

English Cosmopolitanism and Postcolonial Anxiety

The Symphony and Anglo-American Relations

Joanne Cormac

The tension between foreign influence and the struggle to assert an independent American identity plays a central role in narratives tracing the development of the symphony in America. The end point of these narratives is the establishment of successful, prestigious symphony orchestras, comprising largely German orchestral musicians, performing imported programmes dominated by Austro-German symphonists. These orchestras were led by conductors whose »German« identity was crucial to their acceptance and mystique, including namely Theodore Eisfeld, Carl Bergmann, Theodore Thomas, Leopold Damrosch, Arthur Seidl, Wilhelm Gericke, and Arthur Nikisch among many others.¹ This dominance of German symphonic music in the Northeast came at the expense of American composers and musicians who increasingly felt they were squeezed out of the musical scene. In these narratives, the increasing German influence on musical life in Northeast America is both symbolised and catalysed by the establishment of the New York Philharmonic society, which offered little support to American composers, despite a clause in its charter to this effect.² By the last decades of the 19th century, symphonic music was closely associated with »Germanness.«³

-
- 1 Not all were of German origin or nationality (Seidl and Nikisch were Hungarian), but it was important for American audiences that they were perceived so. For a full discussion of the concept of »German« identity in relationship to orchestral musicians and conductors in America see Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht, *Sound Diplomacy: Music and Emotions in Transatlantic Relations, 1850–1920* (Chicago, IL, 2009), 84–107.
 - 2 Article VII stated »If any grand orchestral compositions, such as overtures, or symphonies, shall be presented to the Society, they being composed in this country, the Society shall perform one every season.« Philharmonic Society of New York (1843), »Construction and By-Laws 1 April 1843–30 April 1843«, Board of Directors Records, Folder 717–01-01, p.14, New York Philharmonic Shelby White & Leon Levy Digital Archives, <https://archives.nyphil.org/index.php/artifact/db938eeb-006a-4c08-b3a5-c5526a251b83-0.1> (accessed February 14, 2023).
 - 3 Gienow-Hecht, *Sound Diplomacy*, 84–107; Joseph Horowitz, *Classical Music in America: a History of its Rise and Fall* (New York, 2007), 27.

Undoubtedly, such German influence was central to the establishment of concert life in 19th-century America. However, for a significant period of the century, the story of the development of the symphony in America is rather more cosmopolitan and pan-European than established narratives suggest.⁴ It is as much a story of how Americans both adopted and reacted against English influences and the negotiation of a postcolonial relationship, for example, as it is a story of the impact of the German-speaking immigrant community. Long-standing international networks that had survived both the American revolution and the war of 1812,⁵ meant that 19th-century England and America were connected through shared culture, religion, social networks (particularly marriage), language, trade relationships, and print cultures, which made English newspapers widely available in the new world. At the same time, modern technological innovations further strengthened these connections. Communication technologies improved considerably (undersea cables successfully traversed the Atlantic from 1866), and the invention of the steamship made regular transatlantic crossings possible from 1838. These connections made England a key supplier of music, musical instruments, and music criticism during the first half of the 19th century. England also offered musicians a cultural, and sometimes also a physical bridge, between Europe and America: a place to visit first before continuing onto the Continent (and this worked in both directions). England was a vital stopping point for those undertaking musical studies and for touring musicians. The Germania Orchestra, for example, initially visited London for three months before undertaking its long tours in America. Similarly, Louis Jullien left Paris for London, building up his reputation as a conductor there and touring around the British Isles with his promenade orchestra, before attempting to cross the Atlantic. He prepared the way for his visit to New York by publishing fantastical biographical extracts in the British press, which were reprinted in American newspapers.⁶

-
- 4 For example, Horowitz emphasises the influence of German musicians on the development of American instrumental music in *Classical Music in America*. His chapters on the Boston Symphony Orchestra and the New York Philharmonic emphasise the Germanic repertoire and personnel involved in these organisations. The trajectory of the book as a whole charts the ›rise and fall‹ of Classical music America because a home-grown tradition failed to take root while musical institutions remained ›irredeemably Eurocentric.‹ (p. xiii).
 - 5 For a fascinating discussion of the role of old international networks against the context of nationalism and imperialism see Christopher A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World 1780–1914* (Oxford, 2004), especially 234 as regards England and America.
 - 6 *A Sketch of the Life of Jullien* appeared in the *Musical World* in May, June and July 1853 prior to his departure for America. The piece was written for circulation in America as advance advertisement. Adam Carse, *The Life of Jullien: Adventurer, Showman-Conductor and Establisher of the Promenade Concerts in England, together with a history of those concerts up to 1895* (Cambridge, 1951), 18.

The postcolonial relationship was not always an easy one, however. In the early 19th century, Anglo-Americans vacillated between a desire to impress the British, coveting British imports, ideas, and culture as a means of cultural distinction, and a desire for freedom and independence, and to be taken seriously by the old world.⁷ Even so, multiple points of connection and a continued respect for Great Britain, meant that English practices and tastes had a far greater influence on symphonic life than might otherwise be expected, given the lack of a native symphonic tradition in England, and the greater proficiency of the orchestra of the Paris Conservatoire or the Leipzig Gewandhaus than the Philharmonic Society of London.⁸ English influences (themselves cosmopolitan, shaped by engagement with French, Italian and Austro-German music, musicians, and practices) informed repertoire choices, the setting up of concert-giving bodies, and musical criticism in Northeast America during the first half of the 19th century. However, England's influence was not always compatible with the values that Anglo-Americans prized and felt made their new country unique.

Alongside the influences of German and English models, American critics and composers grappled with the question of American national music identity.⁹ Many critics believed that America should adopt European music by performing »universal« European masterworks, or composing new works in imitation of them, rather than forging its own compositional path. Others were set on developing an independent American voice.¹⁰ Indeed, some felt that as America's republican democratic political system was exceptional and a model to the world, its musical life should develop along similar exceptional lines.¹¹ A deep-rooted tension between America's difference from the old world in its political aspirations and its reliance on the old world for its culture underpinned these musical debates and Americans' anxieties about their interstitial national identity.

7 See Kariann Akemi Yokota, *Unbecoming British: How Revolutionary America became a Postcolonial Nation* (Oxford, 2011) for a detailed discussion of how America negotiated its postcolonial identity and navigated and perceived its continued economic and cultural relationship to Britain following American independence.

8 This perception was widely acknowledged on the Continent at the time. See Joanne Cormac, »Between Beethoven and Mendelssohn: Biographical Constructions of Berlioz in the London Press« *19th-Century Music* 44/2 (2020), 80–99, 81. For a contemporary example from a foreign observer see Hans von Bülow, in *The Musical World* (1871), December 29, 859–60.

9 Douglas Shadle has discussed this in detail in *Orchestrating the Nation: The Nineteenth-Century American Symphonic Enterprise* (Oxford, 2016).

10 See Betty E. Chmaj, »Fry versus Dwight: American Music's Debate over Nationality« in *American Music* 3, no. 1 (1985), 63–84. Shadle discusses these different schools of thought throughout his book. See for example, Shadle, *Orchestrating the Nation*, 33.

11 For example, see P. K. D., »Letter from Boston« *New York Musical World and Times* 9, no. 7 (1854), 77.

This paper examines how America's postcolonial relationship to England during the first half of the 19th century shaped American attitudes to symphonic music. It begins by establishing the role of English influences on musical tastes, programming strategies, and on the development of American concert-giving institutions in the Northeast. It then examines how the postcolonial relationship developed at mid-century, with reference to press responses to the establishment of the New York Philharmonic. The final part frames the reception of the first »national« American symphonies composed by William Henry Fry and George Frederick Bristow within a postcolonial context. The paper argues that when Fry's and Bristow's symphonies were performed by Louis Jullien's visiting orchestra, Jullien successfully marketed the performances by appealing to his Anglo-American audience's colonial heritage. Overall, the paper positions symphonic concerts as a site in which postcolonial anxieties and identities were negotiated and performed.

English Musical influence in New England

Before Continental European musicians began to emigrate to America in large numbers, musical life was dominated by English puritan settlers who brought with them English publications of sacred music, namely psalms, hymns, and anthems.¹² In the 18th and early 19th centuries Boston developed into an important centre for musical trade and performance. Its English settlers retained close commercial ties with England, and an interest in its culture and politics. Accordingly, New England initially exhibited similar musical concerns to those of England, where musical traditions centred on Protestantism and community worship. These traditions involved communal singing at church and at large festivals. Similarly, musical life in New England was mostly dominated by sacred music.¹³ The state of American church music, the reform of psalmody and hymn tunes, and the role of instrumental music in church were central concerns in the Boston musical press in the early decades of the century.¹⁴

12 Frédéric-Louis Ritter, *Music in America* (New York, NY, 1883), 98.

13 Sacred music societies, such as New York's, were some of the earliest American music societies in existence, alongside the Handel and Haydn Societies of New York and Boston.

14 These questions were regularly debated in John Rowe Parker's *The Euterpeiad, or Musical Intelligencer*, the earliest American music periodical printed in Boston from April 1820 until June 1823. For example, the 27 January 1821 issue carried a substantial piece advocating the propriety of instrumental music for performance in church. See »Is Instrumental Music admissible in Christian Worship?« in *The Euterpeiad*, 1, no. 44 (1821), 174. The 27 October 1821 issue urged the importance of »improving the present state of psalmody.« See »Psalmody« in *The Euterpeiad*, 2, no. 16 (1821), 124.

Collections of sacred music, many originating in England, were regularly advertised in John Rowe Parker's *The Euterpeiad, or Musical Intelligencer*, the earliest American music periodical printed in Boston from April 1820 until June 1823. They provided an important means by which symphonies travelled to America from England in the first few decades of the 19th century in adaptations as hymn tunes. For example, the hymn tune settings of Englishmen William Gardiner and Arthur Clifton were popular in New England.¹⁵ Gardiner's hymn arrangements based on the music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven entitled *Sacred Melodies* (published in 1810 with a second volume appearing in 1815) quickly found an audience in America. This was possible due to the longstanding transatlantic print cultures connecting London and Boston, which ensured that New England stayed up-to-date with English fashions. Alongside advertisements and discussion of sacred music collections, *The Euterpeiad* regularly printed musical supplements, comprising sheet music for songs, ballads, and hymns, including Gardiner's settings.¹⁶ Gardiner's approach was cosmopolitan, drawing on a wide range of music, and adapting and arranging it as he saw fit, with few qualms about respecting the composers' intentions. He employed »agents« on the Continent to procure him materials »as they appeared.«¹⁷ In this way, Gardiner's arrangements became an early route of dissemination for symphonies from the Continent travelling to England and from there, mediated via Gardiner's arrangements, to America.

English influences can be found not only in church music, but also in concert life in 19th-century New England. There are striking parallels between musical taste in London and Philadelphia in the early decades of the 19th century. This is evident in the programmes of the Musical Fund Society of Philadelphia (founded in 1820).¹⁸ The repertoire choices reflect English tastes for a cosmopolitan mixture of genres and nationalities. Ballads and glees with a decidedly British flavour featured regularly, including glees by English composers, particularly Bishop and Balfe, and Scot-

15 Clifton had fled London in disgrace in 1817 and settled in Baltimore. In 1819 he published his *Original Collection of Psalm Tunes* based on European Classical music. For details see Peter Mercer-Taylor, *Gems of Exquisite Beauty: How Hymnody Carried Classical Music to America* (Oxford, 2020), especially 14, 38.

16 Teacher and composer Amos Albee sent John Rowe Parker a piece from Gardiner's *Sacred Melodies* for him to print in *The Euterpeiad*. Amos Albee, Letter from Amos Albee to John Rowe Parker (1 November 1820), John Rowe Parker Correspondence, 1802–1840 (Ms. Coll. 186., Box 1, Folder 5), Kislak Center for Special Collections, Rare Books and Manuscripts, University of Pennsylvania.

17 William Gardiner, *Music and Friends; or Pleasant Recollections of a Dilettante* (London, 1838), 846.

18 For an account of the founding of the Society and an overview of the performances given up until the 1880s, see William L. Mactier, *A Sketch of the Musical Fund Society of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, PA, 1885).

tish and Irish airs and melodies,¹⁹ all of which remained popular well into the 1840s and 50s. Other favourite composers heard in Philadelphia that were also popular in England include Auber, Moscheles, Hummel, Romberg, George Macfarren, Kalliwoda, Mayseder, and Weber, drawing together composers and styles from France, Germany, Austria, and England.²⁰

It is against this backdrop of English-inflected cosmopolitanism that the performances of symphonies by the Musical Fund Society of Philadelphia should be understood. The symphony was one part of this broadly »European« music, and not yet closely identified with German national identity. The symphonies available to and performed in the early decades of the Musical Fund Society were the »characteristic« symphonies of the late 18th century and early 19th centuries. These symphonies employed recognisable musical topics, such as pastoral, hunt, or storm topics, to depict a subject, character, or emotion specified by a text or title.²¹ Characteristic symphonies were a product of central Europe, especially the Habsburg Empire. Given the cosmopolitan nature of the empire, they were not associated with a single national identity, and were, in fact, composed by Austrian, Italian, German, French, Bohemian, Dutch, English, and Spanish composers.²² Furthermore, their musical language formed from easily recognisable topics crossed national borders.

Symphonies were relatively rare in the repertoire of the Musical Fund Society in the 1820s and 30s. They were performed with increasing regularity from the 1840s onwards, though in arrangements for different chamber groupings, and often excerpted. The symphonies that were performed were all hugely popular in London. Haydn's music formed a key part of the symphonic repertoire in the early years, namely his *Military Symphony* (performed 1836),²³ his *Symphony No. 97* (1841),²⁴ and his *Surprise Symphony* (1844).²⁵ The Society was eager to perform Beethoven's sym-

19 For example, see the programme of 11 November 1841, which included English glees by the Earl of Mornington and Whitaker. Programme (11 November 1841), Musical Fund Society Collection (Ms. Coll. 513 Musical Fund Society Supplementary Records, c.1820-2004 Scrapbook, Box 32), Kislak Center for Special Collections, Rare Books and Manuscripts, University of Pennsylvania (Hereafter MFSSR).

20 A Kalliwoda overture opened the second half of the concert of 26 April 1840. Programme (26 April 1840), MFSSR. The 1846/47 season also regularly featured Weber's *Jubilee Overture*.

21 See Richard Will, *The Characteristic Symphony in the Age of Haydn and Beethoven* (Cambridge, 2002) for a discussion of these features.

22 See the »Appendix 1: Index of Characteristic Symphonies« in Will, *The Characteristic Symphony*, 249–93.

23 Programme (8 December 1836), MFSSR.

24 Programme (11 November 1841), MFSSR.

25 Programme (30 September 1844), MFSSR. Only one movement was performed of this symphony by a touring group of Swiss bell ringers, the Campanologian Band.

phonies, but kept to the first (1821 and 1845)²⁶ and second, the *Pastoral* (1837),²⁷ and the *Eroica* (1846)²⁸ all of which exhibited mimetic features associated with the Characteristic Symphony. The Society also performed Andreas Jakob Romberg's *Sinfonia in E* in its inaugural concert.²⁹ Romberg was also a favourite in London, his symphonies performed several times by the Philharmonic Society in the 1820s, 30s and 40s.

When the Musical Fund Society was established, London was a key supplier of music and musical instruments to New England. Every issue of *The Euterpeiad* contained multiple adverts for new music and instruments »of the London make« or »just received by the London packet.« London was a watchword for quality, taste, and fashion. For example, I. E. Glover's musical establishment advertised that »The above instruments are selected by one of the most experienced Agents in London, and constantly received spring and fall.«³⁰ Similarly, the Franklin Music Warehouse advertised that it had recently received from London »new and fashionable music of every description.«³¹ The supply of music and instruments from London was similar to the regular supply of other London products, such as clothes and furniture.

In its early decades, the Musical Fund Society of Philadelphia was supplied with much of its music through New England music shops and publishers, which in turn were supplied by London, and by members of the Society returning from visits to London. However, the minutes of the Society show that the Society began to cut out England and go direct to Leipzig-based publisher Breitkopf & Härtel to expand its symphonic repertoire from around 1840 onwards. From this time, the Society's conductor, Leopold Meignen, had an important influence in shifting Philadelphian programming strategies away from variety programmes mostly featuring vocal music, to emphasising instrumental works, particularly Beethoven's symphonies.³² On 22 December 1846, the Society gave Beethoven's *Eroica* symphony for the first time. Interestingly, the printed programme was redesigned to look more Germanic with the use of Fraktur font for the titles of works.³³ However, even though the shift towards Germanicism and away from English cosmopolitanism in terms of

26 Mactier, *A Sketch of the Musical Fund Society of Philadelphia* (as in fn. 18), 8. Mactier writes that the symphony was performed on 24 April 1821. At this time only the first movement was performed. See also the full performance advertised in 1845: Programme (28 January 1845), MFSSR.

27 Programme (17 February 1837), MFSSR.

28 Programme (22 December 1846), MFSSR.

29 Mactier, *A Sketch of the Musical Fund Society of Philadelphia*, 8.

30 Advertisement, *The Euterpeiad*, 22, no. 2 (1822), 175.

31 Advertisement, *The Euterpeiad*, 32, no. 1 (1820), 124.

32 Shadle, *Orchestrating the Nation* (as in fn. 9), 58.

33 Programme (22 December 1846), MFSSR.

symphonic repertoire became more pronounced as the years progressed, the programmes continued to show the continuing influence of English tastes, through the considerable emphasis of Italian opera, English ballads, and other vocal music. Programming trends did not change significantly through the 1850s. They continued to feature a mixture of orchestral works from different national traditions.

London's »Sister Society«

Established in 1842, the New York Philharmonic emerged during a time when English influences were competing with other nationalities for dominance in the realm of symphonic performances, and the impact of German musicians was beginning to be felt. A significant proportion of the orchestra's musicians (more than forty per cent) were of German origin and the language could be heard spoken in the audience, a significant proportion of which was made up of the musicians' families, friends, and pupils.³⁴ Even so, the orchestra represented a multicultural mixture, with 22 Germans, 13 Americans, 11 English, four French and two Italians. The audience was similarly mixed, with concerts attended by any of the multicultural population interested in music.³⁵

The three conductors who led the first concert represented different factions in the city. Ureli Corelli Hill was a native-born American and had studied in Kassel with Louis Spohr.³⁶ A respected musician and concert organiser, he had previously played violin in the short-lived second New York Philharmonic (established 1824). Henry Timm was an accompanist, chorus master and conductor from Hamburg. Although the majority of New York's German population remained culturally segregated from the rest of the city, Timm traversed different communities and was accepted by the local intelligentsia.³⁷ Finally, D. G. Etienne was French and represented a »small but vigorous French clique«³⁸ that was jealous of the German influence on New York's musical life. Etienne had conducted the previous 1824 iteration of the New York Philharmonic. This selection of conductors suggests that the Society aimed to bring together and harmonise the different cliques and factions of the multicultural city, and their various national and cultural identities. This aim perhaps influenced the

34 Howard Shanet, *Philharmonic: A History of New York's Orchestra* (New York, 1975), 3 and Ritter, *Music in America* (as in fn. 12), 248.

35 Ritter, *Music in America*, 342.

36 For more details on Hill's activities during this time see Barbara Haws, »Ureli Corelli Hill: An American Musician's European Travels and the Creation of the New York Philharmonic« in *American Orchestras in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. John Spitzer (Chicago, IL etc. 2012), 348–64.

37 Shanet, *Philharmonic*, 61.

38 Shanet, *Philharmonic*, 8.

thinking of a reviewer for the *New York Herald* who urged that the New York Philharmonic Society should »communicate programmes to subscribers a few days before the concert in at least one English, German and French paper.«³⁹

Despite the multicultural make-up of the orchestra's musicians and leaders, comparisons between the New York Philharmonic and the Philharmonic Society of London were plentiful when the younger Society was first established. The *Albion* journal described the New York Philharmonic Society as »an attempt to form an approved school of instrumental music in this country after the manner and upon the principles of the celebrated Philharmonic Society of London« going on to name London's Philharmonic its »sister society.«⁴⁰ An earlier society for instrumental music, the Euterpean Society, had also previously been associated with the London Philharmonic in the American imagination, with one critic writing, »We wish to see it [the Euterpean Society] become the Philharmonic of this London of America.«⁴¹

London's Philharmonic Society continued to act as a model for New York's, or at least the younger Society continued to be measured against it, for the first few years of its existence. For example, in 1847 the *United States Magazine and Democratic Review* cited the English press's approval of a recent New York Philharmonic performance, and suggested the Society emulate London's practice of hiring a single permanent conductor. However, the paper also noted how the British system might not be compatible with the progressive American political system:

Perhaps an American Philharmonic might think a perpetual directorship too dictatorial – too much of a one-man power to establish. But democracy however excellent elsewhere, has no place in the orchestra. Let this society but elect a man whom their own judgment will point out to them as the fittest for their constant director... and they will resume the progressive march in which we are sorry to say they have halted...⁴²

During its first decade the New York Philharmonic selected similar symphonies to those performed by the Philharmonic Society of London. Alongside Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, the New York Philharmonic regularly performed symphonies by contemporaries Mendelssohn and Louis Spohr, composers with famously strong ties to Britain. The Philharmonic Society of London commissioned works from both composers and hosted them multiple times as performers and conductors. Both

39 »Second Concert of the Philharmonic Society of New York« in *New York Herald*, June 20, 1845.

40 »Concerts« in *The Albion: A Journal of News, Politics, and Literature* 1, no. 40 (1842), 591.

41 Quoted in Ritter, *Music in America* (as in fn. 12), 218. Unfortunately, Ritter does not give the source, merely citing »a writer of the time.«

42 See »The Arts« in *United States Magazine and Democratic Review* (1847), April, 373–74.

Mendelssohn and Spohr were part of Hill's European network,⁴³ but his decision to seek them out initially, and to maintain the relationships as he established the New York Philharmonic, was in part due to their renown in English circles. In 1844, when Hill invited Spohr to conduct a music festival in New York, he cited Spohr's »known liberality in the promotion of the cause of the musical Art both in Germany & England particularly« as one of the reasons for the committee selecting him.⁴⁴ The New York Philharmonic attempted to formalise its ties to these composers by inviting Mendelssohn and Spohr to become honorary members in 1846.⁴⁵ When Hill travelled to Europe in 1847, there were (disappointed) hopes that he would return with a score for the Society by Mendelssohn or Spohr, in a similar vein to the commissions of London's older Philharmonic Society.⁴⁶

The New York Philharmonic became increasingly independent from London's Society, with programming trends diverging in the 1850s. Like Philadelphia's Musical Fund Society, New York's Philharmonic increasingly looked more towards Leipzig than London for programming trends and to source new music. Nonetheless, even towards the end of the century, a close relationship between the two societies continued to be cultivated by its members. E. Francis Hyde, President of the New York Philharmonic, visited London in 1892 and presented the directors and the conductor with a short history of the New York Philharmonic written by Henry Krehbiel.⁴⁷ The society chose Novello, an English publisher with a large presence in New York, as the publisher of the book, and accordingly it was sold in London and

-
- 43 Hill undertook a long European tour between 1835 and 1837, during which time he studied with Spohr and was introduced to Mendelssohn by Spohr at the Lower Rhine Music Festival.
- 44 U.C. Hill, letter to Louis Spohr, 16 November 1844 cited in Wolfram Boder, »Louis Spohr and his influence on American Orchestral Culture« in *Spohr Journal* 35 (2008), 2–9, 6. Spohr declined, citing the impossibility of leaving Kassel. Hill then approached Mendelssohn, who also declined. See John Michael Cooper and R. Larry Todd, »With True Esteem and Friendship«: The Correspondence of Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy and Louis Spohr« in *Journal of Musicological Research* 29/2-3 (2010), 171–259, 174.
- 45 Honorary members are listed in the 1846 Annual Report, 7, *New York Philharmonic Archive*. The only other honorary members at that time were visiting virtuosi who had performed in New York. They included Henri Vieuxtemps, Ole Bull, Leopold de Meyer, and Joseph Burke. See Philharmonic Society of New York (1846) 1846 Annual Report, 14 Sep. 1845–12 Sep. 1846, Board of Directors Records, Folder 549–01-004, 7, New York Philharmonic Shelby White & Leon Levy Digital Archives, <https://archives.nyphil.org/index.php/artifact/9f836777-e5c7-4f7a-acbe-11af66877ff9-0.1> (accessed February 14, 2023).
- 46 See »The Arts« (as in fn. 42), 374.
- 47 Shanet, *Philharmonic* (as in fn. 34), 181. The British Library holds two letters from Hyde to Francesco Berger, Secretary of London's Philharmonic Society from 1892 and 1897. See Letter to Francesco Berger from E. Francis Hyde (18 July 1892) RPS MS 349ff. 103–6, The British Library.

New York.⁴⁸ Hyde wrote to Francesco Berger, secretary of the London society, prior to his visit, and described the importance of the London society for New York's own:

As I have always had a profound admiration for the Philharmonic Society (of London) from which our New York Society derives its name and its plan of labour in the cause of advancing the art of music, I trust that I may be permitted to send to yourself and the other Directors of the Society and to the conductor, a copy of our memorial volume showing what we have thus far accomplished in New York.

With the highest appreciation of the past achievements of your Society, many of whose concerts I have attended during my visits to London.⁴⁹

On this occasion, Hyde also offered to donate money to the Society. The British Library holds another letter from Hyde to Berger from another visit in the summer of 1897. In this letter Hyde asked Berger to convey his thanks to the directors of the Society for the hospitality they have shown him.⁵⁰ Hyde's correspondence suggests that Hyde was a regular visitor to London, and while there he frequently attended Philharmonic Society concerts, during which time an intimacy developed between Hyde and the directors of the Society.

An Unequal Relationship

Through the 1850s, Americans on the east coast with English heritage displayed a continued cultural deference towards England. England's lack of a leading reputation for musical creativity, the increasing influence of German immigrant musicians, and taste for a repertoire that was diverging from British favourites, was not enough to overcome a longstanding respect for and deference to British politics, culture, fashion, education, and imports.⁵¹ In 1852, a writer for *Dwight's Journal of Music* flattered that the Philharmonic Society of London »has long stood among the first

48 The Novello commission is discussed in Society minutes. See New York Philharmonic Society of New York (1892), Business meeting minutes, 8 Oct 1890–29 Jan 1904, Board of Directors Records, Folder 498–01–02, 48, 55, New York Philharmonic Shelby White & Leon Levy Digital Archives, <https://archives.nyphil.org/index.php/artifact/517e656c-812a-4a5f-940b-7eccd8513600-0.1> (accessed February 14, 2023).

49 Letter to Francesco Berger from E. Francis Hyde (18 July 1892), RPS MS 349ff. 103–6, The British Library.

50 Letter to Francesco Berger from E. Francis Hyde (13 July 1897), RPS MS 349ff. 103–6, The British Library.

51 For more on the unequal relationship, see Yokota, *Unbecoming British* (as in fn. 7), especially 226–42.

orchestras in Europe and has exercised a sort of prescriptive right of activity as interpreters in chief of the great symphonies of Mozart, Beethoven etc.«⁵²

During the first half of the 19th century, American English-language coverage of music abroad gave far greater attention to performances in England than in France or Germany. The prospectus printed in *Dwight's* first issue (1852) promised readers »A summary of the significant musical news from all parts, gathered from English, German, French, as well as American papers.«⁵³ In reality, however, the »Musical Intelligence« section of the first volume of *Dwight's Journal of Music* typically followed a regular pattern: »local« (meaning Boston), »New York«, »England«. This structure connected Boston and New York directly to London (the English section mostly dealt with London rather than the provinces), as if the two American cities were a counterpart of their English relative. The first volume of the journal reported extensively on local London debates about the narrow repertoire of the Philharmonic Society and the progressive agenda set by its new rival the New Philharmonic Society,⁵⁴ as if London were a neighbouring city and not separated by an ocean. This practice reflects the interests of the journal's Anglo-American readership.

From 1853, correspondence from Germany and translations of articles from the German press featured, with a regular »Gleanings from German Musical Papers« column, reflecting John Sullivan Dwight's developing interest in German music criticism.⁵⁵ However, coverage of London remained substantial, as did the frequent use of English reporting of events on the Continent; American periodicals would print extracts written by the correspondents of *The Musical World* and other London publications.⁵⁶ This was partly due to pragmatic reasons as no translation was necessary, but nonetheless demonstrated a continued reliance on London as a cultural mediator and taste-shaper.

In 1854, the attention given to London music-making reduced as reporting focussed more on American music-making and debate, notably a heated exchange between composer William Henry Fry and critic Richard Storrs Willis. The exchange was initiated by Fry following Willis' negative review of his *Santa Claus* Symphony. In a series of letters published in the *New York Musical World and Times* and in *Dwight's Journal of Music* he also vented his frustrations about the lack of American symphonic

52 »England« in *Dwight's Journal of Music* (1852), April 24, 23.

53 Quoted in Edward N. Waters, »John Sullivan Dwight, First American Critic of Music« in *The Musical Quarterly*, 21/1 (1935), 69–88, 76.

54 »Musical Intelligence« in *Dwight's Journal of Music* (1852), April 24, 23.

55 For a discussion of the development of Dwight's ideas on music see Ora Frishberg Solomon, *Beethoven's Symphonies and J.S. Dwight: the Birth of American Music Criticism* (Boston, MA, 1995).

56 For example, see *DJM* (1852), May 22, 49–50 or *DJM* (1854), May 6, 36. Ritter comments on the practice of Boston music journals publishing pieces as supplements, all of which had been copied from English publications. See Ritter, *Music in America* (as in fn. 12), 143.

music performed by the New York Philharmonic (examined in more detail below). However, London remained in the »Musical Intelligence« section alongside American cities, until the 22 April 1854 issue when reporting on London moved to a section entitled »Music Abroad«. The »Musical Intelligence« section now focussed only on domestic music-making, perhaps signalling greater independence from the former colonial power. Nonetheless, reporting on London remained substantial through 1854 with the city usually appearing ahead of Vienna, Paris, and Leipzig. Indeed, the 22 April 1854 issue named London the »grand concert theatre and centre for all Europe«. ⁵⁷

At mid-century, *Dwight's Journal* was not the only east-coast American newspaper to position London as the musical taste-shaper of Europe. A writer for the *New York Herald* praised the »perfection to which music has been carried in the British metropolis.« As a consequence, »it has been of late the great centre of musical taste for the rest of Europe« even though the writer admitted »England has never produced one original idea in music.« ⁵⁸ Similarly, the writer argued that New York would be the future centre of the musical world, not because of the composers it would produce, but because of the way musical endeavour was supported by the population at large, rather than through patronage and the state as in Europe. London perhaps continued to be a model for New York, not because it was the centre of musical creativity, but because its capitalist and cosmopolitan infrastructure meant it was visited by musicians from all over Europe, and so it could lead the way in variety, quality, and volume of concert-giving rather than composition. There were also similarities in how musical life was funded in England and America, as aristocratic patrons and court ensembles had never played such a central role in English musical life as on the Continent, and instead concert-giving was shaped by market forces and acquired a public character from an early stage. England could potentially provide a model for America's relationship with European instrumental music.

From the 1840s, however, there is also evidence of American critics asserting their independence from English influences. At times the postcolonial relationship seemed a little awkward, even hostile. Reprinting the New York press coverage of Louis Jullien's concert tour in America, the London periodical *The Musical World* responded scathingly to the American writers who had branded London music critics »a set of old fogies, who denounce everything new as not being formed after ›classical models‹ [...] We used, in this country, to take our opinions in musical matters at second-hand from the London journals; but, happily, a better era has arrived, and we think and judge for ourselves.« *The Musical World* responded haughtily:

57 »Music Abroad« in *DJM* (1854), April 22, 21.

58 »Music – its Progress and its Effects in the United States« in *New York Herald*, December 9, 1852, 4.

The Yankee strictures on London criticism are sufficiently amusing, considering the advanced state of the art of *reviewing* in the United States. *N'importe!* The lion quarrels not with the mouse, but allows the tiny quadruped to tickle him without let or hindrance. That Jullien had made a »hit«, is only what we expected, and in this alone did we feel an interest. To the musical and critical notions of Brother Jonathan we are profoundly, and very naturally, not to say essentially, indifferent.⁵⁹

Such a response was typical of the dismissiveness and condescension the British musical press tended to show towards American music-making efforts and musical criticism at the time.

The American musical press in the 1850s is full of references to America's youth and the early stage of development of its musical life. There are also many references to the desire to compete with and be taken seriously by Europe. To achieve this, some American critics preferred to eschew old-world models, believing that America's »exceptional« qualities would prove as applicable to culture as to politics. For example, on visiting the American piano manufacturer Chickering & Sons, a reporter for the *New York Musical World and Times* enthused that

For a country only three quarters of a century in growth, this [the magnificence of the Chickering warehouses] is indicative of that young America, which is »bound to lead the world.« Such seems to be our »manifest destiny« not only in the extent of our gross products, mechanical and agricultural, but in all the essentials of refinement and taste.⁶⁰

Occasionally, similar views were aired in German periodicals. In 1842 a writer for the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* gave a report on American progress in music, likening the speed of its development to the building of the American railway: »seeming to transform a far-off future into a present reality.«⁶¹ However, such apparently positive comparisons also hinted at the prevalence of old-world perceptions of Americans as a practical and economical people, rather than creative and artistic.⁶² Tellingly, the writer did not highlight American inroads in composition (aside from church music), instead praising developments in music societies and

59 »Jullien in America« in *The Musical World* (1853), September 17, 589.

60 See P. K. D., »Letter from Boston« in *New York Musical World and Times* (1854), June 17, 77.

61 »Fortschritte der Musik in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika« in *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, September 21, 1842, 736. (My translation.) The original German reads: »Gehen ihre Fortschritte so schnell vorwärts, als es bis jetzt der Fall gewesen war, so wird es ein anderes Signalbeispiel der Eisenbahnschnelligkeit sein, mit welcher die Amerikaner fähig sind, eine scheinbar entfernte Zukunft in eine gegenwärtige Wirklichkeit zu verwandeln.«

62 Yokota, *Unbecoming British* (as in fn. 7), 234–35.

concert series, venues, teaching, and musical journalism. Americans were capable of developing the infrastructure to be preservers and appreciators of European culture, rather than originators.

Symphonist William Henry Fry was a passionate advocate for the development of an American national music. Fry's belief in the potential of his country's music was underpinned by his belief in American democracy's superiority over old-world political models. He believed that democracy was essential for music to flourish because through democracy artists would be treated according to their worth.⁶³ Writing for *The Message Bird* in October 1850, Fry argued that »If Art, musical Art, be rendered a profession for a heroic nature, to be accepted as a harvest of social dignities, as well as a means of wealth or fame, it must be under a Democracy like our own.«⁶⁴ For Fry, the continued economic and political postcolonial ties of England and America were pernicious: damaging both to America's democracy and to its quest to assert its independent cultural identity.⁶⁵ He declared that

When we shall have shaken off the heavy load of English tradition which bears down upon art – when genius shall be preferred to gold, Art to acres, then all will strive to be artists, and successes will be vastly multiplied [...]. I see no hope for art, but in the extinction of the principle of Force and Privilege.⁶⁶

He also penned a diatribe about the plan for a Great Exhibition in England (which took place in October 1851) and passionately argued against America's participation precisely because it would reinforce America's subordinate position in the postcolonial relationship:

It [American participation in the Great Exhibition] places us in a colonial position as regards London; it pre-supposes greater wealth in England, greater resources and developments than ourselves possess. As an American, I must protest against our having anything to do with it.

63 Fry launched a blistering critique of English peerages in the *Daily Tribune*, lambasting the English for bestowing titles based on money and family connections rather than merit. William Henry Fry, »Europe by an American« in *Daily Tribune* (1850), February 4. He also repeated his belief in the necessity of democracy for the development of high art in his series of eleven lectures on music that he gave in New York in 1852–53. See Vera Brodsky Lawrence, »William Henry Fry's Messianic Yearnings: The Eleven Lectures, 1852–53« in *American Music* 7, no. 4 (1989), 382–411, especially 390.

64 William Henry Fry, »Musical Art in France, England, and America« in *The Message Bird* (1850), October 15, 493.

65 See Shadle, *Orchestrating the Nation* (as in fn. 9), 64–65 and Fry's articles as correspondent for the *Daily Tribune*: »Europe by an American« (1850–1851).

66 Fry, »Musical Art« 493.

He went on to outline the superiority of American trade, wealth, and produce, and particularly America's superior treatment of skilled artisans, mechanics, writers, and artists.⁶⁷

Nonetheless, well into the 1850s *Dwight's Journal of Music* would continue to publish flattering pieces, praising musical taste and cultivation among the English population, the long history of music education, the variety of concert programming, and the excellence of English music societies.⁶⁸ Even as late as the 1880s America could still struggle to throw off its colonial shackles. The inaugural concert of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, which took place on 22 October 1881 concluded with Carl Maria von Weber's *Jubel Overture*. When the audience heard the tune »God Save the Queen« they spontaneously rose and sang along. A critic for the *Traveller* approved, feeling that it signalled »a universal sentiment of respect to her Majesty and the mother country.« However, this spontaneous patriotic display rankled Louis Elson of the *Courier* who pointed out that »An English audience would scarcely do as much for the Star-Spangled Banner, if one of our composers should introduce it into a symphony or opera.«⁶⁹

Reclaiming the Anglo-American space: Louis Jullien's Cosmopolitan Promenade Concerts

The postcolonial English influence on American musical life may have been uncomfortable at times, but it did not come close to equalling the ferocity of the debate surrounding the German influence. Despite its multicultural origins, the membership of the New York Philharmonic quickly became increasingly Germanic. By 1855 79 per cent of the players were German, and by the 1890s the number had risen to around 95 per cent.⁷⁰ From 1852 for the next 150 years, all conductors were of German birth or heritage.⁷¹ Anglo-Americans did not tend to learn orchestral instruments, and certainly did not consider orchestral playing a viable career.⁷² At the New York Philharmonic the conductor exerted control over repertory choices.⁷³ As the conductors and musicians were mostly German, it followed that the repertory became increasingly dominated by Austro-German music. American composers' works were

67 Fry, »Europe by an American«, in *Daily Tribune* (1850), March 1.

68 V. Schoelcher, »The State of Music in England« in *DJM* (1857), October 17, 219–20.

69 Both quoted in Horowitz, *Classical Music in America* (as in fn. 3), 46.

70 Shanet, *Philharmonic* (as in fn. 34), 142.

71 Shanet, *Philharmonic*, 109.

72 Shanet, *Philharmonic*, 142.

73 This was particularly true of Theodore Thomas's tenure, as the Philharmonic were so desperate to secure him that they gave him decisive control over repertory and personnel. Shanet, *Philharmonic*, 171.

so rarely played that native composers were forced to put on concerts of their own.⁷⁴ Increasingly, their music tended to appear on light programmes alongside vernacular music, instead of within symphony concerts.⁷⁵

Frustrations only grew as the Society continued to refuse to perform the work of American composers. Things came to a head in the war of words that took place in the musical press between American composers George Bristow and William Henry Fry and their supporters on one side, and the critic Richard Storrs Willis (supported by Dwight) and members of the New York Philharmonic on the other. Bristow was allowed to conduct his concert overture in January 1847 with the New York Philharmonic. Following the performance, critics such as Hermann Saroni accused the Society of neglecting Bristow and the Society's national mission. Bristow accused the New York Philharmonic of being »anti-American« because of the measly number of American works it had performed during its 11-year existence.⁷⁶ The Society eventually bowed to pressure, performing Bristow's first symphony at a public rehearsal in May 1850, but the debate had become bitter and xenophobic, with some critics attacking foreign musicians for setting themselves up as superior to local musicians and forming impenetrable cliques.⁷⁷

Louis Jullien navigated deftly through this hornet's nest of sensitivities and warring factions when he brought a small section of his famous promenade orchestra to America in August 1853. The orchestra was formed from players who came from all over Europe, particularly France and England.⁷⁸ Jullien supplemented this kernel of 27 musicians with players he found in New York.⁷⁹ Jullien's concerts were enormously popular, reported on favourably in the Anglo-American press. Crucially, American audiences were already aware of the success of his promenade concerts in London and the British Isles.⁸⁰ Indeed, they associated Jullien so closely with England that there were even rumours that the conductor was English and his French accent merely part of his act.⁸¹ Interestingly, Jullien did not change his programmes

74 Katherine K. Preston, »Encouragement from an Unexpected Source: Louis Antoine Jullien, Mid-Century American Composers, and George Frederick Bristow's *Jullien* Symphony« in *Nineteenth-Century Music Review*, 6, no. 1 (2009), 65–88, 81.

75 Shanet, *Philharmonic*, 118–21.

76 See Shanet, *Philharmonic*, 111–21. See also Ritter, *Music in America* (as in fn. 12), 272.

77 For more details see Shadle, *Orchestrating the Nation* (as in fn. 9), 73–74 and Preston, »Encouragement from an Unexpected Source« 80–82.

78 See Preston, »Encouragement from an Unexpected Source« (as in fn. 74), 80.

79 See Carse, *The Life of Jullien* (as in fn. 6), 75–78.

80 Jullien's British concerts were regularly reported on in the American press and »A Sketch of the Life of Jullien« appeared in the *Musical World* in May, June and July 1853 prior to his departure for America. The piece was written for circulation in America to advertise the tour in advance. Carse, *The Life of Jullien*, 18.

81 The rumour was reported in *The Musical World and Times* (1854), July 8, 111. The periodical asked readers if they had knowledge of Jullien's national origins.

substantially when he transported his promenade model to America. He trusted that English favourites, including movements from symphonies by Spohr, Mendelssohn, Beethoven, Haydn, and Mozart, as well as operatic extracts and Jullien's own waltzes, polkas, and quadrilles would be as popular with American audiences as they were with British ones. His French promenade concert model, anglicised according to British tastes, proved enormously popular with American audiences, with the addition of the *Star-Spangled Banner* and other American national tunes the only real changes to the programmes that had proved so successful in Britain.

Jullien's practices suggest that, despite the press coverage of American critics and composers seeking to carve out independence from England, English tastes continued to prove popular on the east coast. Indeed, one of the means that the ever-astute Jullien used to carve out a space in American symphonic musical life was to play to his audience's English heritage. He gave a concert in New York on 5 December 1853 »in aid of the Charitable Fund of the St George and British Protective Emigrant Society.« The variety programme included arias from operas by Mozart and Rossini, popular songs, dances, and many solos. Alongside the vocal numbers and dances, sat movements from two symphonies that were firm favourites with English audiences: Haydn's *Surprise Symphony* and a movement from Mozart's *Jupiter Symphony*.⁸²

Jullien did not even shy away from programming works with imperial connotations. He began the second half of the concert with his own arrangement of *God Save the Queen*: a tune that we have seen could provoke uncomfortable responses from American audiences and critics. The advert boasted the endorsement of the English aristocracy, claiming that this waltz was »Composed expressly by command of the Queen of England, and performed at the Court Balls at Buckingham Palace.« Jullien chose to conclude the concert with another »Quadrille National«, this time »The English«. ⁸³ Jullien also regularly programmed his own composition *The Great Exhibition*. This peculiar composition, to which Fry would surely have objected, included numerous national melodies, with *God Save the Queen* sounding imperiously at the end as the world looks to England for leadership. The advert for the concert included the endorsement that this piece had been »performed with great success for upwards of 200 consecutive nights in England.«⁸⁴ Jullien programmed these musical celebrations of England alongside tributes to America. He gave his own specially composed *Quadrille National* entitled *The American*. It was advertised as containing »all the prin-

82 The English love of the *Jupiter Symphony* was well known in America, with Fry referencing it in one of his responses to Willis. See *DJM* (1854), February 25.

83 The programme is reproduced in the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, November 29, 1853, 3.

84 »Jullien's Concerts at Metropolitan Hall« in *New York Herald*, December 24, 1853, 3.

cial National melodies, viz: Hail Columbia; the Star-Spangled Banner, Our Flag is there, the Land of Washington, Hail to the Chief, Yankee Doodle &c &c.«.⁸⁵

Through Jullien's cosmopolitan promenade concerts, symphonies were heard as part of popular variety programmes. Even the »Beethoven Night« included operatic extracts and Jullien's *Great Exhibition*.⁸⁶ His concert programmes emphasised theatricality through atmospheric, descriptive, and sometimes humorous music, such as Beethoven's *Pastoral Symphony*, Haydn's *Surprise Symphony*, or the scenic painting of Mendelssohn's *Scottish Symphony*. He sought to heighten the effects of the descriptive music he programmed by rattling some dried peas in a container to amplify the storm effects of the *Pastoral Symphony*, for example.⁸⁷ American critics observed his theatrical style of conducting, using physical gestures and »pantomimic interpretation« to mimic the character of the music.⁸⁸ The theatrical, mimetic, and commercial qualities of Jullien's performances were hugely popular in England. London audiences had a long-developed taste for pictorial instrumental music, dating back to an early preference for Haydn's symphonies. Choreographed versions of Beethoven's *Pastoral Symphony* imported from Paris were hugely popular, further blurring the lines between instrumental music and the theatre.⁸⁹

As Jullien's concerts increased in popularity, he began to programme American symphonies that aligned with the music that had already proved popular in England. These included William Henry Fry's *A Day in the Country*, nine performances of his *Santa Claus Symphony*,⁹⁰ and 15 performances of *The Breaking Heart Symphony*,⁹¹ the Minuet from the Symphony in E by George Frederick Bristow,⁹² and Bristow's *Jullien Symphony*.⁹³ This was appreciated by critics who had become frustrated by German domination. A critic for the *New York Daily Times* was full of praise for the way Jullien had »produced four original works by native composers. Fry's *The Breaking Heart* bears comparison with any symphony of Mozart and side by side with modern German works to which we have been accustomed lately.«⁹⁴ Jullien clearly favoured the descriptive, programmatic symphonies of Fry to the more Mozartian symphonies of

85 »Jullien's Concerts!« in *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, November 29, 1853, 3.

86 »Jullien's Concerts at Metropolitan Hall« in *New York Herald*, December 20, 1853, 6.

87 Carse, *The Life of Jullien* (as in fn. 6), 40.

88 »Musical Pantomime« in *The New York Musical World and Times* (1854), May 27, 37.

89 See J. Q. Davies, »Dancing the Symphonic: Beethoven-Bochsa's *Symphonie Pastorale*, 1829« in *19th-Century Music*, 27/1, (2003), 25–47.

90 See advertisements in *New York Daily Times*, January 2, 1854; *North American*, January 21, 1854.

91 See advertisement in *New York Daily Times*, May 17, 1854.

92 See advertisement in *New York Herald*, December 28, 1853, 7.

93 For details of this symphony and Jullien's performances of it see Preston, »Encouragement from an Unexpected Source« (as in fn. 74), 65–81.

94 *New York Daily Times*, May 22, 1854, 1.

Bristow. Performances of the *Santa Claus Symphony* were accompanied by a written programme, which states that the programme had been produced at the behest of Jullien.⁹⁵

We have already seen that postcolonial sensitivities influenced Fry's writing while Paris correspondent for the *Daily Tribune*. However, English models were difficult to avoid. Despite his insistence on the importance of American composers developing their own musical identity, he tended to use operatic techniques and descriptive and narrative effects in his symphonies that aligned with British cosmopolitan tastes, because they drew on French and Italian opera.⁹⁶ The *Santa Claus Symphony*, which was so championed by Jullien, harnessed this cosmopolitan European language and in addition used onomatopoeic effects, such as mimicking church bells, sleigh bells, and the cracking of santa's whip, narrational devices, the use of instruments to depict characters, movement, and voices, even imitating speech, and intertextual quotations for programmatic effect, namely the *Adeste Fideles* and children's nursery rhymes and lullabies.

For Fry, these theatrical devices enabled him to communicate directly with audiences, aligning with his democratic ideas about symphonic music.⁹⁷ Simultaneously, Fry felt that descriptive music offered a way forward for a uniquely American symphonic music.⁹⁸ However, the same devices that Fry felt were so different from previous models were easily at home in Jullien's cosmopolitan promenade model and familiar to English audiences, appealing to the English taste for descriptive instrumental music. Jullien's choice of Bristow's music also aligned with British tastes for Mozartian classicism, and the second symphony adopted a polka in place of a minuet, perhaps in homage to Jullien. The similarity of English and American tastes in symphonic music at this time, meant that Jullien was also able to take both of Bristow's symphonies as well as Fry's *The Breaking Heart* back to England, where they were successfully performed.⁹⁹

95 The programme is available in the Fry collection held at the Library Company of Philadelphia.

96 Francesco Izzo has noted the prevalence of French and Italian models in Fry's opera *Leonora*, noting accompaniments and melodies that recall Donizetti and Bellini, as well as French elements in the use of ensemble, orchestra, and dramatic arrangement. Francesco Izzo, »William Henry Fry's *Leonora*: The Italian Connection« in *Nineteenth-Century Music Review*, 6, no. 1 (2009), 7–25, especially 7, 18, 19–21, 24. Similarly, Douglas Shadle has argued that Fry translated operatic writing in his symphonic music, adopting Italianate decorations and cantabile passages in *The Breaking Heart Symphony*. Shadle, *Orchestrating the Nation* (as in fn. 9), 93–95.

97 Chmaj, »Fry versus Dwight« (as in fn. 10), 73.

98 Fry expands on this theme in his response to Willis reprinted in *DJM* (1854), February 4.

99 Preston, »Encouragement from an Unexpected Source« (as in fn. 74), 83.

The popularity of Jullien's English programmes and the style of symphonic writing produced in America by Fry and Bristow shows that cosmopolitan English tastes and practices continued to be appreciated by American audiences and composers at mid-century. Even though by the early 1850s American critics and composers had taken steps to assert their independence from Britain's cultural leadership, post-colonial ties continued to have a powerful hold over the music-going public. Jullien's strategy celebrated Anglo-American relations by placing French-infused London fashion and the celebration of American Anglo-Saxon heritage alongside American nationalism and popular tunes. Fry's music, intended to be anti-English and different from old-world models, was popular with American audiences because it was framed within this Anglo-American space. Jullien, clearly aware of recent debates and sensitivities, carved out a space to reclaim the symphony and musical culture more broadly from German transnational immigrant communities. He returned the symphony to a setting that emphasized entertainment, rather than serious endeavour, emphasising the genre's cosmopolitan, pan-European identity (harking back to the way it had been understood in Philadelphia), and its ability to tell stories, and to plant descriptive images in the mind. Against this context he shrewdly performed the home-grown symphonies that had been spurned by the New York Philharmonic. At the same time, Jullien's cosmopolitan packaging of the symphony as a pan-European genre enabled him to navigate the postcolonial sensitivities that made England both comfortingly familiar and attractive, yet also frustratingly superior and stifling. In Jullien's concerts, the symphonic genre was no longer the property of Germans. At times it could appear familiarly English, but at others it was cosmopolitan, rather than the property of any national identity. This dual character enabled it to appeal to broad audiences.

