

THEOPHIL ANTONICEK, GERNOT GRUBER & CHRISTOPH LANDERER (EDS), *EDUARD HANSLICK ZUM GEDENKEN: BERICHT DES SYMPOSIONS ZUM ANLASS SEINES 100. TODESTAGES* (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 2010). ISBN 978-3-86296-008-8, 357pp, €55/\$75.

Eduard Hanslick zum Gedenken: Bericht des Symposions zum Anlass seines 100. Todestages (In Remembrance of Eduard Hanslick: A Report on the Occasion of his 100th Birthday) is a collection of essays that stems from the Hanslick Symposium held in Vienna on 9–10 October 2004. All the essays are in German and in this review I use my own translations of the titles and quotations.¹ The range and scope of the topics covered is broad and impressive, reflecting the burgeoning interest, not only in Hanslick, but in music aesthetics and Viennese music criticism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that is currently taking place both in Austro-German and Anglo-American scholarship. At its best, this volume is compelling and thought-provoking. It confronts a wealth of material on Hanslick that had heretofore remained unexplored, and is to be highly recommended for the level of empirical investigation and the amount of source material it offers. The book comprises a short introduction and twenty-five essays, which are arranged into three main sections under the following titles:

1. Hanslick in an intellectual context: aesthetics and musicology
2. Biography and activity
3. Hanslick as critic and writer

The editors took the opportunity when preparing this centennial publication not only to commission new perspectives on Hanslick but also to cast the net wider and include a number of essays that date back over some thirty-five years.

The risk with such an abundance of essays, however, is of a duplication of material that might better have been avoided. Despite the merits of the volume, this results in a disparity in the standard of how that material is treated: in this volume, exemplary scholarship stands side by side with lesser contributions in terms of methodology, perceptive insights and intellectual rigour. There is a further inconsistency regarding the extent to which some essays do not engage with international scholarly discourse on Hanslick, but rather are limited only to German sources, thus giving this volume a somewhat narrow outlook.

I draw attention to this issue because it has serious implications for the discipline of musicology. In 2002, Richard Parncutt spoke of ‘linguistic imperialism’ in musicology. Whereas upon ‘entering the academy in late 19th century Germany, [musicology]

¹ The research for this review was funded by a Marie Curie International Outgoing Fellowship under the 7th Framework Programme of the European Commission.

acquired a distinctly German character and identity', the 'recent international trend toward the English language and away from an authoritative canon has forced German musicology into a phase of post-imperial decadence'.² Parncutt observed a resistance to this change that I would argue is evident in several of these essays. This relates not only to the individual authors concerned; it also has implications for the volume as a whole, and might well have been addressed by the editors at the review stage. Given the sheer growth of international scholarly writings on Hanslick over the past three decades, much of which grapples not only with German nineteenth-century sources but also with recent German-language scholarship in the field, the reluctance to reciprocate this exchange in parts of this book seems contrary to the spirit of scholarship.

With his annotated edition of *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen*³ and his ongoing project to publish a complete edition of Hanslick's critical writings,⁴ Dietmar Strauss has transformed and revolutionized Hanslick scholarship over the last two decades. It is fitting, therefore, that his is the opening essay in this volume. 'On the Musically Beautiful: Eduard Hanslick and *ennui* in the nineteenth century' explores changing modes of cognition and listening habits in the age of the industrial revolution. Drawing connections between Hanslick's output and the writings of Walter Benjamin, Strauss addresses the changing perceptions of the musical work and its performance. Part I continues from there to explore Hanslick's relationship to a series of key players in the field of music aesthetics in the second half of the nineteenth century. Both Laurenz Lütteken and Gabriele Eder deal with the case of Hanslick and Guido Adler. Lütteken's "'The Collaborative Work of Fantasy": Aesthetics, Value Judgement and Musical Knowledge in Hanslick's Environment' presents a lucid and engaging take on this relationship, one that considers and responds to the latest research in the field. His key focus is 'how Hanslick, on the one hand, positioned himself in the system of musicology, whereas on the other hand this system reacted to Hanslick and the implicit provocation of his treatise'. (67) Drawing not only on Hanslick's aesthetic and critical writings but also on the letters of reference that he penned on Adler's behalf,

² Richard Parncutt, 'Interdisciplinary balance, international collaboration, and the future of (German) (historical) musicology', in Arnfried Edler & Sabine Meine (eds), *Musik, Wissenschaft und Ihre Vermittlung: Bericht zur Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung* (Hanover: Wissner, 2001), 42–51. See http://www.uni-graz.at/richard.parncutt/publications/Pa02_Musicology.pdf (accessed 24 August 2011).

³ Eduard Hanslick, *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen: Ein Beitrag zur Revision der Ästhetik der Tonkunst* ed. Dietmar Strauss, 2 vols (Mainz: Schott, 1990).

⁴ Eduard Hanslick, *Sämtliche Schriften: historisch-kritische Ausgabe. Aufsätze und Rezension, 1844–1865*, ed. Dietmar Strauss, 7 vols (Vienna: Böhlau, 1993–2011).

Lütteken discerns the distinction that Hanslick made between *Musikhistorie* and *Musikgeschichte*, categories that resonate with Friedrich Jodl's opposing terms of *Gelehrter* (scholar) and *Aesthetiker* (writer on aesthetics), the tension between positivist objectivity and critical subjectivity.⁵ *Musikhistorie* is considered to be an antiquarian pursuit of knowledge, a musical archaeology concerned with the excavation of old scores and the examination of their contents. *Musikgeschichte*, on the other hand, 'as aesthetic [knowledge], is coupled with unambiguous value judgement, not the neutrality of the source, and it thereby points back to the critical positions of the eighteenth century, to a certain extent to the traditions of historicism and Idealism'. (72) Hanslick employs this distinction in his 1881 letter of reference for Adler, writing that his work is 'of greater archaeological and philosophical interest, than it is of aesthetic or general historical interest'. (73) This categorization resonates with the branches of musicology that Adler would define in 1885 in his 'Scope, Method, and Goal of Musicology',⁶ albeit with a reversed bias. When taken in the context of the vicissitudes of musicological endeavours throughout the twentieth century, this distinction is both prescient and incisive.

Eder's 'Guido Adler and his Relationship to Eduard Hanslick', originally published in 2000, points the way toward a significant amount of primary source material on Adler.⁷ It was Eder's description of a number of sketches of Adler by Julius Schmid that Kevin C. Karnes cited in his 2008 book *Music, Criticism and the Challenge of History*. By complicating and nuancing the relationship between Adler and Hanslick, Karnes unpacks and illuminates the nature of their conflict.⁸ His findings are not taken up in Eder's essay, however. This renders one of her conclusions—that there is 'much that remains unclear' (96) about this complex relationship—somewhat inaccurate.

Barbara Boisits also grapples with the opposition between aesthetics and art history in 'The Laws of the Specifically Musical: Eduard Hanslick's Justification of Aesthetics in relation to Historical and Scientific Conceptions of Art'. She brings clarity to Han-

⁵ See Kevin C. Karnes, *Music, Criticism, and the Challenge of History: Shaping Modern Musical Thought in Late Nineteenth-Century Vienna* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), particularly 21–47, for an engaging exploration of these opposing terms since the nineteenth century.

⁶ Guido Adler, 'Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft', *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, I (1885): 5–20.

⁷ See Gabriele Eder, 'Eduard Hanslick und Guido Adler. Aspekte einer menschlichen und wissenschaftlichen Beziehung', in Martin Seiler & Friedrich Stadler (eds), *Kunst, Kunsttheorie und Kunstforschung im wissenschaftlichen Diskurs. In memoriam Kurt Blaukopf (1914–1999)* (Vienna: ÖBV and HTP Verlagsgesellschaft, 2000), 107–42.

⁸ Karnes, *Music, Criticism, and the Challenge of History*, 133–87.

slick's distinction by considering, on the one hand, art history to be concerned with the 'emergence' or the 'becoming' of a work of art, and, on the other, aesthetics to be concerned with 'the being of a work', that is, 'those characteristics that make it an artwork [for which] no biographical, sociological, psychological, political or historical analysis could be detected in their value'. (22) Boisit's introductory comment that 'Hanslick formulated a radical aesthetic for music alone that assured it an absolute autonomy' before 'the Russian formalism of the twentieth century' (22), and her allusion in the conclusion to the 'Prague dawn (*Frühzeit*)', in relation to 'formalistic theories in different disciplines' in the former Habsburg monarchy, point to avenues of inquiry of potentially great consequence that might have been pursued. Instead, Boisit's focus is on *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen*, with scant reference to the scholarship that has grown up around it. She explores Hanslick's question of whether aesthetic contemplation can take into consideration factors that lie outside of the artwork itself and elucidates his concern that there should be a separation of aesthetics for different art forms.

Rudolf Flotzinger broaches the relationship between Hanslick and Friedrich von Hausegger. Those familiar with either James Deaville's essay 'The Controversy Surrounding Liszt's Conception of Programme Music'⁹ or Stephen McClatchie's *Analyzing Wagner's Operas*¹⁰ will be familiar with Flotzinger's claim that Hausegger's 1885 text *Musik als Ausdruck* and August Wilhelm Ambros's *Die Grenzen der Musik und Poesie* (1856) were understood to be *Gegenstücke* to Hanslick's *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen*. The strength of Flotzinger's chapter is that it provides much background information on Hausegger and points us in the direction of some of his lesser-known writings.

Werner Abegg's 'Eduard Hanslick and the Idea of "Pure Instrumental Music"' will be of greater appeal to those more familiar with Hanslick's ideas than to those wishing to be introduced to them. In his clearly focused and tightly argued contribution, Abegg poses three fundamental questions: What was the foundation for Hanslick's postulate on the limits of a musical concept? How did he relate this postulate to his central concern, the 'musically beautiful'? Which 'aesthetic characteristics of vocal music' did he 'in no way deny', and how consequential were his refusals 'for the aesthetics of music'?

Abegg traces the idea of pure instrumental music from Johann Elias Schlegel to James Beattie, Tieck, Friedrich Schlegel, Hoffmann and Herder, arguing that only

⁹ James Deaville, 'The Controversy Surrounding Liszt's Conception of Programme Music', in Jim Samson & Bennett Zon (eds), *Nineteenth-Century Music: Selected Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 98–124.

¹⁰ Stephen McClatchie, *Analyzing Wagner's Operas: Alfred Lorenz and German Nationalist Ideology* (Rochester NY: University of Rochester Press, 1998).

Hanslick's pronouncements on the subject elicited numerous responses due to the polemical nature of his text. Conscious that *Geist* is the defining factor in Hanslick's conception of the musically beautiful and that melody is the *Grundgestalt* of this beauty, Abegg explores the concept of the 'ugly' found predominantly in Hanslick's reviews of opera. Citing Hanslick's criticism of Gounod, Meyerbeer and Richard Strauss, Abegg clarifies Hanslick's distinction between music that is beautiful, and music that is false and ugly: absolutely ugly music amounts to absolute nonsense, because music has the capacity to be beautiful. Abegg teases out an important distinction in Hanslick's writings between music that is slavishly bound to a verbal text, as he perceives it to be in certain works by those composers named above, and vocal music that carries its meaning within the music itself. He refers to Hanslick's reviews of Brahms's *Lied Auf dem See*, Op. 106, and Schubert's 'Die böse Farbe' from *Die Schöne Müllerin* as exemplifying the latter for Hanslick on account of the independence of both text and music in these works.

Dieter Borchmeyer's 'Hanslick and Grillparzer: or "On the Boundaries of Music and Poetry"' combines interest and authority in its exploration of the affinities and antinomies between these two figures. This is a welcome study, exploring a key relationship that has received scant attention to date. Whereas Hanslick appropriated Grillparzer's philosophical treatment of the differences between music and poetry and shared his rejection of the literary ambitions of modern German opera in favour of the naivety and poetic simplicity of Italian opera, Borchmeyer finds significance in the fact that Hanslick never addressed his divergence with Grillparzer on the subject of music's capacity to arouse feelings. Broadening the focus on Grillparzer's critique of Weber's *Der Freischütz*, Borchmeyer deftly traces how Nietzsche gathered ammunition from Grillparzer, Hanslick and Otto Jahn for his anti-Wagner polemics.

Both Christoph Landerer and Manfred Eger also address Nietzsche's inability to extricate himself from Hanslick's thinking in his later attacks on Wagner. Landerer does so in the context of his exploration of 'Eduard Hanslick and Austrian Intellectual History'. This is reworked from his book *Eduard Hanslick und Bernard Bolzano: ästhetisches Denken in Österreich in der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Sankt Augustin: Academia, 2004). Landerer's skilful compression from his monograph traces Hanslick's eclectic philosophical influences, pointing to the centrality of Hegel, Kant, Schopenhauer and Zimmermann, before turning to the subject of the Herbartian positivism that infiltrated Austrian intellectualism between 1848 and 1918. Landerer asserts that Hanslick felt closer to the philosophy of Bolzano than he did to Herbart's formalism, which he defines as a 'radical, ahistorical conception of beauty'. (61) Returning to an issue ex-

plored by Geoffrey Payzant in 2002, Landerer questions the sincerity of Hanslick's avowed allegiance to Herbart, seeing it as a tactical manoeuvre to secure an academic post.¹¹ In 'Nietzsche's failure with Hanslick's Ideas: facts and fatalities regarding *The Case of Wagner*', Eger charts the many instances in which Nietzsche's thoughts on Wagner bear an uncanny resemblance to those of Hanslick. He provides much source material but little engagement other than to conclude that, for Nietzsche, Hanslick was 'at once a godsend and a destiny'. (112)

Part II is concerned with Hanslick's biography and professional activity outside of his capacity as a music critic and writer on aesthetics. The first essay in this section is one of the book's most outstanding contributions. Clemens Höslinger's account of 'Eduard Hanslick in his Letters' is the result of a lifetime of research, and he is at pains to fit the sheer wealth of information at his disposal into the confines of this essay. He makes an excellent stab at it, the result being an informative, engaging and eloquent account of Hanslick's correspondence drawn from some 400 letters written between 1844 and 1904. Although there is much material concerning Hanslick's life and biography, there is little of musicological interest, with the exception of a few letters to Brahms, Billroth, Johann Strauss and Nikolaus Dumba.

Equally impressive is Jitka Ludvová's investigation of 'Some Prague realities regarding Eduard Hanslick', a significant reworking of her 1986 essay 'Zur Biographie Eduard Hanslicks'.¹² Ludvová addresses the issue of Hanslick's religion and Jewish heritage, and his attitude towards his Czech lineage, for which this essay will undoubtedly be widely cited. There is detailed documentary evidence concerning the background of both Hanslick's parents and their families. Whereas it is widely known that his Jewish mother converted to Catholicism to marry his father, little else is known of these family circumstances. Ludvová establishes that Hanslick's maternal grandparents, while not orthodox Jews, did live in a Jewish ghetto until such time as they moved to the gentrified area of Prague with Hanslick's parents, where all three generations shared accommodation, providing the opportunity for Hanslick and his siblings to spend a great deal of their childhood with their grandparents. Within the space of one generation, therefore, the family was fully assimilated, so much so that Hanslick would later deny his Jewish ancestry to Wagner. Ludvová also questions Hanslick's claim that he had little knowledge of the Czech language by mentioning his keen interest in the translation by his sister in the late 1840s of a number of literary

¹¹ Geoffrey Payzant, *Hanslick on the Musically Beautiful: Sixteen Lectures on the Musical Aesthetics of Eduard Hanslick* (Christchurch, New Zealand: Cybereditions, 2002), 131.

¹² Jitka Ludvová, 'Zur Biographie Eduard Hanslicks', *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft*, 37 (1986), 37–46.

classics (including numerous titles by Dickens) into Czech. This was also a time when he composed a series of Lieder on Czech texts (1848). Hubert Reitterer's essay on Hanslick's father, 'Joseph Adolf Hanslik as Librarian and Satiriker', complements Ludvová's account and eloquently describes the stimulating intellectual environment in which Hanslick was raised.

Peter Stachel is one of the first scholars to give sustained attention to Hanslick's role in the *Kronprinzenwerk* (Crown Prince's Œuvre) in Vienna from its establishment in 1884 throughout its entire duration, which saw 24 volumes appear under the official title *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild*. Stachel shows the significance of Hanslick's role in this prestigious publication which catapulted him to the highest level of society where he made many valuable personal contacts. Hanslick devoted an entire chapter of his autobiography to this episode in his life.

The frame of reference is considerably narrower in Oswald Panagl's 'Eduard Hanslick as Autobiographer'. The general introductory section on the history of autobiography as a genre seems somewhat superfluous to a volume dedicated to Hanslick and there is comparatively little commentary on the many extensive quotations from Hanslick's writings. Of the commentary there is, much is drawn from Peter Wapnewski's afterword to his edition of *Aus meinem Leben*.¹³ Theophil Antonicek's essay 'Eduard Hanslick and the University of Vienna' documents Hanslick's employment record, showing how his commitment to and enthusiasm regarding his duties at the university waned as the years progressed. Hanslick's attendance at and contribution to faculty meetings are noted, the minutes of which are cited at length. Although there is little information that is not already widely known regarding 'Hanslick and the Vienna Philharmonic' in Clemens Hellsberg's essay on the topic, a clearly written account such as this contributes to the comprehensiveness of the volume.

Part III of this book addresses Hanslick's musical writings. Thomas Grey delivers a much needed and timely reminder that Hanslick was acutely aware of the middle ground between the 'I adore' and 'I abhor' positions on Wagner. Grey seeks to go beyond the *Meistersinger* affair to establish 'how Hanslick's earlier, untroubled opinions were preserved in the later Wagner reviews'. (233) He does so by outlining a critical strategy whereby Hanslick praises that which does not contradict his general negative picture of Wagner, but which rather cleverly supports this picture. He aims to examine how Hanslick's opinion on Wagner can help us to revise our understanding of this composer as a historical and artistic phenomenon, sagely noting that it is time that

¹³ Peter Wapnewski, 'Eduard Hanslick als Darsteller seiner selbst', in Eduard Hanslick, *Aus meinem Leben*, ed. Peter Wapnewski (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1987), 485–513.

Hanslick was no longer viewed as the 'narrow-minded, stubborn opponent of Wagner's "progress"'. (234) Grey clearly documents the complexity and variety of Hanslick's response to Wagner's music, exploring why and to what extent his criticism is justified. This essay makes a hugely significant contribution to both Hanslick and Wagner scholarship.

Hanslick's view of the music of the past is given focussed attention in Wilhelm Seidel's essay 'A Classicist who believes in Progress: Hanslick and the Music of Haydn and Mozart'. This is divided into clearly structured sections, giving it greater clarity than many of the other essays in the volume and displays a level of engagement with (as opposed to observations on) Hanslick's writings. Seidel's frame of reference is wide, and the investigation is well focussed, centring on four fundamental questions: How are Haydn and Mozart considered in a landscape that is no longer their own? How do they relate to the music of Hanslick's present? What do they offer contemporary composers? Of this, what can and ought to remain current? In systematically looking at music of different genres by these two composers, Seidel also explores interesting questions such as the difference in attitudes between Leipzig and Vienna regarding the music of the past, the role of religiosity in how music was viewed in Hanslick's Vienna, and the issue of what is truly German and lasting in music.

Birgit Lodes's 'Hanslick and Beethoven' provides a survey of Hanslick's writings on that composer, beginning with the numerous citations in *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen*, through all of the collected writings. Lodes divides this output into three categories: the known and unknown Beethoven; Beethoven's late works; and dimensions of text and music. Underpinning this endeavour is the question of whether Hanslick promoted certain Beethoven works before or after the members of the *Neudeutsche Schule* did. In her quest to investigate whether Hanslick's view of Beethoven was mediated through that school, Lodes seems to undermine not only Hanslick's independence of judgement but also her own approach. As Grey has shown in this volume, Hanslick's feelings on Wagner were not as polarized as earlier scholarship would have it. Although the *Neudeutsche Schule* question quickly becomes redundant, it recurs throughout, with Lodes's ultimate position being that 'the Beethoven literature of the New Germans forms both a membrane and a motor for Hanslick's designs'. (294) This way of looking at Hanslick's opinion of Beethoven becomes most problematic in the discussion of religious works and the comparison of Beethoven's *Missa Solemnis* and Liszt's 'Graner Messe.' Noticeable by its absence in Lodes's discussion is the question of the respective faiths of the composers, an issue that to my mind impacted greatly on Hanslick's review of these works, as he always responded strongly to what he perceived to be any sort of religious dogma. The frame of reference beyond Hanslick's own writings is somewhat narrow here, given that these

issues are topical in recent Beethoven scholarship.¹⁴ There are many lengthy citations from Hanslick's writings that might well have been truncated.

Continuing with the theme of the *Neudeutsche Schule*, Markus Gärtner's 'Kaleidoscope and Daguerreotype: Positions in the Fundamental Dispute between Eduard Hanslick and Franz Liszt' presents a well-focussed argument, drawn from the author's 2005 monograph.¹⁵ He explores why Hanslick was so hostile to Liszt's music, taking into consideration issues such as the notion of progress versus conservatism, genre designations, the treatment of form and extra-musical associations. Yet Gärtner does not fully answer the question of just precisely what it is that Hanslick considered so atrocious in the music itself, a question that continues to confound scholarship. This essay required a wider consultation of secondary sources, in particular the significant advances in this area in the work of James Deaville¹⁶ and Dana Gooley.¹⁷

Manfred Wagner challenges the stereotypical view of Hanslick's opinion on Bruckner by showing the extent to which the two men not only respected one another professionally but were on collegial and friendly terms for many years, right up to the mid-1890s. He points to the complexity of Hanslick's *Brucknerbild*, quite rightly arguing that whereas he wrote many positive reviews of Bruckner's works, he also derided the symphonic compositions and thwarted the prospect of Bruckner being awarded an honorary doctorate. Wagner's essay is almost completely lacking in citations, however, which is frustrating as there are insightful and important anecdotal observations. Furthermore, I wish that Wagner had developed some of the tantalizing lines of argument on Bruckner and Hanslick presented here, rather than concluding with the vague generalization that Hanslick 'saw a sudden dawning in music history of a movement that would prove fatal in the twentieth century [where the] transfer of voices [would become] the basis of current pop music, regardless of whether it is folklore, techno, or another type of popular music'. (314)

The topics in the final three essays broach areas of Hanslick scholarship that have heretofore been under-represented in the field, namely Hanslick's critical responses to

¹⁴ See for instance Leon Botstein, 'The Search for Meaning in Beethoven: Popularity, Intimacy, and Politics in Historical Perspective', in Scott Burnham & Michael P. Steinberg (eds), *Beethoven and His World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 332–66.

¹⁵ Markus Gärtner, *Eduard Hanslick versus Franz Liszt: Aspekte einer grundlegenden Kontroverse* (Hildesheim, Zürich and New York: Olms Verlag, 2005).

¹⁶ See note 9.

¹⁷ Dana Gooley, 'The Battle against Instrumental Virtuosity in the Early Nineteenth Century', in Christopher H. Gibbs & Dana Gooley (eds), *Franz Liszt and His World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 75–112.

Verdi and Italian opera, operetta, and French music theatre. These authors, therefore, put paid to the lie that Hanslick was something of a German chauvinist in his critical writings. The manner in which they deal with their material differs greatly, however. Michael Jahn's essay on Verdi provides a catalogue of lengthy Hanslick quotations (some almost a page in length) that will be most useful to those interested in Hanslick's views on Italian opera, although there is little or no critical engagement with these sources beyond bullet-point lists at the end outlining what Hanslick found both problematic and laudable in Verdi's operas. Similarly, Harald Hebling's 'Hanslick and Operetta' is arguably more Hanslick than Hebling. There are extensive quotations from Hanslick's reviews of Sullivan's *The Mikado*, Strauss's *Der Zigeunerbaron* and Offenbach's *Die schöne Helena*, amongst others. This is by far the shortest contribution to the collection and ends, as does Jahn's essay, with a rudimentary table charting Hanslick's positive and negative opinions of operetta.

Herbert Schneider's essay provides a detailed and richly informative discussion of Hanslick's response to almost every aspect of French music theatre. He reminds us that Hanslick had a formidable knowledge of French literature, operatic and intellectual history, bolstered by his frequent exchanges with many French music critics. He deftly probes the nature of Hanslick's admiration of *opéra comique* and his opposition to *grand opéra* and systematically investigates a number of categories of Hanslick's reception of French opera, from his opinion on Vaudeville to his take on librettists, his changing appraisals of Berlioz and Massenet throughout his lifetime, and his opinion on the newest developments in French music. This essay—as with Höslinger's above—struggles to fit the wealth of carefully selected information into the available space, leaving not an inch to anything superfluous. It is to be further valued for its consideration of French music theatre in relation to developments in Germany, for its exploration of Viennese adaptations of French operas, and for the quality of its musical and dramatic analysis.

This volume is one of very few collections of essays available on Eduard Hanslick and that alone will guarantee it a wide readership. The multiplicity of source material and archival findings that it contains further enhances it. Yet its appeal would have been greater had there been a more rigorous editorial approach as the book lacks consistency in the standard of the essays on offer. Since the 2004 conference, some of the essays have been significantly revised for publication, yet others appear to have been given less adequate preparation. Also, there is no uniformity in the method of citation used throughout, with sources often being difficult to identify and follow, and it lacks a bibliography and index.

Nicole Grimes

University of California, Irvine, and University College Dublin