Presented at the annual meeting of the American Musicological Society, November 2004, Seattle

The Mass Appeal of Shostakovich's Seventh Symphony

Dr. Terry Klefstad



Shostakovich's Seventh Symphony was first performed in the United States in a radio broadcast concert on July 19, 1942 by the NBC Symphony Orchestra under the direction of Arturo Toscanini.[1] This premiere was a coup for Toscanini; other conductors, especially Koussevitzky and Stokowski, had vied for this privilege. Toscanini at first did seem a strange choice, as the other two conductors were known champions of Shostakovich's music. But Toscanini had the power of NBC behind him, and had secured the performance rights before the symphony was even completed.

---

[1] Image from *Musical America* 64 (June 1944): 11. Reproduced with permission, courtesy of *Musical America* archives.

Stokowski protested in a now-famous letter, claiming his long championship of Shostakovich's music and Slavic blood as reasons why he should conduct the first performance in America. Toscanini would have none of it, and Stokowski did not even conduct the concert premiere—that honor was given to Koussevitzky in August 1942.[2]

The story of this famous scuffle affirms how important Shostakovich's Seventh Symphony was for Americans in 1942. It was a much anticipated work, and the American premiere was a highly prestigious event. Shostakovich was by then a familiar figure on the American symphonic stage. After the *Lacy Macbeth* scandal of 1936 (which was highly publicized in the American press) and the American premiere of his Fifth Symphony in 1938, the first performance of a new symphony by Shostakovich was considered an important event.

The Seventh had a special cachet for American audiences both because of its genesis and the contemporary political situation. Shostakovich had begun composing it in besieged Leningrad and completed it upon his evacuation to Kuybishev. He dedicated the symphony to his home town of Leningrad and promoted it as a work about the ongoing war. At the time of its premiere the United States and the Soviet Union were allies. This was a fairly recent development—the Soviet-Nazi pact of 1939 had brought about a period of tension in Soviet-U.S. relations, but Hitler's invasion of Russia in June 1941 had resulted in an alliance between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. By 1942, Americans were experiencing a renewed vogue for Russian culture. American audiences were thus primed to receive the "Leningrad Symphony" with all of the fervor and spirit that only wartime could bring.

---

[2] This story is related in biographies of both conductors: Oliver Daniel, *Stokowski: A Counterpoint of View* (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1982) and Joseph Horowitz, *Understanding Toscanini* (New York: Knopf, 1987).

The mass appeal of Shostakovich's "Blitz Symphony" for American audiences in 1942 was the result of more than just its context and program as a Russian war symphony. Shostakovich made a conscious effort to make his symphony accessible. His stated goal—to compose for his audiences and to be comprehensible to a wide variety of people—was not only congruent with the official Soviet policy of socialist realism, but also evidence that he had adopted the aesthetic of collectivist symphonism under the influence of his close friend Ivan Ivanovich Sollertinsky. The musical qualities of the symphony that made it accessible—grand gestures, broad melodies, and unison passages—were those that American critics pointed to as banal and pretentious.

Before American audiences and critics had even heard the Seventh, a wave of publicity in the American press prepared the way. Ten articles about the Seventh appeared in *The New York Times*, and promotional articles appeared in *The Musician, Musical America, Time,* and *The New Yorker*. This was an exceptional amount of advance publicity—an article or two in the *New York Times* was more typical for an American premiere of a new Shostakovich symphony. The earliest of these promotional articles, in February 1942, discussed preparations for the Kuybishev premiere (which took place on March 5). The subjects of other promotional articles ranged from discussions of the composer's biography to descriptions of the symphony's genesis and journey to the United States. Not only were Shostakovich's efforts as a fireman and trench digger in besieged Leningrad lauded, but the symphony itself took on an heroic aspect in the story of its journey: microfilmed in Moscow, taken by train to Kuybishev, by plane to Tehran, by automobile to Cairo, by plane to Brazil, and finally, New York.[3]

[3] "Symphony," *The New Yorker* 18 (July 18, 1942): 9. This route is mentioned in several articles of the time, but only *The New Yorker* mentions the Moscow to Kuibyshev leg.

Shostakovich's intentions for the symphony, even before it was complete, were transmitted to the American public by an interview with Ralph Parker, published in *The New York Times* in February 1942. This interview conveyed Shostakovich's belief that music could be a weapon of beauty against the ugliness of Fascism. Parker described Shostakovich as nervous and agitated, "pulling his cigarettes to pieces and stirring his glass of tea." Parker quoted the composer as he laid out a program for the work:

> "The first movement, he described as opening with a calm, lyrical exposition of a theme intended to describe the happy existences of 'ordinary, simple people' . . . 'just ordinary, good, quiet people, going about their daily lives . . .After this preliminary theme I introduce the main theme, which was inspired by the transformation of these ordinary people into heroes by the outbreak of war.' 'This builds up into a requiem for those of them who are perishing in the performance of their duty. In the first movement's final passages I introduce something very intimate, like a mother's tears over her lost children. It is tragic, but it finally becomes transparently clear.
>
> 'The scherzo and adagio movements are of an intermediate character, in which I am moved by the idea that war doesn't necessarily mean destruction of cultural values. The fourth movement can be described by one word—victory. But my idea of victory isn't something brutal; it's better explained as the victory of light over darkness, of humanity over barbarism, of reason over reaction.'"[4]

Shostakovich then offered Parker a sort of artistic manifesto:

> "I consider that every artist who isolates himself from the world is doomed. I find it incredible that an artist should want to shut himself away from the people, who, in the end, form his audience. I think an artist should serve the greatest number of people. I always try to make myself as widely understood as possible, and if I don't succeed I consider it's my own fault."[5]

---

[4] Ralph Parker, "Shostakovich, Composer, Explains His Symphony of Plain Man in War," *The New York Times* (February 9, 1942): 17.
[5] Ibid.

These passages were quoted frequently in subsequent promotional articles and reviews of various performances of the Seventh in America.

Shostakovich expanded his ideas on the role of art in wartime in an article published in *The New York Times* some months later, in June 1942.[6] Although this article did not specifically mention the Seventh Symphony, its topic was the dignity and beauty of Slavonic music during a time of war. Shostakovich lauded the indominatable will and spirit of Slavonic composers in their fight against the Fascists, whom he called a "dirty robber gang" and "the lowest, dirtiest, and vilest specimens." He wrote of art as a weapon of beauty against the ugliness of Fascism. These sentiments were reiterated in an article, also credited to Shostakovich, in the Communist *New Masses*. He wrote: "Art . . . became a new type of armament, striking the enemy."[7] He also quotes Pushkin's statement from *Mozart and Salieri:* "Genius and villany, the two are incompatible."

Two important themes resonate in Shostakovich's words in these two articles: first, continued artistic production was a valuable force for good in time of war, and second, an artist's responsibility was to compose for his audiences. American critics later expressed admiration for the embodiment of the first, in the form of a number of important works by Russian composers during WWII, but they suffered from an essential misunderstanding of the second point, interpreting this position to mean a "dumbing down" of symphonic language for the sake of being accessible.

Shostakovich's comments on the role of the composer and the symphony itself were an expression of the Soviet aesthetic of collective symphonism as espoused by Ivan

---

[6] Dmitri Shostakovich, "Stating the Case for Slavonic Culture," *The New York Times* (June 21, 1942): 28-29.

[7] Dmitri Shostakovich, "What I Believe," *New Masses* 44, no. 5 (August 4, 1942): 28-29. See also Laurel Fay, *Shostkovich: A Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 30.

Ivanovich Sollertinsky, Shostakovich's close friend and mentor. Sollertinsky had long championed the symphonies of Mahler as models of a music that drew its material from everyday life to create a 'collectivist' music.[8] At a 1935 conference on Soviet symphonism, he explained his theories on the Soviet symphony and Mahler as one possible solution to the problem of reconciling symphonic thought to the reigning doctrine of socialist realism. Mahler's symphonies, he said, were concerned with everyday life and ordinary people. They formed, after the tradition of Beethoven, a democratic and collectivist approach to the genre.[9] In 1941, Sollertinsky gave a speech at the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Union of Soviet Composers in which he traced a compositional line from Beethoven through Tchaikovsky and Mahler to Shostakovich. Beethoven, he said, established the "epic" symphonic type, which concerned the struggles of a variety of characters, "where the consciousness of not one but several human beings is given expression as they struggle against one another."[10] The epic, Sollertinsky said, was characterized by "lyrics that belong to the entire nation, and its culture."[11] Sollertinsky pointed to this type of symphony as the source for the future of Soviet music. He asserted that the Soviet symphony must be universal in scope.[12]

Shostakovich was familiar with and even admired these ideas; he referred to this very speech in a 1946 *Sov'etskaya Musika* article that commemorated Sollertinsky's life (on the second anniversary of his death). He wrote, among other things, that Sollertinsky's theories on the epic style of symphonism resulted in "the birth of quite a

---

[8] Pauline Fairclough, "The 'Perestroyka' of Soviet Symphonism: Shostakovich in 1935," *Music & Letters* Vol. 83, No. 2 (May 2002): 259-73.
[9] Fairclough, 264-65.
[10] Eric Roseberry, *Ideology, Style, Content, and Thematic Process in the Symphonies, Cello Concertos, and String Quartets of Shostakovich* (New York: Garland, 1989), 526.
[11] Ibid., 535.
[12] Ibid., 539.

few new genres and formations—an original, peculiar, mosaic-like monumentalism."[13] This was an apt description for his own music. He also remarked that Sollertinsky had "paved new creative paths for Soviet composers."[14] Shostakovich's assumption of Sollertinsky's epic/collectivist symphonic aesthetic seemed to be genuine and to move beyond the adherence to socialist realism that was required of him as a Soviet composer. In the case of his Seventh Symphony, it is clear from both his public comments and his general philosophy on the symphony itself that Shostakovich intended it to be a work that spoke with a collective voice to a wide audience.

In this, the Seventh was successful. American audiences received the symphony with "bravos," ovations, and cheers. Reviews of the broadcast premiere, which was performed for a studio audience, remarked upon the audience's enthusiasm. In *Time*, we read "The audience jumped up and cheered, as if it had just heard news of a Nazi defeat."[15] In a review of the concert premiere, Olin Downes described a ten-minute standing ovation.[16] At this concert and other performances that season, the audience applauded between the movements. When this happened in Boston, Koussevitzky, a conductor known for his intolerance of unruly audiences, "sanctioned the breach of custom."[17]

The audiences must have been ignoring the reviews. Most of the American critics found Shostakovich's Seventh as a symphony to be of very poor quality. This may have

---

[13] Ibid., 545.
[14] Ibid., 556.
[15] "Shostakovich and the Guns," *Time* 39 (July 20, 1942): 53.
[16] Olin Downes, "Shostakovich Seventh Receives First U.S. Concert Premiere," *The New York Times* (August 15, 1942): 12.
[17] L.A. Sloper, "Boston Symphony Season Opens," *Christian Science Monitor* (October 10, 1942). Courtesy of the Boston Symphony Orchestra archives, BPL #62.

been in part a reaction to the abundant advance publicity. Downes effectively summarized their complaints in a review of an October 1942 New York performance:

> The concensus was to the effect that the Shostakovich Seventh symphony was a work puffed and cannonaded into public attention for purposes of political propaganda; that the enormous publicity it received in advance of the hearing gave it a fictitious value for conductors and audiences, and that, inherently, the composition was inexcusably long, superficial in its contents, poorly put together and highly derivative from the music of other composers who had thoughtlessly anticipated Mr. Shostakovich's utterances; that, in short, its pretentions far exceeded its manufactured reputation and actual merit.[18]

On one level, critics resented the amount of attention given the symphony before it appeared on the American concert stage. On a deeper level, they disliked the symphony's status as political propaganda. Similar sentiments had been expressed in their reactions to Shostakovich's Fifth and Sixth Symphonies, which were also framed as "music for the masses," composed in compliance with official Soviet policy. This connection of political (i.e., Soviet) ideology and music was a source of angst for many American critics. Throughout the 1930s and 1940s, Downes in particular consistently argued against art based on political ideology; it was his chief complaint against Shostakovich, whom he thought otherwise a very talented composer.

Downes said that he had derived his consensus on the Seventh from published reviews in America, informal conversations with fellow critics, and reviews of the London premiere, which preceeded Toscanini's broadcast. The few critics who disagreed with Downes' evaluation were those who tended to focus on the program of the Seventh and offer little comment on the music.

---

[18] Olin Downes, "Essence of a Score: Toscanini's Treatment Casts New Light on Shostakovich Seventh," *The New York Times* (October 18, 1942), 7. Courtesy of the New York Philharmonic archives.

The mainstream critics, though, including Downes, Nicolai Nabokov, Oscar Thompson, Virgil Thomson, Miles Kastendieck [Brooklyn Eagle], and others, were fairly consistent in their comments: Shostakovich's Seventh was too long, poorly constructed, essentially shallow, and unoriginal. They linked these impressions to the Seventh's reputation as 'music for the masses.' For example, B.H. Haggin, writing for *The Nation,* noted that Shostakovich's obligation to compose ideological music for the masses resulted in a work "as pretentious in style as in length." He concluded that mass appeal did not necessarily make for good writing, and that an audience's reaction did not validate the symphony as a great work of art:

> Shostakovich can turn from the battlefield straight to his pen and paper; he can produce an hour-and-a-quarter-long symphony that expresses, in terms which the Russian masses can understand, the struggle and final victory of humanity over barbarism as they imagine and feel it; his symphony can move listeners in other countries by its associations with events in which their emotions are involved; but what plays on their emotions about the sufferings and heroism of the Russian people is an excessively long piece of bad music.[19]

Nicolai Nabokov, like the other critics, blamed the Seventh's musical weaknesses on Shostakovich's choice of overly simplistic musical language. He found the absence of "complex polyphonic development" unsettling: "The symphony consists either in long passages of rather thin two-part writing, or in noisy and not too original chord progressions. Often the noisiest parts which seem so complex are in reality nothing but chord-stuffing of very banal melodic lines."[20] Nabokov wrote that he would like to reduce the work to 20-25 minutes, "deleting some of the most commonplace parts."

---

[19] B.H. Haggin, "Music," *The Nation* Vol. 155, No. 7 (August 15, 1942): 138.
[20] Nicolai Nabokov, "Shostakovich's Seventh," *The New Republic* 107 (August 3, 1942): 144.

Other critics had similar reactions. Oscar Thompson commented that the Seventh was "full of tricks and devices," and that he could not find "one superior idea."[21] Virgil Thomson simply called the work "easy listening."[22] He remarked that it would be easier to listen to if it were accompanied by a film.

In addition to the length and perceived simplistic approach, the most common complaint in American reviews of the Seventh concerned Shostakovich's borrowing of musical styles, gestures, and even literal passages from other composers. For example, the long crescendo of the invasion theme over an ostinato accompaniment was seen as a direct borrowing from Ravel's *Bolero*.[23] The beginning of this passage also bears an uncanny resemblance to the violin pizzicato from the second movement of Sibelius's Fifth Symphony.[24] Most found these quotations to be evidence of a lack of originality and artistic depth. Nabokov, for example, asked: "Is it necessary to employ an eclectic style combining all kinds of clichés like those found in Tchaikovsky's *Overture of 1812,* the *Heldenleben* of Richard Strauss, and the *Bolero* of Ravel?" No, he answered. "The banality, even the tediousness, of this method tends to reveal too clearly Shostakovich's weak point: his lack of genuine melodic invention."[25] The ubiquitous references to works of other composers, and later, even his own work, gradually became a hallmark of Shostakovich's style, and not necessarily part of his collectivist aesthetic. But it was a quality that American critics again and again found symptomatic of weak writing.

---

[21] Oscar Thompson, "Shostakovich Seventh has Premiere," *Musical America* 62 (August 1942): 4.
[22] Virgil Thomson, "Imperfect Workmanship," *New York Herald-Tribune* (October 15, 1942), 8. Courtesy of the New York Philharmonic archives.
[23] Thompson, Nabokov, Haggin, Stefan
[24] Thompson, Haggin, O'Gorman, and Downes
[25] Nabokov, 144.

And yet, for all of these complaints of excessive length, simplistic style, and compositional kleptomania, none accused Shostakovich of not accomplishing his stated goal to be understood by everyone. The essential problem behind the American critics' dislike of Shostakovich's Seventh Symphony was their misunderstanding of Soviet collective symphonism. When Shostakovich told Ralph Parker, "I always try to make myself as widely understood as possible, and if I don't succeed I consider it's my own fault," he was claiming kinship to the Beethovenian symphonic tradition, not merely submitting to the power of Soviet authorities, as Downes claimed he was.[26] In his pre-broadcast essay, Downes provided some context for the Seventh as "music for the masses;" he recalled the *Lady Macbeth* struggle and Shostakovich's return to favor with his Fifth Symphony, which was widely recognized as a work of socialist realism. He wrote: "The cry was now for simplification of musical speech, for a music which should be readily grasped by the mass of the people, a theory to which Shostakovich has heartily subscribed."[27] But Shostakovich had something different in mind. In his article on Slavonic culture, he referred to Tchaikovsky as Beethoven's true symphonic heir because he added a lyricism and depth of emotional expression that made the symphony, which he called "that most complex form of musical art," more accessible.[28] To Shostakovich, then, the act of composing a symphony "for the masses" was not only one of submission to the Soviet policy of socialist realism (though it certainly was that); it was also a confirmation of his heritage as a symphonic composer and heir to Beethoven, Mahler,

---

[26] Olin Downes, "Shostakovich: Place of Soviet Composer Whose Seventh Symphony is Due Here," *The New York Times* (July 12, 1942): 5.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Shostakovich, "Stating the Case."

and Tchaikovsky. What greater collective "epic" struggle could one depict than that of a most horrible war?

The most obviously "simplistic" passages in the Seventh, for example, the broad opening melody in unison strings and the seemingly endless repetitions of the invasion theme, were those most important to the war program. These passages disappointed the American critics who perceived the Seventh to be primarily a work of political propaganda. They attempted to approach the Seventh as absolute music, apart from its war program, and in doing so, discovered a rather banal piece of music. But ignoring the program was contrary to Shostakovich's intentions. He had composed what he labelled a "Blitz symphony," a weapon in the war against Fascism.

The Seventh could not be separated from its time or context—Shostakovich's audiences recognized that, and even the most skeptical critics could not deny its profound emotional impact. It was only within the context of the war that the Seventh appeared to American audiences to be a monumental work. The Seventh was the perfect union of content and form, in that sense. It served as a monument to the spirit of the Soviet people, and war monuments are carved in marble or cast in bronze—heavy, massive, and easy to recognize.

American critics predicted that the Seventh would quickly fall out of the regular performing repertoire, and it did. Performance records of the New York Philharmonic Symphony show six performances in 1942, four performances in 1962, and then a revival in 1990. Records from other orchestral archives [Boston and Philadelphia] show even fewer performances after the 1942-43 season. As the symphony became more separated

from its context, interest in it waned. No one would ever hear it in the same way that its first audiences, caught in the middle of a terrible war, did. The "Leningrad" was a symphony for its time, and even Downes eventually (by his fourth review) came to acknowledge that. He remarked that Shostakovich was composing for the Russian people, who were suffering in the middle of a war, while Americans sat comfortably in their theater seats and criticized the Seventh according to its artistic merits. Although he did not even then call the Seventh a masterwork, he wrote:

> "Nevertheless, back of this symphony of Shostakovich is the reality and stress of these times, and the unsophisticated, dirty supplications and dreams and furies of a people who have neither the time for nor need of art for art's sake."[29]

[29] Downes, "Essence of a Score."

Table 1: Early performances in America of the Seventh Symphony

Date	Orchestra	Conductor	Event
July 19, 1942	NBC Symphony Orchestra	Toscanini	Broadcast premiere
August 14, 1942	Tanglewood Student Orchestra	Koussevitzky	Concert premiere
October 9, 1942	Boston Symphony Orchestra	Koussevitzky	Boston premiere
October 14, 1942	Philharmonic-Symphony Society (New York)	Toscanini	New York premiere

On the Seventh Symphony:

February 9, 1942
Parker, Ralph. "Shostakovich, Composer, Explains His Symphony of Plain Man in War." *The New York Times*.

February 15, 1942
"Footnotes on Headliners: Symphony." *The New York Times*, sec. 4.

February 16, 1942
"Music: Soviet's Best Bet." *Time* 39: 81-82.

April 5, 1942
Parker, Ralph. "Shostakovich—A Major Voice of the Soviets." *The New York Times*, sec. 8.

April 1942
Rabinovich, D., and S. Shlifstein. "Pens Victory Symphony During Darkest Hour." *The Musician*. 47: 55, 58. Also published as "Shostakovich Seventh Symphony Has Premiere in Russia." *Musical America* 62 (March 10, 1942): 7.

June 16, 1942
"Koussevitsky Gets Shostakovich 7th." *The New York Times*.

June 17, 1942
"City to Hear Soviet Work." *The New York Times*.

June 21, 1942
"Asides of the Concert and Opera Worlds: Delivering a Score in Microfilm from Soviet Union by Air." *The New York Times*, sec. 8.

Shostakovich, Dmitri. “Stating the Case for Slavonic Culture.” *The New York Times*, sec. 8.

July 12, 1942
Downes, Olin. “Shostakovich: Place of Soviet Composer Whose Seventh Symphony is Due Here.” *The New York Times*, sec. 8.

July 18, 1942
“Symphony.” *The New Yorker* 18: 9.

July 19, 1942
Selby, John. “Toscanini to Pay Tribute to Russians:To Conduct Symphony Written Under Fire of Nazi Guns.” *St. Joseph, Missouri News Press.*

July 20, 1942
“Shostakovich and the Guns.” *Time* 39: 53.

July 26, 1942
Downes, Olin. “Second View of a Symphony.” *The New York Times*, sec. 8.

July 27, 1942
“Premiere of the Year.” *Newsweek.* 20: 66.

July 1942
Slonimsky, Nicolas. “Dmitri Dmitrievitch Shostakovitch.” *The Musical Quarterly* 28, no. 3: 415-44.

August 3, 1942
“Shostakovich: U.S. Hears his Seventh Symphony Written During Leningrad Siege.” *Life* 13: 35-36.

August 4, 1942
Grennard, Elliott. “Shostakovich’s Music.” *New Masses*, 29.

August 15, 1942
Downes, Olin. “Shostakovich Seventh Receives First U.S. Concert Premiere.” *The New York Times.*

October 15, 1942
Biancolli, Louis. “Blitz Symphony.” *Telegram.* Courtesy of the New York Philharmonic archives.

August 3, 1942
Nabokov, Nicolai. “Shostakovich’s Seventh.” *The New Republic* 107: 144.

August 4, 1942

Shostakovich, Dmitri. "What I Believe." *New Masses* 44: 28-29.

August 15, 1942
Haggin, B.H. "Music." *The Nation*. 155: 138.

August 1942
Thompson, Oscar. "Shostakovich Seventh has Premiere." *Musical America* 62: 4.

September 3, 1942
"John G. Paine Scores Critics, Conductors." *The New York Times*.

September 1942
Rothe, Friede F. "Berkshire Festival Ends with Shostakovich 7th." *Musical America* 62: 5.

October 10, 1942
Sloper, L.A. "Boston Symphony Season Opens." *Christian Science Monitor*. Courtesy of the Boston Symphony Orchestra archives, BPL #62.
"Symphony Concert." *Boston Herald*. Courtesy of the Boston Symphony Orchestra archives, BPL #62.

October 15, 1942
Kastendieck, Miles. "Shostakovich Seventh Has Concert Premiere." *Brooklyn Eagle*. Courtesy of the New York Philharmonic archives.
O'Gorman, Edward. "Toscanini Leads Seventh Symphony of Shostakovich." *New York Post*. Courtesy of the New York Philharmonic archives.
Stefan, Paul "Critics vs. Public: Shostakovitch and his 'Music with a Message.'" *Musical Courier* 126, no. 4: 5, 13.
Thompson, Oscar. "Toscanini Leads Shostakovich 7th." *New York Sun*. Courtesy of the New York Philharmonic archives.
Thomson, Virgil. "Imperfect Workmanship." *New York Herald-Tribune*. Courtesy of the New York Philharmonic archives.

October 17, 1942
Biancolli, Louis. "Is Narrative Guide Aid to Listener? New Shostakovich Symphony Revives Debated Question." *Telegram*. Courtesy of the New York Philharmonic archives.
Thompson, Oscar. "Shostakovich Vogue: Several Questions Concerning the Soviet Composer and His 'Mass Appeal.'" *New York Sun*. Courtesy of the New York Philharmonic archives.

October 18, 1942
Downes, Olin. "Shostakovich 7th Wins Ovation Here." *The New York Times*, sec. 8. Courtesy of the New York Philharmonic archives.

Downes, Olin. "Essence of a Score: Toscanini's Treatment Casts New Light on Shostakovich Seventh." *The New York Times*, sec. 8. Courtesy of the New York Philharmonic archives.

October 1942
Stutsman, Grace May. "Season Launched by Koussevitzky: Boston Symphony Opens 62nd Year with Beethoven and Shostakovich Works." *Musical America* 62: 4.

November 9, 1942
"Shostakovich's Seventh: The Russian composer's newest symphony has become a symbol of the Soviet's brave fight." *Life* 13: 99-100.

December 4, 1942
Thompson, Oscar. "Shostakovich 7th Led by Rodzinski." *New York Sun*. Courtesy of New York Philharmonic Archives.

February 7, 1943
Parker, Ralph. "The Symphonist of Russia's Travail." *The New York Times Magazine*.

February 10, 1943
Slonimsky, Nicolas. "Soviet Music at Quarter-Century Mark." *Musical America* 63: 20.

August 15, 1943
"Shostakovich and Sonya." *Newsweek* 22: 80.

February 7, 1944
Berger, Arthur. "Music in Wartime." *The New Republic* 110: 175-78.

December 2, 1944
Thompson, Dorothy. "The Return to the Grand Manner: 'An Heroic Age Calls for Heroic Expression.'" *The Saturday Review of Literature* 27: 9-10.

On Shostakovich, Sollertinsky, and collective symphonism:

Fairclough, Pauline. "The 'Perestroyka' of Soviet Symphonism: Shostakovich in 1935." *Music & Letters* Vol. 83, No. 2 (May 2002): 259-73.

Roseberry, Eric. *Ideology, Style, Content, and Thematic Process in the Symphonies, Cello Concertos, and String Quartets of Shostakovich*. New York: Garland, 1989. See Appendices A, B, and C.