticism, subjectivism, emotionalism, and the complexity and obscurity of late-Romantic music.[10] Many terms that, according to Scott Messing, collectively defined the idea of 'classical' – and consequently 'neoclassical' – in the interwar period can be linked to this ideological orientation centred on the notion of 'order': clarity, simplicity, objectivity, purity, refinement, constructive logic, conciseness, sobriety. These words resonate throughout the writings and primary sources examined in the essays included in this issue.[11]

Conceiving neoclassicism as a cultural and ideological stance rather than as a univocal stylistic or aesthetic orientation allows for a clearer understanding of its close connection to the cultural climate of the interwar period. Of course, its chronological delimitation may prove problematic. According to Danuser, 'despite its widespread consequences for the period 1920–50, neoclassicism is not a concept defined by period'; and Raffaele Pozzi maintains likewise that 'the conventional placement of this phenomenon within the interwar period cannot be regarded as valid in itself, independently of the chosen perspective'.[12] Nonetheless, if this 'perspective' is precisely that of culture, ideology, and politics – as adopted by the essays collected in this issue – then the interwar years cannot be seen as a mere 'conventional' chronological marker, but rather as an essential aspect of the phenomenon. The fact that neoclassicism gained prominence in Europe between the two world wars reflects more than just a conventional historiographical periodization: it points to a deeper cultural dimension, as the movement itself emerged in response to the political and social climate of the time.

This also allows for a clearer distinction between interwar neoclassical works and other – mostly pre-World War I – compositions that similarly drew on musical forms and styles of the past, including many retrospective *hommages* or pieces '*à la manière de…*' or 'in ancient style'. Many nineteenth-century composers engaged in parodies or pastiches of earlier music with a distinctly retrospective and

nostalgic flavour, and the technique of paraphrase was widespread throughout that century, particularly in paraphrases of dance music, which became increasingly popular as an ingredient of the 'music-hall' and 'café-concert' styles, and as a sign of the emerging global modernity fuelled by the Second Industrial Revolution, international trade, and the Universal Expositions. Within the broad landscape of early twentieth-century music that, in various ways, revived elements of the past without thereby being properly classifiable as 'neoclassical', one may mention the numerous French compositions inspired by the Baroque tradition (*néo-classique* in the French sense), such as Debussy's three late Sonatas (1915–17), Ravel's *Le Tombeau de Couperin*, or other historicizing piano pieces by Ravel, like *Menuet antique* (1895), *Sonatine* (1903), and *Menuet sur le nom d'Haydn* (1909). One could also cite *pastiches* such as Vincenzo Tommasini's *Le donne di buon umore* (1917, based on music by Domenico Scarlatti) or Ottorino Respighi's *La boutique fantasque* (1919, on music by Rossini), which belong to the same type of ballet scores based on 'ancient' music, typical of Sergey Diaghilev's productions (Stravinsky's *Pulcinella* also falls in this lineage, although its deliberate strategies of distancing from the source material correspond to some essential features of neoclassicism); or other twentieth-century orchestral *pastiches* on early music, like Respighi's three series of *Antiche danze ed arie per liuto* (1917, 1923, 1931).[13] Whereas such compositions were intended to evoke a nostalgic sense of 'antiquity', neoclassicism sought to convey a sense of modernity through a strategic manpulation of the past. Backward-looking sensibility and retrospective antiquarianism were not defining features of interwar neoclassicism, which emphasized, rather, the modernist engagement with tradition; and this was less a renewed turn to a remote 'past' than a deliberate break from a more recent one – namely, late Romanticism.

We should also distinguish neoclassicism from the reference to musical forms and techniques of the past, which during the interwar period characterized many compositions generally regarded as distinct from – if not opposed to – neoclassicism. This holds true even when such a revival drew on notions of 'order' and 'structural clarity' that, in some respects, echo the broader neoclassical concern with formal discipline. Schoenberg's own turn to twelve-tone composition, for example, and his reintegration of forms and procedures typical of both Baroque music and the classical-romantic tradition, show undeniable connections with the postwar cultural climate. This has led some scholars to posit a shared 'neoclassical' matrix underlying the musical developments of both Schoenberg and Stravinsky in the early 1920s.[14] Such reasoning, however, risks conceptual blurring, by equating artistic tendencies that diverge fundamentally in their aesthetic premises. Differences at this level prove more significant than any surface analogies.

Raffaele Pozzi, for instance, has highlighted the contrast between Schönberg's organicist conception of form and Stravinsky's paratactic – 'Cubist', in Pozzi's view – approach, based on the juxtaposition of distinct, self-contained musical blocks. This contrast supports the interpretation of Stravinsky's neoclassicism as grounded in a technique of 'montage', fundamentally at odds with the organic conception of the Austro-German tradition.[15] Another essential difference lies in the 'alienating' effect of Stravinsky's use of his musical materials and models, in contrast with Schönberg's. The interpretation of neoclassicism through the lens of defamiliarization (*ostranenie*), as theorized by Russian Formalism, was central to Rudolf Stephan's reading of Stravinsky's neoclassicism.[16] Further divergence can be found in the composers' respective relationships to tradition. Whereas Schönberg's classicism retains a sense of continuity and inner extension within the Austro-German lineage, Stravinsky's neoclassicism approaches multiple musical traditions from a position of distance, shaped by cultural and historical discontinuity.[17] According to Gianfranco Vinay, this distancing is a defining feature of Stravinsky's neoclassicism, and reflects a perspective of 'cultural ubiquity': that of the *déraciné* artist negotiating with foreign cultures.[18] This remains true even in those works where such distance does not manifest as ironic parody, but rather emerges through a full integration of the model into a modern musical idiom, as in the *Octet for Wind Instruments*, or through a monumental reimagining, as in *Oedipus Rex*. More importantly, whereas for Schönberg the turn to tradition and the search for a new formal 'order' remained a vehicle for subjective expression and did not entail a rejection of the aesthetic principles that had underpinned his pre-war output, in Stravinsky's neoclassicism 'order' signified an 'objective' conception of the musical work, as a non-expressive, non-emotional, and non-subjective formal construction. This conception was famously articulated in Stravinsky's 1923 article *Some Ideas about my Octuor*, in which he declared: 'My *Octuor* is a musical object. This object has a form and that form is influenced by the musical matter with which it is composed. The differences of matter determine the differences of form'.[19]

These distinctions between neoclassicism and other contemporary re-engagements with tradition also correspond to differing compositional preferences and technical approaches. While it may be difficult to identify a single neoclassical 'style' or 'aesthetics', certain structural features are nonetheless commonly associated with neoclassical music. This dimension has been deeply explored in the music of Stravinsky, whose neoclassicism is strongly shaped by the distinctive approach to musical form, based on the same logic of 'block-juxtaposition' that characterizes other 'periods' of his musical production. In her book *After the Rite:*

Stravinsky's Path to neoclassicism (1914-1925), Maureen Carr showed, through the study of the sketches, how Stravinsky integrated in this formal conception various musical materials borrowed from the music of the past.[20] More generally, one of the most distinctive technical feature of neoclassical music – and one of the main reasons behind the expression '*retour à Bach*' – is the renewed emphasis on linear-contrapuntal writing. This is evident in the works of several composers, such as Stravinsky and Paul Hindemith, beginning around 1922–1923. What distinguishes the neoclassical use of contrapuntal techniques from the polyphonic writing that also re-emerges in other composers not typically labelled as neoclassical is their integration within a post-tonal harmonic language that avoids a radical or systematic exploitation of the full chromatic total, favouring instead alternative systems of pitch organization that may only superficially resemble traditional tonality: pitch centricity around specific tonal centres, non-conventional pitch collections – whether symmetrical or diatonic – and symmetry-based procedures. Béla Bartók's compositions after 1926, for instance, frequently exhibit the integration of imitative counterpoint into a post-tonal harmonic framework characterized by interval cycles and symmetrical constructs, as László Vikárius recalls at the beginning of his article in this issue. In his essay on Alfredo Casella, Francesco Fontanelli underscores the significance of a compositional feature – summed up in the formula 'return to C major' – that, although quite basic, stands out as one of the defining traits of neoclassical music across a wide range of composers: the use of diatonic pitch collections outside the framework of traditional tonality and functional harmony.

Finally, another challenge when trying to define the concept of neoclassicism lies in the negative connotations that have been attached to it over the past century. In France, prior to World War I, the term (or its French equivalents) largely carried a pejorative connotation, used to describe qualities that contemporary French critics disparaged in German composers aligned with the Classical tradition, particularly those shaped by Beethovenian ideals of form and thematic development – a critique that paralleled the one directed at the other major strand of German music, namely Wagnerianism. This negative connotation disappeared in post-World War I music criticism, which instead attributed to the word a set of positive and 'objective' aesthetic values, conceived in opposition to an ideal of subjective expressivity associated with Late Romanticism.[21]

When, in 1923, Boris de Schloezer first applied the adjective 'neoclassical' to Stravinsky's compositions from the early 1920s, he borrowed the term from the extensive repertoire of definitions and slogans with which French intellectuals described postwar *avant-garde* trends, but gave it a new meaning that would

become dominant in the interwar period.[22] 'Neoclassical' came to signify a return to rigor, transparency, and clarity of form, which had been lost in the late-Romantic tradition, particularly the German one, and in its Expressionist offshoots, epitomized by Arnold Schönberg. Many essays in this issue reveal, through the lens of contemporary critical reception, a range of values associated with this positive meaning in different European cultural areas. The pejorative connotation re-emerged only in the late 1940s and early 1950s, within the new *avant-garde* climate of the young serial generation. By then, a highly influential interpretation of neoclassicism as regressive and reactionary response to the contradictions of contemporary society had been articulated in the writings of Theodor W. Adorno, culminating in his book *Philosophie der neuen Musik*, published in 1949 – although its two main sections dated from 1941 and 1947.[23]

The need to move beyond any conception of neoclassicism as an anti-progressive movement opposed to modernity, and to instead highlight its modern features, its distinctly twentieth-century foundations, and its modernist inclinations, has led Hermann Danuser to reconsider the traditional label of 'neoclassicism' in favour of the broader historiographic category of 'modernist classicism' – or 'classical modernism'.[24] This category encompasses the musical production traditionally labelled as 'neoclassical', often interpreted as a form of counter-modernism within progressivist historiographical narratives such as Adorno's, but may also include those compositions which, while incorporating certain 'classical' or 'classicizing' elements, have traditionally been considered outside neoclassicism precisely because of their progressive orientation.

The essays in this issue, however, do not adopt this conceptual framework. Grounded in archival research, many of them investigate the discursive practices that shaped the critical debate and reception of neoclassicism during the interwar period. As such, rather than imposing new historiographic constructs – including that of 'modernist classicism' – they seek to uncover the categories and conceptual frameworks specific to that historical moment.

From this perspective, it is worth examining the linguistic formulas and expressions employed by contemporary critics to refer to neoclassicism, such as the slogan 'return to Bach', whose origins, dissemination, and development are the focus of Aurore Flamion's essay in this issue. As shown by the press excerpts analysed by Flamion, the supposed 'return' denoted a range of compositional approaches that might just as well have been described as a 'return to' Mozart, Scarlatti, Clementi, Händel, or other composers of the Baroque or Classical periods. Thus, the reference to Bach functioned as a synecdoche for a broader ideal of contrapuntal writing, formal clarity, and structural mastery embodied

by various seventeenth- and eighteenth-century composers. More significantly, Flamion's enquiry demonstrates that the slogan entailed a range of political and national identity implications.

THE POLITICS OF NEOCLASSICISM. BETWEEN SOCIETY AND TRANSCENDENCE

Interpreting the political dimension conveyed by the works, the writings, and the public gestures of the composers is a complex hermeneutic operation, as is, more generally, the analysis of the political dimensions of the creative act. In a seminal 1994 article, Lydia Goehr outlined the preliminary precautions necessary for undertaking this task. She distinguished between two possible relationships: the first, which she called the 'crude solution,' focuses on an 'external and contingent' relationship between works and their political environment, and the second, which she called the 'critical solution,' identifies an 'internal, essential, and abstract relationship' between the musical and the political.[25] On this basis, for instance, Steven Huebner has shown the implicit ideological content of Ravel's *Menuet sur le nom de Haydn* and the complexity of the network of values that are not strictly speaking 'political gestures'.[26]

In addition, identifying a univocal politics of neoclassicism is complicated by the ambivalence of its very foundational ideological premises. The pursuit of a symbolic 'order' was an ideological stance that could take on different political, social, moral, philosophical, and national-identitarian overtones depending on how it was framed in the various contexts. While providing a common ideological ground across virtually all neoclassical experiences, it lent itself to diverse inflections, serving different political agendas. Over the course of almost three decades, it was both aligned with nationalist and conservative (or even reactionary) ideologies – especially when associated with a mythical, idealized national cultural identity – and employed to assert artistic autonomy against ideological manipulation, especially in more progressist, cosmopolitan, and anti-totalitarian contexts. László Vikárus' article in this issue adds another piece to this complex political and cultural mosaic of neoclassicism by examining the position of Bartók, who was firmly opposed to authoritarian regimes and for whom neoclassicism, with its strong roots in the folk music of the past and its aim of reconnecting the new and the old, was a way of resisting the political pressures of his time.

Early signs of neoclassicism already reveal how the same need to restore a classical 'order' could lead to radically different political outcomes. The potential for such divergence is already encapsulated in the contrasting positions of Hans Pfitzner

and Ferruccio Busoni in a *querelle* that is frequently cited in historical accounts of neoclassicism. Busoni's idea of 'a young classicism' (*Junge Klassizität*) as '[…] the mastery, the sifting and the turning to account of all gains of previous experiments and their inclusion in strong and beautiful forms' reflected a cosmopolitan perspective that sought to mediate the traditions and the modern achievements of various national cultures. In contrast, Pfitzner's appeal to 'classical' values went hand in hand with a vehement rejection of the 'anti-German' elements of modern music (including Busoni's), and his conservative rhetoric – 'apolitical' in the sense of Thomas Mann's *Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen* (*Reflections of an Apolitical Man*), of 1918, which Mann himself would later repudiate during the Weimar Republic –foreshadowed the rise of nationalism and authoritarian regimes.[27]

Clear political overtones marked the critical discourse about the Stravinsky–Schoenberg opposition, which shaped much of the ideological framework of neoclassicism. This was the case in a foundational 1928 article by Arthur Lourié, which set the terms of the dispute between the two supposedly most important composers of the 20th century by contrasting two ways of relating to the past: 'on the extreme right' the 'neo-classical' (Stravinsky); and 'on the extreme left' the neo-gothic (Schoenberg).[28] The former, according to Lourié, corresponded to a healthy conservative stance toward traditional values, while the latter was characterized by a rejection or misuse of tradition, leading to a kind of 'revolutionary anarchy'.

From a sociological perspective, Cocteau's formula of the '*rappel à l'ordre*' implicitly conveyed a form of socio-cultural critique aimed at the decadent and self-referential 'elite public' traditionally aligned with late-Romantic aesthetic values, in favour of a simpler and more 'popular' art, rooted in shared national cultural values. It embodied the aspirations of a new intellectual class that called for a new art aimed at a broader, though still cultivated, audience. Many compositions of *Les Six* incorporated elements of popular culture such as jazz, cabaret, and music hall, along with symbols of modern life, thus giving voice to ideals of artistic democratization that resonated with the rise of new media and urban mass culture.

A more overtly socially motivated artistic orientation emerged with the concept of *Gebrauchsmusik* ('music for use') and the ideals of *Neue Sachlichkeit* ('New Objectivity') that took shape during the Weimar Republic and found their most articulate expression in the music of Paul Hindemith between roughly 1923 and 1933.[29] At the heart of this movement were the democratization of access to music, the active education and engagement of citizens, the rejection of the aesthetic ideals associated with the old cultural elites, and the use of music as an ethical, educational, and social tool at the service of the *Gemeinschaft* (community).

Many of the core aesthetic and ideological premises of neoclassicism significantly overlapped with those of *Gebrauchsmusik* and *Neue Sachlichkeit*. They both arose as rejections of the Romantic aesthetics of the Sublime and as reactions against the perceived excesses and disorders that had led to war and – in Germany's case – defeat. Both movements tended to downplay artistic individuality in favour of the objectivity of the artwork. Both celebrated clarity, sobriety, semplicity, emotional detachment, and playfulness. *Neue Sachlichkeit* also advocated for an art that could be grounded both in modern culture and in the past. There remained, nonetheless, a fundamental difference between the socially driven artistic tendencies of Weimar Germany and the more 'socially detached' Parisian Neoclassicism: the former's commitment to functionality challenged the notion of 'art for art's sake' and undermined the paradigm of autonomy that continued, to a good extent, to define the latter. The fully functional conception of music embodied in the very term *Gebrauchsmusik* not only critiqued the bourgeois-Romantic idea of the artwork as individual expression but also rejected the broader notion of artistic autonomy and the belief that art should exist as an end in itself.

The notion that French neoclassicism expressed an exclusively non-functional view of music also requires some refinement. Doubts in this regard arise when one considers those composers who interpreted their music as an essential component of the ritual dimension, within a perspective of religious faith. While this vision remains distinct from the notion of music serving a social function (in the sense of *Gebrauchsmusik)*, it is also not entirely compatible with an ideal of '*l'art pour l'art*'.

The relationship with the idea of transcendence and the religious faith is frequently neglected ideological aspect of neoclassicism – Stravinsky being among the rare notable exceeptions.[30] In this respect, it is worth recalling its affinities with the notion of anti-modernism as defined by Jacques Maritain, whose ambition lies in a desire to combine tradition and progress, often summarized in the oxymoron 'conservative modernism'. In this context, it is also important to note that neoclassicism, often perceived as ironic and irreverent, finds common ground with Catholic religious music through their quest for order and universality after World War I. Figures like Stravinsky and Poulenc embraced religious orthodoxy, integrating hieratic elements into their works. In this issue, Tadhg Sauvey further expands this perspective by describing the intersection of neoclassical objectivism and Catholic ritual in the musical philosophy of Joseph Samson. Serving as director of the Dijon Cathedral choir, Samson developed a philosophy of liturgical music centred on objectivity and functionality, rejecting personal expression in favour of conformity to religious rituals. He viewed liturgical music as a craft, where the composer works within constraints imposed by the liturgy, creating works

that serve the ritual rather than expressing individual emotions. This approach opposes the concept of art for art's sake and emphasizes the intrinsic beauty of music, detached from textual meaning. This case study highlights the significant influence of the intellectual revival of Catholicism in the 1920s, notably through Jacques Maritain. Sauvey effectively demonstrates how Samson sought to reconcile neoclassical objectivity with the intellectual traditions of church music.

NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL? NEOCLASSICISM ACROSS INTERWAR EUROPE

From the perspective of national-identitarian construction, neoclassicism displayed a fundamental ambivalence: while it often embodied nationalist tendencies, it could equally assert notions of universality, normativity, internationalism, and cosmopolitanism. The very expression 'return to Bach' exemplifies this ambiguity: the historical figure of Bach was 'de-Germanized' and presented as part of a universal heritage transcending national boundaries; yet, as Flamion shows in her article in this issue, this universality was in fact 'made in France', and grounded in an 'internationally French' aesthetic premised on the erasure of German musical tradition. When Schoenberg famously portrayed – in the second movement (*Vielseitigkeit* [Versatility]) of his *Drei Satiren* for mixed choir, Op. 28 (1925) – Stravinsky as a 'Kleine Modernsky' (little Modernsky), his hair styled like a wig in imitation of that of 'Papa Bach (as the little Modernsky imagines him)' a deeper tension between competing nationalist ideologies stood behind the caricature. 'All of this [Schonberg's and Stravinsky's 'return to Bach'] was done', Taruskin argued, '[…] under the stern auspices of order and discipline, which is to say, *sub specie patris* [read: Bach] *et patriae* […]'. Schoenberg's own homage to Bach – even explicitly so at times in his twelve-tone works (think, for example, of the B-A-C-H motif in the *Variations for Orchestra*, Op. 31) – was also 'tinged from the outset with chauvinism': and 'his' Bach was […] a national as well as a universal figurehead, asserting one nation's claim to ascendance and forestalling "Latin and Slav hopes of hegemony"'.[31]

The question arises, thus, whether the manifestations of neoclassicism in various European regions should be understood as expressions of universalistic and cosmopolitan ideals, or rather as nationally grounded developments. To answer this question, we can observe that the variety of uses of certain aspects of neoclassicism ranges from a deliberately conservative nationalist use – often implicitly articulated to the right of the political field – to much more cosmopolitan tendencies, protecting political values of artistic autonomy while using forms and

styles of the past – often located more to the left. In the European context, we can clearly see a Franco-German tension between nationalist ideologies, where values of sobriety and objectivity are opposed to the perceived decadence of modern works. In past years, some scholars supported the idea that neoclassicism emerged primarily in those geographical areas where the Austro-German classical tradition was perceived as an external and foreign influence. However, this view is not entirely consistent: although in France neoclassicism emerged largely as a reaction against the hegemony of that tradition, and after 1923 took on essentially the tone of a response to (German) Expressionism, a crucial component of its initial impetus also lay in in a reaction against the Impressionist and Symbolist aesthetics associated with Debussy and Debussyism; and the 'distaste for the expressive principles [of] Expressionism' was a driving force behind neoclassicism even in Germany itself, during the Weimar Republic.

This complexity reflects the fact that neoclassicism emerged across various geographical areas in response to factors that were partly shared and partly specific to each national context. Yet even within a single country, widely differing positions could emerge, shaped by varying cultural and political backgrounds. In France itself, the range of ideological substrates attached to neoclassicism was quite broad, although certain trends were more predominant. Jane Fulcher has described the French musical neoclassicism of the interwar period as not merely an aesthetic trend, but a political space often strongly marked by nationalist and conservative inscriptions.[32] She showed how Vincent D'Indy and the composers of the Schola Cantorum made stylistic choices reflecting a mindset closely linked to political ideals (order, balance, proportion) and promoting a 'French classical culture' with a moral and spiritual dimension. On another level, figures like Cocteau also led a generation of composers to reinvent musical nationalism in a modern way, while remaining attached to certain traditions in a context of fear of foreign influences. On the other hand, when composers like Ravel and Debussy used ancient forms, they did so in a spirit of valuing a free and open classicism, distancing themselves from conservative attitudes.

In Italy, neoclassicism arose in part from a desire to restore an Italian tradition of instrumental music after decades operatic – and *verismo* – dominance. However, other political – nationalist – motivations were also at stake. In his essay in this issue, Fontanelli shows the slow ideological construction that led Alfredo Casella to the 'liquidation of the atonal intermezzo' through the revaluation of tonal hierarchies with an approach to neoclassicism that partly resonated with the cultural policies of the Fascist regime. As early as 1913, in fact, Casella had sketched the plan for a chamber 'Divertimento' – then changed to 'Concerto (or

Serenata) in Italian Style', and the orchestral settings of two patriotic poems by Gabriele D'Annunzio; a project that was resumed a decade later, coinciding with the advent of Fascism, and according to a new 'classicist' perspective combining European cosmopolitanism and autarchy.

An essential way in which this volume seeks to engage with these issues is by broadening the geographical framework, moving beyond those countries traditionally regarded as the cradle of neoclassicism. In fact, musical historiography has primarily examined neoclassicism through a French – and, to a lesser extent, German – lens. Yet, expanding the focus to include geographical areas such as the Iberian Peninsula, the Scandinavian countries, or Soviet Russia – often regarded as peripheral, if not entirely unrelated, to neoclassicism – can yield valuable insights into both the nature and the dissemination of the phenomenon, especially given the scarcity of systematic studies on the discourse surrounding neoclassicism in these regions.

What emerges from this expanded geographical scope is that both the nature of the neoclassical engagement with the past and its reliance on the notion of 'order' were shaped either by strong impulses toward national identity construction or by contingent political circumstances. In Spain, for instance, neoclassicism aligned with the nationalist and conservative aspirations that marked the country's unstable political climate of the 1920s and early 1930s. However, as Ruth Piquer's essay on the reception of de Falla's works demonstrates, these aspirations were part of a broader project of cultural modernization – one that involved both a return to Hispanic traditions and a desire to integrate elements of European modernism – which resulted into an attempt to resolve the duality through a kind of 'universal nationalism'. Similarly, Arnulf Christian Mattes' enquiry into musical neoclassicism in Norway shows that during the 1920s and 1930s Norwegian critics, lexicographers, and composers engaged with questions of national identity and a culturally ambivalent stance toward German traditions. The typically neoclassical terminology they adopted reflects the fact that, in their country, musical neoclassicism emerged not simply as an import of European stylistic trends, but as a distinctive synthesis of universal musical principles and national cultural values.

Finally, Anna Giust's essay offers a new perspective on Soviet Russia. According to standard music-historiographical accounts, neoclassicism is hardly identifiable in this context, at least not in the form it had taken in Western European Countries.[33] In the Russian cultural climate of the 1920s, references to past models or aesthetic principles were typically dismissed as reactionary and backward-looking. With the rise of Socialist Realism, Western neoclassicism was subsumed under the category

of 'formalism' and denounced as an expression of reactionary bourgeois culture.[34] In fact, the term 'neoclassicism' was not openly discussed in Soviet music press; and when it did appear, it was typically used in a pejorative sense, referring to stylistic retrospection and cultural decadence. Nevertheless, Giust's reading of the Soviet music press offers a more nuanced perspective, revealing the presence of concepts and terminologies associated with Western neoclassical discourse that migrated from modernist aesthetics into the proletarian cultural framework. In this light, Socialist Realism in music may be seen as a political response to several unresolved issues that emerged by the end of the 1920s – including a renewed desire for 'order' – aimed at constructing an ideal of Soviet music as 'modern and classical at the same time.' Giust's analysis, thus, may provide a new empirical foundation for Pozzi's statement that 'Stalinism […] severed 'the historical roots of classical categories such as order, harmony, simplicity, comprehensibility, and naturalness, transforming them into ahistorical aesthetic imperatives.'

In the end, even when identity-driven impulses are framed within universalist ideals and hence cannot be entirely characterized as 'nationalist', they nonetheless represent a clear departure from the sensibility that had shaped the musical culture prior to the devastation of World War I and the 1918 influenza pandemic. These traumatic events erected new barriers and pushed individuals back into more narrowly defined cultural boundaries. As Danuser observes, although the relationship between 'universal and national factors' evolved over time, 'from 1920 to 1950, the idea of "modernist classicism" was understood in terms of national connections'.[35]

ARCHIVAL RESEARCH AND NEW DIGITAL RESOURCES

Several essays included in this issue are grounded – in keeping with the focus and scope of this journal – in the study of specific archival sources preserved in physical repositories. Fontanelli's contribution focuses on Alfredo Casella's sketchbooks housed at the Fondazione Giorgio Cini's Institute of Music in Venice, offering an interpretation of both the musical sketches in themselves and the annotations that can be found on their 'thresholds' (in the Gérard Genette's paratextual sense): titles, formal plans, and other marginalia. Vikárius's essay reflects on the relationship between Bartók's social and political concerns and his aesthetic convictions that can be related to neoclassicism, drawing on the valuable testimony of two partially unpublished archival documents preserved in the Bartók Archives in Budapest. Sauvey's reflection on the 'musical philosophy' of Joseph Samson relies, among

other sources, on several unpublished writings held at the Bibliothèque municipale de Dijon, where Joseph Samson served as director of the Cathedral choir.

The other essays of this issue complement this perspective by shifting the focus from sources concerning the work or thought of individual composers to a broader sphere of public discourse, as evidenced by press coverage, reviews, and critical essays circulating during the interwar period. This approach enables an empirical assessment of the presence and transformations of the concept of neoclassicism, shifting the focus from the reception and the self-categorizations of the music of individual composers to the reconstruction of critical discourses circulating within specific cultural environments.

Notable examples of this approach are Scott Messing' 1988 book – in which the reconstruction of the genesis and evolution of neoclassicism as a concept is based to a good extent on the analysis of press criticism and reviews – and a 2017 article by Marianne Wheeldon, based on a scrutiny of the debates in the Parisian musical press between 1919 and 1923.[36] More recently, in 2024, Federico Lazzaro revisited the issue, broadening the scope of his research to include around 140 articles published in seven major Parisian music journals from the entire interwar period. Lazzaro's lexichographic enquiry quantified the presence of discourse on (neo)classicism in the French music press, measuring the frequency, context of use and conceptual variability of terms such as '*néo-classicisme*' or '*nouveau classicisme*'.[37] This methodology enabled him to move beyond the composer-centered paradigm that still characterizes both Messing's book – largely focused on the Stravinsky-Schoenberg antithesis – and Wheeldon's article – who shifted the attention to yet another antithetical pair of composers: Debussy vs Stravinsky.[38] Lazzaro demonstrated that although critical discourse often revolved around a few influential and emblematic composers, it in fact addressed a much broader spectrum of authors and aesthetic agendas. Several articles in this issue continue along this line of enquiry, while shifting the focus not only away from the usual composers, but also – as previously discussed – from the customary geographical areas that have dominated discussions on neoclassicism.

The greatest challenge in conducting this expansion of the geographical-cultural scope lies in the scarcity of primary sources and archival materials that would allow for a clear understanding of the extent, breadth, and timing of the dissemination of neoclassicism as a concept. To overcome this obstacle, several essays in this issue adopt innovative methodologies of archival research, drawing on databases, digitized periodicals (whether OCR-processed or not), digital newspaper archives, and application programming interfaces (APIs). These tools have revolutionized archival practices by introducing new ways of accessing and managing digital

sources. Their potential for musicological research is considerable, marking a qualitative leap beyond traditional archival methods. By enabling the collection of quantitative data and the production of qualitative analyses, they expand and enhance traditional lexicometric methodologies based on printed media. An important opportunity they offer is the possibility of simultaneously investigating different types of sources that reflect various levels of discourse, from the more public and widely circulated materials, such as newspapers, concert reviews, concert programmes, broadcasting reports, etc., to more specialised writings, such as scholarly articles in subject-specific periodicals.

An illustrative case is that of Norway, examined by Arnulf Mattes in this issue. As Mattes points out, even the most significant studies on Norwegian interwar composers – published from the 1990s onward – have suffered from a lack of accessible primary sources, which are indispensable for critically validating historiographical and biographical narratives. In many cases, such sources are held in archives, foundations, or private collections that impose significant restrictions on researchers. To address these limitations, Mattes grounds his investigation in the 'Digital Bookshelf', a project launched by the National Library of Norway in 2009, which today provides researchers with access to an extensive repository of digitized publications. By offering free access to a large corpus of literature from the 1790s to 2005, all in full-text digital format, this resource has radically changed the conditions for historiographical research in Norway.

Flamion's article – which maps the usage of terms such as 'neoclassical' and 'return to Bach' between 1918 and 1939 – offers an example of the potential that lexicometric research gains through the consultation of digitised press materials via application programming interfaces (APIs) – server-based coded routines that enable the sharing of data and functionality between different software systems, allowing them to interact and communicate with one another. Their utility is particularly significant in the analysis of press sources and archival materials, as they facilitate the consultation, collection, and analysis of data contained in digitised press catalogues. Specifically, Flamion's study employs a lexicometric approach based on the parallel consultation of two digital catalogues: Gallica – the digital library of the Bibliothèque nationale de France – accessed through the Gallicagram – an API that processes all the digital resources hosted on Gallica, thus allowing users to analyse word occurrence and frequency in Gallica's digitised periodicals – and the *Répertoire international de la presse musicale* (RIPM).[39] The use of such tools, while facilitating material research, also requires scholars to develop new methodologies and refine interpretive strategies for handling, considering the inherent limitations of the digital tools and databases. Flamion, for instance, points

out that one of the main limitations of the corpus accessed via the API lies in the predominantly short format of the texts retrieved – mostly reviews and brief reports of musical events addressed to a non-specialist audience – which do not include major specialized musicological journals such as *La Revue musicale* or *La Revue Pleyel*, both available through RIPM but not accessible via the API. The format and typology of these texts often led authors to use expressions such as 'return to Bach' with the assumption that readers would understand their meaning, without engaging in deeper theoretical or critical reflection, nor exploring connections with related notions such as 'neoclassicism'. Flamion rightly acknowledges this potential bias and attempts to correct for it by taking into account that more thorough discussions and reflections on the concept of neoclassicism were possible only in specialized music journals.

Anna Giust's essay, which examines Soviet journalism of the 1920s, shows that the digitized press archives remain invaluable even when the research methods they afford are not available – due, for example, to technical limitations such as the absence of OCR text – as they still grant scholars access to materials otherwise difficult to consult under contingent circumstances. Like many Western European Russianists, Giust has had to contend with the obstacles to scholarly mobility and archival research in Russia posed by the geopolitical tensions after Russia's invasion of Ukraine. In this context, open-access digitized press archives become an indispensable tool for research. The digitization of the Soviet political press – notably the *Pravda*, now available on several websites – has long opened new research perspectives for scholars working outside of Russia. In the field of musicology, numerous Russian music journals that proliferated after 1917 are progressively being made available in digitized form. While they offer music historians many valuable snapshots of the period, they remain largely under-researched. Focusing only on the databases and catalogues used or referenced in Giust's study, one can mention the website of the journal *Muzïkal'naya akademiya* (*Music Academy*), which provides digitized access to all issues published since 1933, including those published until 1991 when the journal – until then the official organ of Soviet musicology – was re-titled *Sovetskaya muzïka* (*Soviet Music*); the websites of the St. Petersburg Theatrical Library and the St. Petersburg Institute of Art History, both of which host various other historical music periodicals in digital format. In her study, Giust complements these digital sources with *Muzïkal'naya kul'tura* (*Musical Culture*) and, above all, *Sovremennaya muzïka* (*Contemporary Music*), the bulletin of the Association for Contemporary Music (*Assotsiatsiya sovremennoy muzïki*), published in six volumes (thirty-two issues) from 1924 to 1929 – both accessible in full text digital format via RIPM.

Ruth Piquer's essay is yet another example of how digital resources are disclosing new methodological opportunities for archival research in musicology. It draws on a wide range of sources, such as periodicals, newspapers, and archival materials, accessed through both physical and digital repositories – the Hemeroteca Digital of the Biblioteca Nacional de España (BNE), the Archivo Manuel de Falla, and the Fundación Juan March. Particularly relevant for Piquer's enquiry are the newspapers *El Sol* and *La Voz*, whose digitization in the BNE allows for a systematic search and cross-referencing with other music-related articles and writings, thus disclosing their connections with the discourses circulating in of early twentieth-century Spanish culture.

In the end, the picture that emerges from the studies in this issue is that of neoclassicism as a discursive field: a fluid constellation of ideas, concepts, and rhetorical strategies shaped in response to aesthetic, social, and political transformations.

Notes

1 Igor Stravinsky, 'A Warning', *The Dominant* [London], 13-14 December 1927 and 'Avertissement', *Musique*, I/3, 15 décembre 1927, text edited in *Confidences sur la musique. Propos recueillis* (1912-1939), textes et entretiens choisis, édités et annotés par Valérie Dufour, Arles: Actes sud, 2013, pp. 68–69.

2 See the excerpt from the interview to Stravinsky by Hubert Roussel, quoted in Robert Craft, '"Dear Bob[sky]" (Stravinsky's Letters to Robert Craft, 1944- 1949)', *The Musical Quarterly*, LXV/3, 1979, p. 424. Other statements of a similar kind are quoted in Scott Messing, *Neoclassicism in Music: From the Genesis of the Concept through the Schoenberg/Stravinsky Polemic*, Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988, p. 192, note 4.

3 See Raffaele Pozzi, 'L'ideologia neoclassica', in: *Enciclopedia della musica.*, I: *Il Novecento*, Torino: Einaudi, 2001, pp. 444–470: 446–447; French translation; 'L'idéologie néoclassique', in: *Musiques. Une encyclopédie pour le xxie siècle*. I: *Musiques du xxe siècle*, Arles-Paris: Actes Sud-Cité de la musique, 2003, pp. 348–376.

4 James Tobin, *Neoclassical Music in America. Voices of Clarity and Restrain*t, Lanham (MD): Rowman & Littlefield, 2014, p. 6.

5 Richard Taruskin, 'Back to Whom? Neoclassicism as Ideology', *19th-Century Music*, XVI/3, 1993, pp. 286–302.

6 The risks of indiscriminately applying this label to an excessively wide variety of compositions see Gianfranco Vinay, 'Le néo-classicisme musical ou bien "la nuit où tous les chats sont gris"' https://mediatheque.cnd.fr/?Gianfranco-Vinay-Le-Neo-classicisme-musical-ou-bien-la-nuit-ou-tous-les-chats [last accessed 26 May 2025].

7 Federico Lazzaro, 'Discussing (Neo)Classicism in the Parisian Musical Press, 1919–1940, Quantifications, Conceptions, and Historiography', *Journal of Music Criticism*, VIII, 2024, pp. 1–70: 1.

8 Hermann Danuser, 'Rewriting the Past: Classicisms of the Inter-war Period', in: *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 260–285: 261.

9 See Marianne Wheeldon, 'Anti-Debussyism and the Formation of French Neoclassicism', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, LXX/2, 2017, pp. 433–474.

10 Jean Cocteau, *Le Rappel à l'ordre*, Paris: Librairie Stock, 1926.

11 Messing, *Neoclassicism in Music*, p. xiv.

12 Danuser, 'Rewriting the Past', p. 261; Pozzi, 'L'ideologia neoclassica', p. 448.

13 For a discussion of these examples and their differences from neoclassicism in a more proper sense, see especially Volker Scherliess '"Torniamo all'antico e sarà un progresso". Nostalgie créatrice en musique', in: *Canto d'amore. Modernité et classicisme dans la musique et les beaux-arts entre 1914 et 1935*, édité par Gottfried Boehm, Ulrich Mosch, Katharina Schmidt, Basel: Kunstmuseum Basel - Paul Sacher Stiftung, 1996, pp. 39–60: 40–42; Ludwing Finscher, 'L'ancien comme nouveau', *ivi*, pp. 63–73: 64–70. On the Italian context see Fiamma Nicolodi, 'Aspects compositionnels et esthétiques du néoclassicisme en Italie', in: *Die Klassizistische Moderne in der Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts. Internationales Symposion der Paul Sacher Stiftung. Basel 1996*, hrsg. von Hermann Danuser, Winterthur: Amadeus, 1997, pp. 73–91: 82–84.

14 See for example Charles Rosen, *Arnold Schoenberg*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1996 (1975[1]), p. 72. Pozzi ('L'ideologia neoclassica', p. 455) also recalls that a similar opinion had been previously expressed by Pierre Boulez.

15 See Scherliess, '"Torniamo all'antico e sarà un progresso"', p. 59. See also Volker Scherliess, 'Inspiration und Fabrication. Beobachtungen zu Igor Strawinskys Arbeit an The Rake's Progress', in: *Quellenstudien* II. *Zwölf Komponisten des XX. Jahrhundert*, hrsg. von Felix Meyer, Winterthur: Amadeus, 1993, pp. 39–72; Id., 'Zur Arbeitsweise Igor Strawinskys – dargestellt an der *Symphonie d'instrument à vent*', in: *Vom Einfall zum Kunstwerk. Der Kompositionsprozess in der Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts*, hrsg. von Hermann Danuser und Günter Katzenberger, Laaber: Laaber Verlag, 1993, pp. 161–185.

16 Rudolf Stephan, 'Der Neoklassizismus als Formalismus', in: *Funk-Kolleg Musik*, vol. 1, hrsg. von Carl Dahlhaus, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1981, pp. 307–331. See also Rudolf Stephan, 'Zur Deutung von Strawinskys Neoklassizismus', in: *Igor Strawinsky*, hrsg. von Heinz-Klaus Metzger und Rainer Riehn, München: Edition text+kritik, 1984 (Musik-Konzepte, 34/35), pp. 80–88; reprinted in: *Vom Musikalischen Denken: Gesammelte Vorträge*, hrsg. von Rainer Damm und Andreas Traub, Mainz: Schott, 1985, pp. 243–248.

17 See Gianfranco Vinay, *Stravinsky neoclassico. L'invenzione della memoria nel'900 musicale*, Venezia: Marsilio: 1987, p. 21.

18 Gianfranco Vinay, 'Le néoclassicisme et l'ubiquité culturelle de la Poétique musicale strawinskienne', in *Die Klassizistische Moderne,* pp. 35–54.

19 Igor Stravinsky, 'Some Ideas about My Octuor', *The arts*, 4-6 January 1924; original French text: 'Quelques idées à propos de mon Octuor' [1923], in: Dufour, *Confidences sur la musique*. pp. 61–67.

20 Maureen Carr, *After the Rite: Stravinsky's Path to neoclassicism (1914-1925)*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

21 Messing, *Neoclassicism in Music*, pp. 80–85.

22 Schloezer's first usage of the term 'neoclassicism' in connection to Stravinsky can be found in 'La musique', *Revue contemporaine*, 1 February 1923, p. 257 (also reprinted with the title 'Le couple Schoenberg-Stravinsky' in *La revue musicale*, 1 March 1923, p. 189). A few months later Schloezer used again the term in 'La saison musicale', *Nouvelle revue française*, 1 August 1923, pp. 238–248: 241. On Boris de Schloezer as an exegete of Stravinsky see Valérie Dufour, *Stravinski et ses exégètes (1910-1940)*, Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, pp. 107–134 (see in particular p. 129 on the shifting meanings of the term 'neoclassicism'). In the 1920s, alongside Schloezer, it was above all Arthur Lourié who contributed to linking the term 'neoclassical' to Stravinsky's compositions from those years.

23 Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno, *Philosophie der neuen Musik*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1949, Engl. translation: *Philosophy of New Music*, translated, edited, and with an introduction by Robert Hullot-Kentor, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2020. Adorno's view of neoclassicism as presented in *Philosophie der neuen Musik* can be traced back as early as an unpublished 1928 essay, titled 'Die stabilisierte Musik', (in: *Musikalische Schriften,* VI, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1984 [*Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. 18], pp. 721–728).

24 Danuser, 'Rewriting the Past'. See also Id., 'Einleitung', in: *Die Klassizistische Moderne*, pp. 11–20.

25 Lydia Goehr, 'Political Music and the Politics of Music', *The Journal of Aesthetic and Art Criticism*, LII/1, 1994, pp. 99–112: 105.

26 Steven Huebner, 'Ravel's Politics', *The Musical Quarterly,* XCVII/1, 2014, pp. 66–97: 91.

27 Pfitzner's ideas were articulated in the two polemical essays that had triggered the controversy with Busoni: *Futurinstengefahr* (1917) and *Die neue Aesthetik der musikalischen Impotenz* (1920). They were also implicitly expressed in the subject of his opera *Palestrina*, of 1917.

28 Arthur Lourié, 'Neogothic and Neoclassic', *Modern Music*, V/3, 1928, pp. 3–8. See Dufour, *Stravinski et ses exégètes*, pp. 93–97; Ead. '"Néo-gothique et néo-classique". Arthur Lourié et Jacques Maritain: aux origines idéologiques du conflit Stravinski-Schoenberg', in: *Musique, art et religion*, édité par Sylvain Caron et Michel Duchesneau, Lyon: Symétrie, pp. 31–41.

29 Stephen Hinton, *The Idea of* Gebrauchsmusik*: A Study of Musical Aesthetics in the Weimar Republic (1919–1933) with Particular Reference to the Works of Paul Hindemith*, New York and London: Garland, 1989.

30 See, e.g.: Susanna Pasticci, 'La presenza della fede nell'universo creativo di Igor Stravinskij' in: *Atti del Congresso internazionale di musica sacra in occasione del centenario di fondazione del PIMS*, a cura di Antonio Addamiano e Francesco Luisi, vol. 2, Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2013, pp. 1093–1113; Ead., *Sinfonia di Salmi: l'esperienza del sacro in Stravinskij*, Lucca: LIM, 2012, pp. 17–51; Tamara Levitz, *Modernist Mysteries:* Perséphone, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 117–181.

31 Taruskin, 'Back to Whom?', p. 299. Taruskin quotation is from Schoenberg's article 'National Music (2)' (1931), in: *Style and Idea, Selected Writings of Arnold Schoenberg*, ed. by Leonard Stein, transl. by Leo Black, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984, pp. 172–174: 173.

32 See Jane F. Fulcher, 'The Composer as Intellectual: Ideological Inscriptions in French Interwar Neoclassicism', *The Journal of Musicology*, XVII/2, 1999, pp. 197–230.

33 See for example Danuser, 'Einleitung', p. 17, who argues that no form of 'classical modernism' can be identified in Soviet Russia, since 'a classicist current – driven by Russian composers' need to align themselves with what was perceived as the dominant German instrumental tradition – extends into the twentieth century, and under Stalinism, classicist and monumental-romantic elements become intertwined.' Dansuer refers here to Andreas Wehrmeyer's essay, 'Aspekte klassizistischen Komponierens in der russischen Musik', in: *Die Klassizistische Moderne*, pp. 201–218.

34 See for example Volker Scherliess, *Neoklassizismus. Dialog mit der Geschichte*, Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1998, p. 133.

35 Danuser, 'Rewriting the Past', p. 280.

36 Messing, *Neoclassicism in Music*; Wheeldon, 'Anti-Debussyism and the Formation of French Neoclassicism'.

37 Lazzaro, 'Discussing (Neo)Classicism'.

38 Wheeldon, 'Anti-Debussyism and the Formation of French Neoclassicism', pp. 65–97.

39 See the homepage of Gallicagram (URL quoted in Flamions' article in this issue). A presentation of the API and additional literature on it is also quoted by Flamion.