in Wiley's narrative. Again, there is an apparent justification of this approach to Tchaikovsky's life. As Wiley suggests, 'he was an avid reader and yet said so little about the issues of his day. He lived in momentous times; what was he thinking about beyond his immediate preoccupations? . . . Tchaikovsky, an important figure in the culture of his day, is difficult to place within that culture' (p. 449).

This would appear to be the key to why Wiley's biography reads as it does. By basing its biographical chapters so relentlessly on Tchaikovsky's accessible letters, and by looking outward from the composer's own point of view, it naturally enough begins to take on the inward, egotistical, domestic, or everyday qualities of Tchaikovsky's own concerns. There is little here of Glenda Dawn Goss's striking recent attempt to situate the significance of Sibelius's life and works at the very heart of Finnish cultural self-realization and political self-determination (*Sibelius: A Composer's Life and the Awakening of Finland* (Chicago, 2009)). There is, of course, a decided advantage in refusing to make Tchaikovsky into anything like a symbol of his age or nation; Tchaikovsky the man (and to some extent the composer) is kept to the fore as a real, complex, contradictory, enigmatic, and troubled individual. And in a field such as Russian cultural history, where the search for overarching explanations often becomes the pretext for banal and reductive assertions of a crudely essentialist nature, Wiley's measured and judicious prose refuses to give glib answers to trite questions. Yet where there is a commendable restraint when it comes to unwarranted speculation (particularly when it comes to questions of the composer's love life), this sense of moderation nonetheless leads to a concomitant impoverishment of context. To what extent does it matter that Tchaikovsky commented so little on, say, the emancipation of the serfs or the Balkan question, or that one cannot be sure whether his comments on realism (p. 450) allude to contemporary Russian debates on the nature of aesthetics? Wiley rightly notes that by 1885, 'Tchaikovsky's professional status . . . was higher than that of any other Russian composer' (p. 284), and surely it is in the knotty relationship between privately led life, mysteriously intuited artistic inspiration, and publicly staged persona that much of Tchaikovsky's significance is to be found. Few of us probably record our own reactions to the social and public discourses of the day, yet surely equally few of us would also deny their interaction with, and indeed their very influence on, important aspects of our lives. Scholars of Russian culture and society can fill in for themselves the relevant details of the historical context, but for the kind of general readers at which Oxford University Press's 'Master Musicians' series is explicitly aimed, it is something of a shame that more space was not devoted to a more integrated portrait of the composer in his age (although that would surely have put yet more pressure on a book that is already long on detail).

Part of Wiley seems to long for Tchaikovsky's missing letters to be released, restored, or rediscovered, for speculation and censorship to be replaced with facts and corroboration. Yet he also knows that deep down, 'a sense of not-knowing will remain' (p. 449). Perhaps it is this sense of not-knowing that continues to inspire—and might even account for—our sense of Tchaikovsky's elusive and paradoxical genius.

Philip Ross Bullock
Wadham College, University of Oxford
doi:10.1093/ml/gcq071

The Société des Concerts du Conservatoire, 1828–1967. By D. Kern Holoman. pp. xvi + 620. (University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 2004, £63. ISBN 0-520-23664-5.)

Only a conductor could write a book such as *The Société des Concerts du Conservatoire, 1828–1967*, and only a first-rate scholar would have the perseverance to plough through thousands of documents from one hundred and forty concert seasons, the ability to see historical significance in the smallest of details, and the imagination to bring them to life. D. Kern Holoman knows how orchestras work. He understands their aspirations and the mythologies constructed around conductors; the work demanded of performers as well as the fights over promotions and recording contracts; what's needed to keep subscribers and the press happy; and the challenge of generating enough financial resources to repair instruments, hire soloists, fund pensions, and balance their budget. Holoman can also tell a story. Quoting from minutes of their meetings, transcriptions of real conversations, and interviews with still-living orchestra members, he makes us feel almost like we're there. With an engaging and accessible style, he seeks to recreate the excitement their performances generated, events 'not to be missed' (p. 3). This orchestra and chorus were the most important in Paris for decades, their performers the city's finest, and their audiences from

among the political, economic, social, and intellectual elites. Through historically sensitive and evocative analyses, Holoman shows how the orchestra evolved into one of the world's great philharmonic societies.

The book is organized in five parts. The first focuses on the orchestra's musicians, their committees, and their relationship to the Conservatoire; its original hall, known for superb acoustics and for seating only 800; and the concerts, from audience reception and the mechanics of putting together a concert season to how much money was made over the years. Next comes a three-part chronological analysis of the orchestra and its concert seasons, organized by period and conductor. Holoman analyses each of the twelve conductors' background and musical preferences. He follows the orchestra's responses to political turbulence, personnel crises, and changing tastes, and explains their evolving ambitions, showing it to be 'as flexible as it was strong' (p. 14). The fifth part, on a website for the book (<http://hector.ucdavis.edu/sdc/>), transcribes the orchestra's administrative archives. Clearly organized and a model for scholars working on musical organizations, it includes complete programmes (searchable within each year), personnel lists, subscription prices, statutes and decrees, discography, additional illustrations, comments by famous composers, and bibliography. The programmes make possible almost endless inquiry. One can trace not only the evolution of their repertory, but also the careers of pianists, violinists, and singers who performed with them. (Under Andre Cluytens's leadership in the 1940s and 1950s, soloists were featured on almost every concert. I was fascinated to see Debussy's *Jeux* on their programmes twice in the 1960s. Was this interest in the ballet coming from Boulez, Stockhausen, and German scholars who had begun analysing the work, or did the Société's performances help stimulate renewed attention to it?) Unfortunately, the programme notes for these concerts, which began in the late 1880s, were far too extensive to include on the website.

The text itself reads like a kaleidoscope. Holoman holds in his reader's mind many elements at once, shifting his focus every few pages. This facilitates experience of the orchestra's complex organizational life and diverse issues that rose to dominate their attention. Continuity thus is somewhat elusive in this book, but nonetheless assured by certain recurring issues: membership, the organization's finances, their repertory (old and new), government relations, tours, recordings, and the orchestra's sound.

The founder François-Antoine Habeneck sets the tone, responsible for the 'artistic vision and personal intervention' that in 1828 transformed student concerts into 'a lasting association of the most accomplished artists in the land' (p. 12). Beginning with him, we get a sense of the 'collective mission [that] took precedence over any one member's essentially transitory membership' (p. 9). The members' solidarity, based on 'mutual esteem, *travail*, and *talent*', derived from three organizational characteristics. For many years, they shared some relationship to the Conservatoire, most of them as its graduates or professors. Many remained with the orchestra for decades, with some, such as Delvedez, Taffanel, and Gaubert, becoming its conductor. And the orchestra functioned in a democratic manner, with effective self-governance ruled by some fifty statutes and a constitution. There were competitive auditions for vacancies, elections for conductors, an administrative committee of twelve elected members who met weekly, and annual general assemblies. Performers behaved like a special kind of worker, competing to get their jobs and negotiating with one another over their disputes as well as the right to perform elsewhere. At the end of the season, earnings were pooled and each *sociétaire* given an equal part, less any fines he might have incurred. Beginning in 1838, members put aside 20 per cent of their earnings into emergency and retirement accounts.

The Société's administrative committee was more powerful than any conductor. Through their minutes, which Holoman mines with considerable skill, we watch the orchestra endeavouring to balance audience taste and performer preferences, considering who could use their hall and for what purposes, pondering 'options for dealing with *compositeurs vivants*' (p. 254), facing the competition from other orchestras (see below), and struggling with the inevitability of market pressures. We hear committee members discussing ongoing problems, such as aging members and the need to retain choral singers, especially females. We follow their debates on whether to accept women as *sociétaires,* forbidden by an amendment passed in 1843. (There was only ever one woman instrumentalist, the harpist Alys Lautemann. She became the orchestra's soloist in 1942, but was never made a full *sociétaire.*) And, when conductors retire or die, the committee's minutes document their anxieties and the process of selecting a successor.

Each conductor, of course, had his own style. Whereas François-Antoine Habeneck con-

ducted with the violin and bow and seemed to have 'supernatural powers' (p. 140), Delvedez, even if groomed by Habeneck, was more contemplative, theorizing orchestral practice 'with an eye toward identifying the ways of greatness' (p. 240). Some were very restrained. Paul Taffanel was known for his 'sobriety of gesture' (p. 297) and André Messager his 'studied elegance', cultivating 'a sense that the orchestra was largely independent of its conductor' (p. 331). Others injected their own personalities. While Georges Marty's presence at the podium was known for its 'imperial' authority (p. 314), Philippe Gaubert was beloved for his 'earthy, almost peasant-like orientation toward his life and work' (p. 391) and Charles Munch for 'unusual compassion' with his performers, giving some 'pet names' (p. 446). Each contributed to the history of the organization. Marty was 'modest to the point of reluctance' to perform music by living composers, preferring Baroque oratorio (p. 315), whereas Jules Garcin and Charles Munch enthusiastically promoted it. André Messager, among others, used tours and recordings to transform the Société into an international orchestra 'for the prestige of the institution and the nation' (p. 434). Some were 'star' conductors who commanded real money, such as Munch, who in the 1940s received up to seven times what instrumentalists made. But lest one think that conductors dominated, a critic once pointed out that 'the orchestra is itself the virtuoso', the conductor secondary in importance to 'the tradition, innate so to speak' (p. 359). In the 1960s, the position of first conductor was eliminated in favour of guest conductors, including Manuel Rosenthal and Pierre Boulez.

What bound *sociétaires* and conductors was their commitment to 'their *métier* as guarantors of the great classics in long-perfected interpretations' (p. 236). Most important, there was Beethoven, 'mastered systematically by the musicians and their conductors in a disciplined approach for which there was no precedent in the history of concert music' (p. 136). We're not told exactly what underlies Beethoven's allure, but week after week they worked on his music, movement by movement, the major works 'rehearsed for years before being presented' (p. 107). In a local newspaper, Berlioz helped audiences understand this music. (His analyses of Beethoven's symphonies were also reproduced in the programmes of the Concerts Colonne on 29 November 1885, 24 October 1886, and 10 November and 8 December 1895.) By 1832, the Société had performed all Beethoven's symphonies. Successive Société conductors also prioritized the composer, most beginning their autumn season with one of his symphonies. In their first fifty years, they featured 287 performances of Beethoven's music (Haydn following with sixty-six performances, Mendelssohn with sixty, and Mozart with thirty-six). Beethoven's Ninth Symphony was long considered 'the traditional measure of a new conductor's inaugural year' (p. 279). Wagner first heard it in Paris in 1839, performed by the Société des Concerts, and Holoman suggests that 'the confluence of stimuli—Habeneck, Berlioz, the Ninth, and most of all the quality and force of the Paris players—represents a turning point in Wagner's conception of what an orchestra could do' (p. 169). With their extraordinary chorus and its many professional singers who performed on every programme for decades, the *Missa Solemnis* also became closely associated with the Société des Concerts. First introduced to audiences in excerpts beginning in the 1830s and the subject of a clash between Garcin and his musicians over who should perform it and how, the Société was the first to perform it complete in France in 1888 and reprogrammed it for decades thereafter. In its final years, besides performing individual works in many concerts, the Société dedicated entire concerts to Beethoven—six in 1964, one in 1965, and two in 1966.

Another major work the Société loved to perform was Bach's B Minor Mass. When the concertmaster Charles Lamoureux was on the administrative committee in the early 1870s, he argued for performing the St Matthew Passion, but was voted down and later left to create his own choral society. The Société performed the Credo from the Mass five times between 1875 and 1885, but the reader should be aware that amateur choral societies introduced Parisians to most of Bach's larger choral works, especially the cantatas, the two Passions, and other movements of the Mass (the Gloria in 1883 and the whole second half in 1887). In 1891 and 1892 the Société finally performed the complete Mass, for the first time in France, earning their highest receipts to date. In 1908 the Mass took even more than Wagner, and in 1966 they were still performing it. Their first complete St Matthew Passion was not until 1928, but chosen to introduce the Société to radio audiences. To understand why it took them so long to perform these works as well as why the Mass then became such a success, one should note the complicated role religion played in nineteenth-century France, the importance of the Pope's acceptance of the Republic in 1891

and 1892, and the Catholic revival that followed. (On the French taste for Bach, see Joël-Marie Fauquet and Antoine Hennion, *La Grandeur de Bach: L'Amour de la musique en France au XIX^e siècle* (Paris, 2000).)

The Société's history of performing new music was complicated and I would have enjoyed reading more about the orchestra's relationship with living composers. Since Habeneck, some have insisted that they were devoted to encouraging a French symphonic tradition, or at least committed to providing, 'with prudent reserve, access to modern works both French and foreign' (p. 253). Except for a few years, the administrative committee gave readings to new works by living composers. Berlioz, fashioning himself as a disciple of Beethoven, was so popular he once hoped he would succeed Habeneck as their conductor. Delvedez championed Bizet and Massenet, and later Munch did the same for Messiaen. Some unusual works made it into their programmes, such as by Augusta Holmès and little-known winners of the Prix Rossini. (These awards, from the Académie des Beaux-Arts, went to young composers and librettists for the best cantata. Between 1885 and 1911 the Société performed six such prize-winning works.) After 1904 the government required such premieres in return for a modest subsidy. Still, the musicians themselves were not always convinced. 'It isn't the society's role to welcome musicians who are not already classed among the masters', explained one of them in 1897 (p. 303). Their favourites tended to be those whose careers and reputations were already established, such as Gounod (especially in the 1880s and 1890s), Franck (but only after he died in 1890), and Debussy (well after *Pelléas*). In some ways, Saint-Saëns benefited most from the Société. Taffanel put on thirty-one performances of his works in the 1890s and, in 1896, given how many of his works it had premiered since the 1860s, the press pointed out that 'the Société des Concerts is becoming the Concert Saint-Saëns' (p. 304). Having an organ in the hall made possible the premiere of his Third Symphony, one of the only works of the time to be accompanied by a long analytical pamphlet with dozens of music examples. Saint-Saëns may have done well with the Société because he understood the classics, having toured as a pianist of Mozart and Beethoven even in Germany and written Variations on a Theme of Beethoven. This raises interesting questions: did the tastes reflected in the Société's 'tradition' influence what new music they were willing to promote? Even the style and shape they may have given to this music in performance? Were Ravel's classical tendencies what later made his music so popular with the Société?

The twentieth century brought changes in their relationship to the state, the advent of concert tours, and significance given to radio and recording. Not until they folded in 1967 and re-emerged as the Orchestre de Paris were they ever fully subsidized, with funding from the state, the city of Paris, and the département de la Seine. In 1838 Habeneck and others proposed becoming the 'official orchestra of the state' with a permanent subsidy in return for performing at state ceremonies (p. 170). They did long enjoy certain privileges through their association with the Conservatoire and the use of its hall, while making their own decisions and supporting themselves through ticket sales, and many of the Société's performers were also part of the orchestras of the Opéra and Opéra-Comique, both state-supported. Sometimes the government expected them to perform for official ceremonies, such as celebrations for the visiting Russian Navy, the centennial of Michelet, and the funeral of President Félix Faure. During the Second World War, the Reich Ministry ordered them to give gala concerts for the 150th anniversary of Mozart's death. But their role at the Universal Exhibitions, when they might have served as emblems of the nation, was limited—Colonne conducted the official concerts in 1878—and they themselves declined to do benefit concerts, including for war victims, unless 'politically unavoidable' (p. 243). Before the 1950s and 1960s, Holoman cites only the Swiss and American tours as relying on direct government support.

The concerts in Belgium and Lyon (1907), Barcelona (1924), and tours of Switzerland (1917), the United States (1918), and Japan (1963) transformed the image of the Société, as did their residence with the festivals of Aix-en-Provence beginning in 1947 and Besançon in 1950. Reviews beyond Paris were gratifying and the extra money appreciated, even if their successes were marred by personnel problems and disputed accounting (Messager resigned upon their return to France in 1919). In New York they recorded for Columbia Gramophone and in the 1930s their reputation grew through recordings for the Compagnie Française du Gramophone. During the 78 era, they recorded some three thousand minutes. Most of their LPs were produced by Pathé-Marconi/EMI. In 1958 they were the only Parisian orchestra to have recorded the complete Beethoven symphonies. With Ravel in the 1960s becoming 'as strong a pillar of the

society's traditions as Beethoven had been' (p. 493), Holoman considers their best recordings the complete Ravel from 1961–2, remastered on CDs in 1987. Perhaps not surprisingly, he observes that over time the performers became 'greatly more engaged by the recordings than by the Sunday concerts' (p. 495). Radio broadcasts of their dress rehearsals beginning in the early 1930s also cut into the successes of their live concerts. Audiences would hear them on the radio on Sunday mornings and then attend concerts of a competitor on Sunday afternoons.

Orchestra managers will learn much here about how to run their affairs productively and successfully for many years, while musicians will be fascinated with how this orchestra forged a certain sound for which it became known. Holoman helps the reader imagine what attracted full houses for decades and assured its distinction at home and abroad, regardless of its repertory. We are not told if the performance of so much Beethoven helped shape this sound, nor how they may have negotiated between what was needed for the German classics and music more specific to French taste. In any case, the language used to describe their sound suggests quintessentially French values. Some characterized it by its grace, suppleness, subtle nuances, and 'such perfect unity of timbre' (p. 358). Others referred to 'refined good taste, an intimate understanding of the French style, respect for tradition, sensible and sensitive interpretations, flawless technique, and an unrivaled richness of sonority' (p. 119). In comparison with German orchestras before the First World War, Holoman describes the Société's playing as 'relatively thin, narrow of vibrato, and free of the sentimental elements increasingly to be found in post-Romantic technique' (p. 333). This 'goût français' results from a 'kind of purity of expression', 'a clipped, almost matter-of-fact perfection of the pitch content', unusually short staccati, minimum vibrato in both the wind and string playing, and 'scrupulous avoidance of bel canto phrasing' (p. 491). The Société was also known for the 'unusually high pitch to which the orchestra tuned in the late 1940s and 1950s' and the 'biting' tone quality of the winds (pp. 120–1). Analysis of their recordings, one of the highlights of this book, allows Holoman to dig into the details, while tracing subtle changes in their sound over the years, especially when it came to the use of string portamento in Ravel's *La Valse*. All this makes one yearn to hear those old recordings, perhaps if they could be made available on the book's website.

If there are downsides to this remarkable, beautifully written analysis of an individual organization, its ideals, and its music-making practices, this is because it is primarily an internal study, based largely on internal perspectives as recorded in the minutes of their meetings. If another volume were possible, I'd love to read about this same story from more outsiders' perspectives. Most important would be comparison with the Société's rival orchestras. It's true that the Concerts Pasdeloup was a sort of 'interloper' (p. 204), founded in 1861 to perform very similar repertory, albeit to a much less sophisticated audience. Its success was such that a Société member once cut rehearsals to be a featured soloist with Pasdeloup, causing a huge uproar with his cohorts. And, like the Société but more committed to new music, both Pasdeloup and later Colonne devoted rehearsals to reading young composers' work, some of which was chosen for concert performance. However, this 'imitation' should not be overstated since in many cases these other orchestras performed works well before the Société and, as Holoman acknowledges, 'would take the lead in out-of-town appearances, recordings, and broadcasts' (p. 257). After the Société had achieved 'a runaway success' with fragments of Berlioz's *Damnation de Faust* in 1875, it was the Concerts Colonne, from whom the Société later tried to 'reclaim Berlioz' (p. 259), that would use its superlative performances of the entire two-and-a-half hour work to make their mark in the concert world. I have thus argued that we should not think of concert societies in late nineteenth-century France as independent, but rather as organizations with blurred boundaries that functioned as part of an interconnected network. (See my 'Building a Public for Orchestral Music: Les Concerts Colonne', in *Le Concert et son public: Mutations de la vie musicale en Europe de 1780 à 1914* (Paris, 2002), 209–40, and 'Democracy, Ethics, and Commerce: The *Concerts Populaires* Movement in the Late 19th-Century France', in Hans Erich Bödeker, Patrice Veit (eds.), *Les Sociétés de musique en Europe, 1700–1920: Structures, pratiques musicales et sociabilités* (Berlin, 2007), 455–79.) Holoman assumes that because the Concerts Pasdeloup was reborn in the twentieth century and still performs today, it had a continuous history, whereas it folded when Pasdeloup's original orchestra went bankrupt in 1884, surpassed by Colonne in the quality of their performances and popularity with the public. Comparative study would also reveal that, although the Société discovered a new form of income after the First World War by

admitting listeners to Saturday morning dress rehearsals, Colonne began this tactic in 1875, not charging for tickets, but requiring paid honorary membership to attend. To understand the Société's full significance, scholars will now want to compare not only the repertory of other orchestras in Paris and abroad, but also the strategies they and their competitors used to stay afloat under ever-evolving conditions and to handle the demands of star soloists and contemporary composers.

A case in point: without taking into account competition by other local orchestras, Holoman's characterization of Garcin's embrace of Wagner risks misleading as well as sidestepping the onus of the Société's conservative tastes. When the Société first performed Wagnerian excerpts from *Tannhäuser* and *Lohengrin* in 1866 and 1869, this was after Pasdeloup had earlier demonstrated their popularity with audiences. Garcin's 'premieres' of the prelude to *Tristan und Isolde* in 1891 and the religious scene from *Parsifal* in 1892 (pp. 293–4) were long after other Parisian orchestras had performed them. Colonne first conducted the *Tristan* prelude in 1881, giving it again in 1889, 1890, and 1891, only weeks before the Société's first performance. Colonne's orchestra gave its premiere of the religious scene from *Parsifal* in 1884 and had performed it nine times, including twice in 1892, before the Société did it that March. Lamoureux first conducted the first act of *Tristan* in 1884 (and numerous times thereafter) and the religious scene from *Parsifal* in 1886. As such, one should understand the Société as following rather than leading the emerging public taste for Wagner. Moreover, the Société was less interested in new Wagnerian works. Just after *Parsifal*'s premiere in Bayreuth in summer 1882, all three of the other major Parisian orchestras, Pasdeloup, Colonne, and Lamoureux, gave their premieres of the prelude of *Parsifal* on the same Sunday that October, whereas the Société, which started its season in November, ignored Wagner altogether that year. When Taffenel took over in the autumn of 1892, defying the competition that sometimes dedicated entire concerts to Wagner's music, he decided almost to eliminate Wagner from the Société's programmes for a decade. His reason: Wagner's 'excessive sonority doesn't lend itself to performance in our little hall' (p. 271).

The Société's audiences may have contributed to its 'retrogressive' tendencies well into the twentieth century. Holoman suggests that 'most of the subscribers were openly hostile to aggressive modernism' (p. 111). With their performances almost entirely sold out through advance subscription sales (unlike for their competitors, who depended largely on sales at the door), the Société was relatively free of market concerns. Subscriptions tended to remain in families for generations and it was extremely difficult to procure a seat if one were not a subscriber except through a small 'black market' for tickets (p. 97). Only in 1903, after the Société suffered 'vacillating receipts and inexorably rising expenses' (p. 319), did it make available single ticket sales. Yet this apparently did not result in any less resistance. One listener was seen reading the newspaper when they performed Debussy. Even in 1933, Gaubert noted, 'We can play Saint-Saëns without fear, but then things heated up when we tried *L'Apprenti sorcier* [by Paul Dukas] for the first time: subscribers demanded their money back' (p. 435). The issue of subscriber tastes, however, needs analysis of more than correspondence cited in the administrative committee's minutes. Why would audience loyalty necessarily encourage 'retrogressive' tastes? Was it merely that the audience was aging along with the performers? Or was the sound cultivated by the orchestra antithetical to modernism? Or the genres most associated with the Société, such as large works for chorus and orchestra? (Related to this, were the Société's fortunes ultimately tied too closely to the taste for such music as it declined substantially after the wars?) Holoman tells us that the patrons included not just wealthy families and government bureaucrats, but also many professional musicians and families of the *sociétaires*. What about the latter would necessarily make them so resistant to the new and the progressive in music? Was there ever a claque that would have promoted a certain point of view, thereby potentially influencing audiences? Beyond these concerts, were all subscribers truly 'music-lovers' or, increasingly, social elites, there to assert family ties and make connections with the city's other elites? Was the status associated with being a subscriber ever capable of challenging, even dominating, conflicting musical concerns? If audiences played a role in the music that became associated with the Société and, indeed, in the emergence of a certain canon of musical masterpieces, it is important to know much more about them, who sat where for how long, and what these performances meant to them.

As this book is not primarily a study of public taste, most of the reviews cited are also from the committee minutes. But how rich and useful would be a substantial study of the

critical reception of the Société from 1828 to 1967. This would allow us to comprehend more fully the meaning of their 'tradition' and how this may have evolved over time. I'd be curious, for example, how Beethoven was understood when performed under the baton of their twelve conductors. How was each of their Beethovens distinct from those conducted by Pasdeloup, Colonne, Lamoureux, and their successors? Critics could help us address this. And what did Beethoven mean to them when performed next to a wide range of other music? Listening to Beethoven in the context of Mendelssohn and Haydn is far different from hearing his music juxtaposed with that of Wagner, Debussy, or Shostakovitch. Moreover, if the Société represented a certain standard, one would see this in the discussions and debates. After 1903, when the Société began to advertise, engage a press service, and give away up to sixty tickets per performance to critics, the increase in reviews offers an ideal opportunity to examine the meaning and impact of its performances, not just for those privileged to be able to attend, but also for other orchestras and other musicians near and far.

D. Kern Holoman's *The Société des Concerts du Conservatoire, 1828–1967* has laid a magnificent foundation for the study of all orchestras, immensely valuable to anyone who wishes to know how one works. It is to be savoured and returned to frequently, especially the programmes on the website. There is much to admire in 'the history and principles' of an organization that survived 'even the harshest of crises with some dignity . . . to re-emerge on Sunday afternoons in an almost relentless permanence' (p. 387) for one hundred and forty years.

Jann Pasler
University of California at San Diego
doi:10.1093/ml/gcq078

Teoretické dílo. By Leoš Janáček. Edited by Leoš Faltus, Eva Drlíková, Svatava Přibáňova, and Jiři Zahrádka. pp. 716. Theoretical Works, ser. 1, vol. 1. (Editio Janáček, Brno, 2007–8. ISBN 978-80-904052-0-2.)

Teoretické dílo. By Leoš Janáček. Edited by Leoš Faltus, Eva Drlíková, and Svatava Přibáňova. pp. 489. Theoretical Works, ser. 1, vol. 2. (Editio Janáček, Brno, 2007–8. ISBN 978-80-904052-1-9.)

Not long ago, collections of Janáček's writings consisted of a volume of folkloristic works (1955) and two volumes of theoretical works (1968 and 1974). Both were soon seen as inadequate: incomplete (most of the unpublished writings were ignored), and, in the case of the theoretical works, not even indexed. Janáček's remaining writings, known not always helpfully as his 'literary works', had not been brought together in this way, although some could be found in specialist articles devoted to pieces that he published in particular newspapers. The most prominent partial collection was from the Brno newspaper *Lidové noviny*, collected first in the 1930s, and published again in a censored form in the 1950s. For everything else, one had a hard time seeking out obscure journals and newspapers.

Today the position is quite different. There are five handsome, uniform volumes, comprising the literary works (two volumes, 2003), the theoretical works (two volumes, 2007–8) and the folkloristic works (one volume, 2009, with more to follow). The literary works had been planned for years, part of the Janáček collected edition initiated by Supraphon in the 1970s. After regime change in Czechoslovakia in 1989 Supraphon was broken up and its more profitable publishing activities were taken over by Bärenreiter. This included the Janáček Complete Collected Edition, but, as far as writings were concerned, the only sign of progress was that a salaried editor had been assigned. But once Janáček's royalties returned from a central state source to a newly formed 'Janáček Foundation', its funds began to be used not to support and accelerate the Bärenreiter complete edition (based in Prague), but instead to create a rival 'Editio Janáček' (based in Brno), which with huge energy began pouring out volumes of music and writings that had so far been neglected by Bärenreiter. It could be argued that the new publisher has been rather too hastily productive. While it is helpful to have all these volumes of writings available, more attention given to the status of the texts would have made these volumes much more valuable.

In the theoretical volumes under review here, for instance, volume 1 comprises, with a couple of exceptions, all of what was in the two volumes edited by Zdeněk Blažek published in 1968–74, and seemingly without any reference to Janáček's original versions. To take a brief example, an article 'O dokonalé představě dvojzvuku' [On the perfect concept of two-note chords], JW XV/44, was originally published, like so many of Janáček's earlier theoretical writings, in instalments (1885–6) in the journal he edited, *Hudební listy*. Blažek repub-