A chapter devoted to ‘nationalist symphonies of the 1950s’ considers works that tried to incorporate aspects of indigenous Australian musical culture. McNeill acknowledges that ‘the thorny issue of appropriation was unspoken’ at that time (p. 119), and he is inclined to be generous in his judgement of such composers as Alfred and Mirrie Hill, Clive Douglas, James Penberthy, and John Anthill, arguing that ‘within the limitations of their time and worldviews…[they] reach out in admiration and respect towards Indigenous Australians’ (p. 120).

Into a ‘neo-classic and progressive’ category McNeill places the works of composers Robert Hughes, Raymond Hanson, Dorian Le Gallienne, Margaret Sutherland, and David Morgan. The latter was a discovery for this reviewer, as he may be for many others—but McNeill argues that Morgan should be ‘ranked amongst Australia’s finest symphonists’, notwithstanding the fact that ‘his name does not appear in any current reference on music in Australia’ (p. 175). He is also still living. The penultimate chapter is reserved for ‘Australian Expatriate Symphonies’, which perhaps unsurprisingly includes names better known today both in Australia and abroad such as Hubert Clifford, Arthur Benjamin, Peggy Glanville-Hicks, and Malcolm Williamson.

As McNeill concludes, however, mere knowledge of the existence of their scores is not enough. Their works need to be heard. This remains unlikely given both the prevailing economic conditions across the West referred to at the outset of this review, and the fact that the programming decisions of Australian orchestras are also largely in the hands of overseas-trained artistic directors and conductors who have no particular identification with, or compelling curatorial responsibility for, this repertory. All the same, this book represents a major advance in making what must remain a slim possibility at least a little more conceivable.
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A Musician Divided has been released amidst a flurry of projects set to kindle interest in Andre Tchaikowsky (1935–82). Born in Warsaw to a Jewish family as Robert Andrzej Krauthammer, Tchaikowsky survived the Ghetto under the protection of his grandmother (who made the name change) and went on to become one of the most internationally sought-after pianists of the 1960s and 1970s. It is his activities as a composer, however, to which Anastasia Belina-Johnson and David Pountney, among others, have been seeking to draw attention of late. In 2013, Pountney oversaw the world premiere of Tchaikowsky’s only opera, The Merchant of Venice (1968–82), at the Bregenz Festspiele, and Belina-Johnson completed a German-language biography (André Tchaikowsky: Die tägliche Mühe ein Mensch zu sein (Holheim, 2013)). A full-length documentary is currently in the making and a collection of his letters has just been made available in English for the first time (My Guardian Demon: Letters of André Tchaikowsky and Halina Janowska, 1956–1982 (Huntingdon, 2015)).

David Ferré, author of The Other Tchaikowsky (self-published in 1991), has been assiduously detailing these activities on a website (www.andretchaikowsky.com), which serves as a valuable research tool alongside this inaugural English-language study.

At the heart of Belina-Johnson’s volume are two as yet unseen documents offering new insight into Tchaikowsky’s life and career: a ‘Testimony’ recorded in 1947 of his experience as a Jewish child in Nazi-occupied Poland, and his diaries of 1974–82, written once he had settled in England. The diaries are largely complete, we are told, but for entries and passages dropped for legal reasons, and unedited but for corrections of (almost all) grammatical and spelling errors (p. 100). They are also adorned with photographs and ample footnotes identifying the people and works mentioned, and, most interestingly, pointing out moments when Tchaikowsky’s account is unreliable.

Framing these sections are a biographical outline and compositional survey. The chapter on Tchaikowsky’s life draws extensively on reminiscences from those who knew him. Most of these were collected by Ferré between 1985 and 1992, others by Belina-Johnson in 2013. Their presence in conjunction with the diaries allows for a comparison of Tchaikowsky’s public and private behaviour, thus tying in with one of the book’s key themes: the divided Tchaikowsky.

The chapter on his music lists his compositional output and offers segments of varying length and content on each of the surviving mature works. Some of these read like pro-
gramme notes, with musical description and details on a work’s genesis; sections on those pieces with performance and recording histories are accompanied by extracts from sleeve notes, programmes, and newspaper reviews. By far the most extensive discussion is reserved for The Merchant. Here, where more space is allowed, observations appear that make the prospect of further research by Belina-Johnson on this topic a tantalizing one.

On the whole, these outer chapters are summarial and descriptive. This is partly a result of the volume having been put together, as Belina-Johnson admits in the Preface, in less than a year (p. 13); but it also reflects one of the volume’s main objectives: Belina-Johnson presents the materials and raises questions in order that critical analyses of both writings and works might be taken up by later investigators. The book presents a wealth of materials to that end. In addition to Tchaikowsky’s own writings and the previously unpublished reminiscences by friends and colleagues, the book includes appendices listing recordings of Tchaikowsky’s performances and compositions. One key item that is missing, however, is a bibliography. Any future researchers will need to scan the footnotes and acknowledgements to discern Belina-Johnson’s sources of information.

The primary intention is rather traditional: to inspire studies of Tchaikowsky’s life and works. Belina-Johnson herself suggests publishing Tchaikowsky’s unfinished autobiography with a commentary to ‘steer the reader between fact and fiction’ (p. 11) as a possible project, and reports that she is in the process of writing a full biography. (It is unclear whether this will be distinct from her German biography of 2013.)

Work-based studies are encouraged by the recurring argument that Tchaikowsky was a composer who was forced to perform in order to make ends meet—a ‘musician divided’, in other words. As such, the volume follows up a call made by Ferré thirty years ago for Tchaikowsky’s biography to be rewritten as not that of a ‘pianist who composed but a composer who played the piano’ (‘A Note on André Tchaikowsky’, Musical Times, 126 (1985), 670). While it would be unprofitable to use the diaries as the basis for psychoanalytical studies of Tchaikowsky’s music, there are other ways in which the entries prove illuminating for potential work-based studies. Tchaikowsky goes into revealing depth, for example, on the processes behind the Second Piano Concerto, the song cycle Ariel, and The Merchant of Venice—although often these passages are retrospective and, therefore, ought to be treated with caution.

The diaries do not always, however, offer firm support for the standpoint that Tchaikowsky was first and foremost a composer. For one thing, during the eight years they cover, Tchaikowsky completed only a handful of pieces: a string quartet, a piano trio, and The Merchant, which he had begun in 1968. What is more, Belina-Johnson’s efforts to stress Tchaikowsky’s compositional aptitude on occasion prove contradictory. She insists, for instance, that composing ‘was the one area of his profession where he never procrastinated’ (p. 357); and yet, when pushed to finally complete The Merchant under the pressure of a deadline from the English National Opera, Tchaikowsky expressed surprise at his productivity: ‘not since adolescence’ he confided, ‘have I written so quickly and spontaneously’ (p. 298).

What is less obviously foregrounded is that this book also opens up the possibility of analysing Tchaikowsky’s skill and creativity as a performer. In his diaries, Tchaikowsky describes periods of intense work on recitals (p. 215) and gives honest, often harsh, self-appraisals of his own playing. What is more, tucked in at the back is a CD of a semi-private recital recorded in Western Australia in 1975. As in the diary (and as opposed to the official recordings), here we catch Tchaikowsky at his most candid: he chats and jokes with his audience, and his playing is far from technically perfect. Although his studio recordings are currently difficult to come by, it can be hoped that this volume might encourage their rerelease, thus further facilitating studies of Tchaikowsky’s pianism.

Rather than debating the extent to which Tchaikowsky was ‘a musician divided’ between performance and composition, it might be more productive to consider how the two informed one another: how his performance style and preferred repertory shaped his compositional decisions, and how his penchant for composition shaped his creative approach to performance. Reading the diaries, it is clear that Tchaikowsky valued the performer in the creative process. For instance, he expresses his amazement at Radu Lupu’s rendition of his Second Piano Concerto at its premiere in 1975: ‘It’s truly amazing how often he would take me by surprise, sometimes by his exquisite timing, sometimes by a subtle departure from the indicated dynamics, which every time proved
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an improvement on what I had written! Perhaps I only provided the notes, and Radu the piece?" (p. 169). Throughout, his opinions and the make-up of his works are transformed by live performances. After hearing the Lindsays perform his Second String Quartet, he declares it his favourite work (pp. 204–5), and after the Lupu premiere, he alters the orchestration and dynamics and makes cuts to the Second Piano Concerto (pp. 168–71). That performance played such an important part in Tchaikowsky’s compositional process poses a problem for those works that remained unperformed in his lifetime. As Belina-Johnson speculates, imbalances in the make-up of his works are transformed by live performances. After hearing the Lindsays perform his Second String Quartet, he declares it his favourite work (pp. 204–5), and after the Lupu premiere, he alters the orchestration and dynamics and makes cuts to the Second Piano Concerto (pp. 168–71). That performance played such an important part in Tchaikowsky’s compositional process poses a problem for those works that remained unperformed in his lifetime. As Belina-Johnson speculates, imbalances in the make-up of his works are transformed by live performances. After hearing the Lindsays perform his Second String Quartet, he declares it his favourite work (pp. 204–5), and after the Lupu premiere, he alters the orchestration and dynamics and makes cuts to the Second Piano Concerto (pp. 168–71). That performance played such an important part in Tchaikowsky’s compositional process poses a problem for those works that remained unperformed in his lifetime. As Belina-Johnson speculates, imbalances in the make-up of his works are transformed by live performances. After hearing the Lindsays perform his Second String Quartet, he declares it his favourite work (pp. 204–5), and after the Lupu premiere, he alters the orchestration and dynamics and makes cuts to the Second Piano Concerto (pp. 168–71). That performance played such an important part in Tchaikowsky’s compositional process poses a problem for those works that remained unperformed in his lifetime. As Belina-Johnson speculates, imbalances in the make-up of his works are transformed by live performances. After hearing the Lindsays perform his Second String Quartet, he declares it his favourite work (pp. 204–5), and after the Lupu premiere, he alters the orchestration and dynamics and makes cuts to the Second Piano Concerto (pp. 168–71). That performance played such an important part in Tchaikowsky’s compositional process poses a problem for those works that remained unperformed in his lifetime. As Belina-Johnson speculates, imbalances in the make-up of his works are transformed by live performances. After hearing the Lindsays perform his Second String Quartet, he declares it his favourite work (pp. 204–5), and after the Lupu premiere, he alters the orchestration and dynamics and makes cuts to the Second Piano Concerto (pp. 168–71). That performance played such an important part in Tchaikowsky’s compositional process poses a problem for those works that remained unperformed in his lifetime. As Belina-Johnson speculates, imbalances in the make-up of his works are transformed by live performances. After hearing the Lindsays perform his Second String Quartet, he declares it his favourite work (pp. 204–5).

John Morgan O’Connell is one of the pre-eminent scholars conducting archival research into the music of Turkey during the late Ottoman/early Republican era. This monograph, rather than providing a general introduction to this dynamic period of Turkish music history, primarily examines debates surrounding the recorded and concert performances of Mümin Nurettin Selçuk during fifteen years of the singer’s forty-year career (ignoring, for the most part, his compositional output and his considerable instrumental acumen on tambūr). Selçuk has scarcely been written about in any language, and the extant writings in Turkish do not do justice to his significance in the modernization of Ottoman and Turkish art music, especially regarding vocal performance and the staging of art music concerts. A peculiar public figure, at least in comparison with his musical and intellectual contemporaries, Selçuk neither wrote memoirs nor reflected in writing on his astonishing four-decade career in music, yet he collected a large amount of paraphernalia related to his musical life. This volume is the only major work to draw upon this archive, which has been preserved by Selçuk’s daughter Meral Selçuk.

His life, and consequently this brief period of Turkish urban musical history during the early formation of the Turkish Republic, provide an assemblage of source material much more commonly found at the heart of Central and Western European historical musicological studies than works of ethnomusicology.

O’Connell’s arguments, and the debates that he outlines, are constructed from an expansive set of dichotomies: alaturka/alafranga, East/West, Orient/Occident, empire/republic, sacred/secular (and mystical/romantic love), masculine/feminine, conventional/radical, language/music, chaos/order, artiste/artist, bourgeois/aristocratic, past/present. These dichotomies largely concern the relation between critical discourses (especially musicological and non-academic newspaper criticism) and changing musical practice within his life and that of his contemporaries. Looming above them are two key terms that are not dichotomous: style and modernity. As O’Connell makes clear, despite the music-stylistic ramifications of this particular discourse analysis, debates about style were just as much debates about society, class, fashion, and different competing frameworks for modernity. The primary framework for this exegesis is Pierre Bourdieu’s conceptualization of doxa, with a secondary framing around Dick Hebdige’s conceptualization of subculture.

This is a complex book about complex times. This was the era of ‘catastrophic’ language reforms, in the oft-cited words of Geoffrey Lewis (The Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success (Oxford, 1999), which resulted in the expunging of words of Arabic and Persian origin and their replacement with neologisms of either Mongolian, Slavic, or French origin (there are no fewer than eighteen terms for style in O’Connell’s book!). While O’Connell is correct that primarily French terms were adopted in relation to matters of musical style, the broader suggestion that there are ‘very few terms adapted from German’ (p. 36) is not wholly accurate, however, as much of the technical vocabulary surrounding radio and recorded media is German (see Ayhan Dinç, Özden Cankaya, and Nail Ekici (eds.), İstanbul Radyosu: Anlar, Taşantila (İstanbul, 2000)). Not just words were changed; theSurname Act of 1934 required all citizens to be assigned an approved (Turkish) surname (see Meltem Türköz, ‘Surname Narratives and the State-Society Boundary: Memories of Turkey’s Family Name Law of 1934’, Middle Eastern Studies, 43 (2007), 893–908), a situation that brings added complexity to the present volume, as not all the musicians discussed are widely known through their surnames. One central musician, the cellist and tambūr player Mesut Cemil ‘Tel’, is rarely known as ‘Tel partly because ‘Tel’ (meaning ‘wire’ or ‘string’) was an adopted surname, and not shared with his father, the renowned composer Tanburi Cemil Bey. The reproduced 1930 concert programme (p. 110) does not include the Tel surname, and he dropped it only a few years after adopting it; consequently, it is almost never used in any Turkish-language writings. Even the use of Selçuk’s surname deviates from Turkish writings, which typically refer to him as Mümin Nurettin, as he wasn’t a