
Cosmopolitanism in the Age of Nationalism, 1848–1914

Author(s): Dana Gooley

Source: *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 66, No. 2 (Summer 2013), pp. 523–549

Published by: University of California Press on behalf of the American Musicological Society

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jams.2013.66.2.523>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



University of California Press and American Musicological Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Musicological Society*

JSTOR

Cosmopolitanism in the Age of Nationalism, 1848–1914

DANA GOOLEY, Convenor

Contents

Introduction DANA GOOLEY	523
Beyond Heroism: Music, Ethics, and Everyday Cosmopolitanism RYAN MINOR	529
Opera Is Elite / Opera Is Nationalist: Cosmopolitan Views of Opera Reception in the United States, 1870–90 KATHERINE K. PRESTON	535
Camille Saint-Saëns and Stoic Cosmopolitanism: Patriotic, Moral, Cultural, and Political JANN PASLER	539
Works Cited	545

Introduction

DANA GOOLEY

Over the past two decades scholars working on music in the nineteenth century have intensively scrutinized music and nationalism, producing a highly differentiated understanding of its history, ideological foundations, and cultural manifestations. When we invoke the concept of the “national,” we do so with exceptional critical awareness. Yet this transformation has barely generated any critical reevaluation of the “cosmopolitan.” Why is nineteenth-century cosmopolitanism so rarely defined or even superficially examined? Perhaps it resists analysis because intellectuals and artists did not make it a major preoccupation, leaving no explicit trail in treatises or critical debates. In the nineteenth century, as today, the word was used loosely as a synonym for “sophisticated,” “worldly,” “international,” or “widely traveled.” But a lack of discourses from the period does not mean that cosmopolitanism did not exist. Many of its practices and social formations survived from the past, perhaps

This colloquy builds on a conference panel held at the 2012 IMS conference in Rome. We thank Ralph Locke for his interest, insight, and commentary in its early stages.

Journal of the American Musicological Society, Vol. 66, Number 2, pp. 523–550 ISSN 0003-0139, electronic ISSN 1547-3848. © 2013 by the American Musicological Society. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Rights and Permissions website, www.ucpressjournals.com/reprintInfo.asp. DOI: 10.1525/jams.2013.66.2.523.

more so in music than in other strata of culture. Yet they had lost the discursive articulation and ideological validation they had previously enjoyed. For many writers in the later part of the century, cosmopolitanism could be understood only negatively, as an *absence* of roots, folk spirit, developed subjectivity, or the capacity to transmit authentic feeling—to name only those qualities Wagner claimed to be fatally lacking in Mendelssohn and Meyerbeer.

Cosmopolitanism in nineteenth-century Europe is difficult to pin down, and its relationship to musical culture is anything but straightforward. But it deserves attention more than ever because cosmopolitanism has emerged as a leading subject in interdisciplinary humanities and social sciences. Following the initiative of Cheah and Robbins's 1998 essay collection *Cosmopolitanics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, studies across several disciplines began to examine how new forms of communication, migration, and the radical hybridization of cultures have altered people's sense of attachment to nations and to nation-states. These studies concentrated on the weakening force of the nation-idea in a globalized or globalizing world and traced the development of alternate, non-national identity formations that appear to reanimate the concept of "world citizenship." This sociological focus coincided with an ethical and political embrace of cosmopolitanism by philosophers as diverse as Jacques Derrida and Martha Nussbaum. Both Derrida and Nussbaum revaluated Kant's cosmopolitan critique of nation-based sovereignty for the sake of world justice, the rights of stateless people, and the federative principle.¹ Thus cosmopolitanism was revived to affirm possibilities of affiliation and of political subjectivity that suspend or subordinate the nation concept.

The burgeoning interest in cosmopolitanism has heavily impacted ethnomusicology, and has recently made scattered appearances in historical musicology.² Nearly all of these studies consider twentieth- and twenty-first-century contexts marked by global networks of commerce and communications, post-colonial transformations, mass displacements, migrations, and diasporas. The nineteenth century has received comparatively little attention. Perhaps its reputation as the century of nationalism and nation-based state building makes it seem off limits. The intensive musicological deconstruction of nationalisms in recent years has possibly left the impression that musicians and audiences, especially in the latter half of the century, were overwhelmingly preoccupied with nationhood and the sense of citizenship it provided, and carried this directly into their musical pursuits. At this point we might benefit from questions that would show the limits of national thinking in the musical sphere. What aspects of musical life resisted the pull of national ideology, or simply re-

1. Derrida, *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*; Nussbaum, "Kant and Cosmopolitanism."

2. The most commonly cited works include Stokes, "On Musical Cosmopolitanism"; and Turino, *Nationalists, Cosmopolitans, and Popular Music in Zimbabwe*. Recent studies closer to the methods historical musicology include Magaldi, "Cosmopolitanism and World of Music in Rio de Janeiro"; and Cohen, *Stefan Wolpe*.

mained outside its gravitational field? For much of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, European art music was housed in cosmopolitan milieus and networks such as opera, court ceremonies, salons, touring virtuosos, and music printing. Did these formations and institutions submit passively to the nationalist ideology in the nineteenth century, or might they have remained cosmopolitan, evading national inflection? Might music have the capacity, perhaps an exceptional capacity, to shed national markers?

By asking such questions we hope to reanimate the tensions between national and cosmopolitan principles and practices. As William Weber has noted, “Little has been done to analyze what nationalistic movements *opposed* within musical culture.”³ Wagner’s attacks on Meyerbeer and Mendelssohn are only the most notorious sign that cosmopolitanism carried a powerful ethical and political charge, organizing the value systems of composers, patrons, and audiences. In a study of German-British cultural relations, Celia Applegate notes that “plenty of people in Mendelssohn’s time used the word *cosmopolitan* in reference to the musical world but very often in derogatory terms . . . associated above all with Paris,” and she offers this as her reason for not using the term.⁴ But how did the term “cosmopolitan” become derogatory? And why was it associated specifically with Paris when it had a vital international element? Similar questions can be asked about Russia later in the century. “For a Russian,” writes Richard Taruskin, “the term ‘cosmopolitan’ is never without complications.”⁵ Around 1900, he explains, Russian composers and writers such as Alexander Serov, Anton Rubinstein, and Tchaikovsky came under attack by music historians who considered them cosmopolitan. The criteria by which these composers were judged included ethnicity (Jewish), training (at German conservatories or on Italian tours), and compositional style (Italian, French, and German influences). These motley criteria give the impression that the cosmopolitan consolidated various forms of otherness, yet it has rarely been considered in relation to more familiar strategies of othering.

One difficulty in studying cosmopolitanism is simply identifying its location or site. Perhaps it should be traced at the level of practices—behaviors, social performances, patterns of travel, networks of communication—“actually existing cosmopolitanism.”⁶ Some musicologists have located it in compositional technique and style, arguing that composers such as Weber, Meyerbeer, Tchaikovsky, and Busoni are cosmopolitan because they amalgamate available national idioms (French, German, Italian).⁷ Other writers foreground repertoire and institutions. William Weber, for example, comparing concert institutions in various European capitals, defines as “cosmopolitan” any repertoire

3. Weber, “Cosmopolitan, National, and Regional Identities,” 209. Emphasis original.

4. Applegate, “Mendelssohn on the Road,” 231.

5. Taruskin, “Non-nationalists and Other Nationalists,” 133.

6. On this often-cited term see Cheah and Robbins, *Cosmopolitics*, 2–3 and 238.

7. Tusa, “Cosmopolitanism and the National Opera.”

that mixes works by composers from different countries. In Weber's view, institutions with cosmopolitan repertoire were usually making a bid for cultural authority on a European scale, as opposed to that of region and nation.⁸ Another place we might locate cosmopolitanism, following Applegate, is in the lives and outlook of professional musicians. Even when economically disadvantaged, musicians often had to become "citizens of the world" to get training or fulfill professional obligations. Many musicians traveled, spoke several languages, entertained guests and travelers from various countries, and involved themselves in institutions with international profiles, including publishers of music and journals. Many, after traveling abroad, became promoters of musical nationalism at home, suggesting that cosmopolitanism and nationalism were aligned—complementary rather than contradictory.⁹ Intellectual historians previously held that the affirmative and critical cosmopolitanism of eighteenth-century intellectuals was ended by the French revolution and its discourse of *la nation*,¹⁰ but more recent studies have revised this in favor of the idea of national-cosmopolitan complementarity. Daniel Malachuk, for example, argues that major proponents of the national idea in the mid-nineteenth century—writers as diverse as Giuseppe Mazzini, Ernest Renan, George Eliot, and Walt Whitman—all saw nationalism and cosmopolitanism as parallel, mutually reinforcing positions.¹¹ These "nationalist cosmopolitans" (Malachuk's term) felt that people should direct their energies and affections toward a single nation and that such focalization would facilitate the realization of a larger spiritual or human purpose. They considered nationalism a means to the universal goals of general benefit and elevation.

Several nineteenth-century musicians and artists can be described as "nationalist cosmopolitans" in this sense, but their cases reveal contradictions, not harmonious alignments, between cosmopolitan and national principles. Liszt, in his early years, espoused utopian and universalist philosophies aimed at nothing less than the transformation and redemption of all mankind. But during his concert tours he played to the interests of nationalists in Hungary and Germany, and he was taken to task for it. He perceived no contradiction between the national and the cosmopolitan, but his public often did.¹² Wagner, in his 1849 essay *Art and Revolution*, claimed that "the Art-work of the Future must embrace the spirit of a free mankind, delivered from every shackle

8. Weber, "Cosmopolitan, National, and Regional Identities." For another view of cosmopolitanism centered on repertoire and institutions, see Gerhard, *Urbanization of Opera*, 394.

9. This alignment has been affirmed in passing by a number of musicologists. Taruskin writes: "Modern national consciousness emerged in Russia, as it did everywhere else, as a consequence of the cosmopolitan thinking of the urban élite" (Taruskin, "Nationalism"). On this point see also Parakilas, *Ballads Without Words*, 24, and Stokes, "On Musical Cosmopolitanism."

10. Schlereth, *Cosmopolitan Ideal*, 132–33.

11. Malachuk, "Nationalist Cosmopolitics."

12. See Goolley, "Liszt, Heinrich Börnstein, and the German Exile Cause"; and Loya, *Liszt's Transcultural Modernism*, 108–14.

of *hampering nationality*; its racial imprint must be no more than an embellishment, the individual charm of manifold diversity, and not a cramping barrier.”¹³ Here the national is subordinate to something more universal. In 1872, Wagner added a new preface stating that, since 1849, his universal art ideal had come to realization in Germany: “My belief in the German spirit, and the trust in its predestined place amid the Council of the Nations [im Rathe der Völker] . . . took an ever mightier hold upon me as time rolled on.”¹⁴ Wagner’s new preface certainly intensifies the nationalist spin, but it does not negate the cosmopolitan altogether. It preserves the conceptual structure of “nationalist cosmopolitan” by situating Germany “amid the Council of Nations.”

Wagner’s shift represents not just a “change of mind,” but a conceptual instability or violence at the heart of the “cosmopolitan nationalist” platform. This instability originates in the gap between elite intellectuals, on the one hand, and the “people” on the other. Writers such as Renan, Mazzini, and Tocqueville wanted to dispense with the Enlightenment categories of “all mankind” and “the world” not because they considered it philosophically invalid, but because they considered it too abstract to arouse people’s feelings or win their loyalty. People needed something more immediate or tangible, and the nation was the largest entity that people would realistically be expected to love or relate to. These intellectuals, unlike their eighteenth-century forebears, were reckoning with the “masses” and social psychology. They did not, however, consider themselves part of the masses: from their privileged position, they believed they could see what was good for all mankind and what it meant to belong to “the world,” and in this respect they left the intellectual inheritance of eighteenth-century cosmopolitanism unaltered. The “nationalist cosmopolitan” intellectual thus promoted nationalist thinking in a sort of bad faith, considering nationalism only as a means to cosmopolitical ends.

The notion of a friendly alliance between nationalist and cosmopolitan perspectives became increasingly difficult to sustain in the last third of the century, as more strident and chauvinist voices made themselves heard. In 1870, at the dawn of English musical nationalism, composer George McFarren exclaimed: “Alas, for the cosmopolite, whose citizenship is so universal that he has no special affection for the soil that gave him birth! . . . It is the misfortune of Englishmen . . . to be indifferent to, if not to ignore, our indigenous capacity for music.”¹⁵ French writer Paul Bourget, in his 1892 novel *Cosmopolis*, diagnosed the high life of international cosmopolitans as a hopeless battle against an innate “permanence of race.”¹⁶ The “cosmopolis,” Bourget announced, is

13. “Art and Revolution,” in *Richard Wagner’s Prose Works*, 1:53–54. Emphasis added.

14. *Ibid.*, 29. For the original German see Wagner, *Gesammelte Schriften und Dichtungen*, 3:7.

15. “The National Music of Our Native Land,” *Musical Times* 14, 1 July 1870, 519. Quoted in Weber, “Cosmopolitan, National, and Regional Identities,” 224.

16. Bourget, *Cosmopolis*, 3.

a mirage: “That world, indeed, does not exist; it can have neither defined customs nor a general character. It is composed of exceptions and singularities.”¹⁷ This is cosmopolitanism understood in a purely negative sense—a void of everything the nation could provide: community, subjectivity, distinctiveness. The aspect of cosmopolitanism most crucially obscured by such late-century opponents was its philosophical and critical force. In the ancient world cosmopolitans had been “wise” critics, suspicious of the worldly and narrow interests that come into play in city-state politics. The *philosophes* of the eighteenth century drew directly on the Stoics when they mounted their critiques of the absolutist state, the clerics, and the aristocracy. They proclaimed the rule of reason and demanded a rational foundation for politics and ethics.¹⁸ Yet by the end of the nineteenth century, these aspects of cosmopolitanism had gotten buried under a new set of representations of cosmopolitans as people pursuing decadent lifestyles and deficient in local, nourishing attachments.

Around 1900 the latent cosmopolitanism of musical culture started to gain recognition as “internationalism.” In the inaugural issue of the *Zeitschrift der internationalen Musik-Gesellschaft* (1899), Oskar Fleischer justified his new organization and journal with the now-familiar internationalist rhetoric. “In all areas of culture and industry,” he wrote, “we sense more and more a steady drive toward international interconnection.” The broad goal of the new international association of musicians would be to correct “one-sidedness, short-sightedness and a lack of education in the domain of music,” and thus redress problems caused by the biases of national music associations: “When national boundaries no longer stand between populations like a Chinese wall, and they compare and justify their opinions . . . then music must take unprecedented flight and all members will benefit.”¹⁹ Fleischer’s internationalist rhetoric is not synonymous with cosmopolitanism. He foregrounds the role of economy, and celebrates national distinctiveness.²⁰ But his internationalist project carries over many Enlightenment values: it promotes the reasoned debate of divergent opinions, the elimination of local prejudices, an ethic of international peace (in line with Kant’s aspiration “for eternal peace”), and a conception of general benefit to what he calls the “world market” of music. Above all, Fleischer offers internationalism as a reforming critique of nationalist excess.

Suspicion of cosmopolitanism has persisted into the present and made it a sensitive term. Several writers advocate for cosmopolitanism only after positing a “reformed” version. Homi Bhabha supports a “vernacular cosmopolitanism which measures global progress from a minoritarian perspective,” opposing it

17. *Ibid.*, 2.

18. Schlereth, *Cosmopolitan Ideal*, xviii–xix.

19. Fleischer, “Zum Geleit,” 4.

20. *Ibid.* “[This society] foresees in no way the sacrifice of national and personal particularities and differences in music. Nothing would be more wrong!” (Sie sieht es keineswegs ab auf ein Aufgeben der nationalen und persönlichen Besonderheiten und Unterschiede in der Musik. Nichts wäre verfehltler!)

to a decadent class of young professional “global cosmopolitans.”²¹ Kwame Anthony Appiah advocates a “rooted cosmopolitanism” practiced by a “cosmopolitan patriot,” implicitly rejecting the perspective of the “uprooted” cosmopolitan.²² Applegate, writing about musical exchanges between England and Germany, rejects the term “cosmopolitanism” in favor of “cultural internationalism,” while expressing some uneasiness that the latter “is not necessarily a native category.”²³ In their various ways, these writers are embattled with an image of cosmopolitanism tainted by imperialism, class domination, and cultural elitism. But perhaps this image itself is a product of the anti-cosmopolitanism of the later nineteenth century and needs to be examined as such. Instead of making cosmopolitanism more attractive by reinvesting it with roots, patriotism, or rich dialogism, we might contemplate how we could affirm its indifference to identity, its robust rationalism, and the positive value of detachment from local identifications. The identity politics of the 1980s and 1990s encouraged us to see all political and ethical positions, all epistemologies and ways of knowing the world, as rooted in particular subject positions and particular identities. In 1988, Barbara Herrnstein Smith could thus confidently dismiss cosmopolitanism as an untenable position, a disguise for the assertion of specific interests in the form of objective claims.²⁴ Today, however, with the revival of philosophical platforms affirming cosmopolitanism, that claim is worth revisiting, and challenging.

Beyond Heroism: Music, Ethics, and Everyday Cosmopolitanism

RYAN MINOR

There is an appealing enthusiasm to the prospect of interrogating “Cosmopolitanism in the Century of Nationalism,” perhaps the anticipation that it offers immediate entry into the realm of Big Questions. How could it not? Historically, nothing less than the ideal of social organization itself—the moral, cultural, and political ties that bind individual and group identities—has subtended the discourses surrounding cosmopolitanism. But if the stakes seem clear enough, the object is less so: should we look for a person? a practice? a state of being, alternately utopian or dystopian? At the risk of raining on a parade that has barely started, I propose that thinking through this question within a nineteenth-century context (and a musical context at that) will not always produce the same moral gravitas that has long imbued discussions of cosmopolitanism, particularly in its eighteenth- and twentieth-century iterations.

21. Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, xiv–xvi.

22. Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism*, 241.

23. Applegate, “Mendelssohn on the Road,” 231.

24. Smith, *Contingencies of Value*, 54.

Often, it would seem, cosmopolitanism in nineteenth-century European musical cultures was an unmarked, maybe even unremarkable, category. And perhaps the fact that European cosmopolitanism did not bear the overtly moral and political charge that it did in the neighboring centuries is precisely what is interesting about it.

For a musicology still focused on purging itself of teleologies leading into and out of the nineteenth century, the claim that there may be something interregal, moderate, or unexceptional about that century may seem attractive, if also suspiciously premature. After all, is it not an anti-cosmopolitan rhetoric that underlies Wagner's infamous denunciation of Mendelssohn and Meyerbeer—a rhetoric, moreover, that provided so much ballast for the anti-cosmopolitanism of twentieth-century cultural politics? And looking in the other direction historically, is there any reason that Kant's Enlightenment ideal of a universal cosmopolitanism could not have held its sway past his death?²⁵

The discursive history suggests otherwise: as Pheng Cheah has shown, neither Kant's "cosmopolitics" nor twentieth-century theories of diasporic identities within global capitalism—in many ways the twin pillars of debates on cosmopolitanism, both of which centered on the responsibilities and possibilities of contemporaneous ethical action—seem to have many explicit correlates in the nineteenth century.²⁶ I would add that cosmopolitanism thus shares some structural similarities with the public sphere, similarly an eighteenth-century ideal whose historiography tends to skip over the nineteenth century in order to focus on the dislocations of the twentieth; and insofar as both discourses are concerned with the coordination and communication between individual, local, and more abstract identities, both would have obvious relevance to musicologists and cultural historians trying to broaden our understanding of audiences and other musical publics.²⁷ All the same, cosmopolitanism simply does not surface in nineteenth-century discourse with anything like the regularity or urgency of the surrounding centuries.

But if the specter of cosmopolitanism in the nineteenth century marks a new historiographic frontier (one whose exploration need not be deterred by the relative lack of explicit contemporaneous discussion), there are historical obstacles that are not easily overcome. For one thing, most of the work on twentieth- and twenty-first-century cosmopolitanisms takes as its starting point a recent history—and insistent present—of mass diaspora and migration that have no clear correlate in nineteenth-century Europe. (The European context of my remarks is paramount; the musical cultures of nineteenth-century *émigrés* to the United States, for instance, may offer more hospitable

25. Kant, "Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose."

26. Cheah, "Introduction Part II: The Cosmopolitical—Today," in Cheah and Robbins, *Cosmopolitics*, 20–41.

27. Habermas, *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. See also Calhoun, ed., *Habermas and the Public Sphere*.

terrain for thinking about cosmopolitanism according to the terms of its twentieth-century articulations.) Conceivably one could speak, in nineteenth-century Europe, of transnationalism to some degree, but the specifically post-colonial inflections of “rooted” or “vernacular” cosmopolitanisms that have come to characterize recent discourse are not as easily transported.²⁸ Post-unification Italy and Germany might be a starting point—for instance, how is one simultaneously Italian and Piemontese, or German and Saxon, following unification—yet these too are fundamentally different questions than those, prompted by migrations across long-codified national borders, which underlie recent discussions and phenomena of cosmopolitanism.

There is another difference, and that is that cosmopolitanism tends to be an oppositional discourse. In Kant’s formulation, cosmopolitanism was an antidote to the militarism of the absolutist state, just as by the twentieth century it stood in juxtaposition to the nation-state. It is precisely this oppositional nature that has enabled not only the demonization of cosmopolitanism but also its heroization, particularly on the level of individuals. Not coincidentally, a marked tendency towards hagiography already underlies some early work on twentieth-century musical cosmopolitanism, and one could easily imagine that musicology—a discipline hardly averse to hero-worship—would adopt it as a default heuristic for the earlier century as well.²⁹ (Just as Michael P. Steinberg has noted that it was only as “Mendelssohn hero” that the composer could be rehabilitated postwar, it is not hard to foresee a “Meyerbeer hero” as the inaugural poster child for musicology’s foray into nineteenth-century cosmopolitanism.³⁰)

Yet it is not at all clear that cosmopolitanism was oppositional, much less heroically so, when it lacked an obvious and consistent counterbalance. And in most of the nineteenth century—before, in Cheah’s wry formulation, “the hyphen between nation and bourgeois state has been rendered so tight that it has completely disappeared”—cosmopolitanism and nationalism hardly amounted to opposing, and mutually exclusive, counter-forces.³¹ Even after official forms of nationalism emerged as the preeminent means of attracting and organizing Europeans’ affective identification, the relationship between nation and state remained a work in progress for much of the century; hence the famous comment, often attributed to Massimo d’Azeglio: “We have made Italy; now we must make Italians.”³² The new German Reich was also in a permanent state of catch-up for most of the decades following unification:

28. See, respectively, Appiah, *Ethics of Identity*; and Bhabha, “Unsatisfied Notes on Vernacular Cosmopolitanism.”

29. One example is Cohen’s *Stefan Wolpe*. The later time period of her study may, however, more appropriately accommodate heroic narratives.

30. Steinberg, “Mendelssohn’s Music and German-Jewish Culture.”

31. Cheah, “Introduction Part II,” in Cheah and Robbins, *Cosmopolitanics*, 28.

32. For a brief historiography of the d’Azeglio quote, see Confino, *Nation as a Local Metaphor*, 221n47.

there was no official national anthem, for instance, until the Weimar Republic.³³

In this climate, cosmopolitanism did not register as an individual's escape from, or denial of, national identity so much as a premature step, both skipping over and taking for granted a move towards nationality which, for many, was not a given until the end of the century—and whose telos in the nation-state was as much as anything an attempt to counterbalance aristocratic privilege. What nineteenth-century nationalism found problematic was not cosmopolitanism per se, but the exclusionary milieu of pan-European urban elites who were its most conspicuous representatives; as William Weber has recently argued with regard to musical publics, “Attacks on international opera exemplified movements that Benedict Anderson defined as ‘antimetropolitan’: reaction against a dominating power or social class and efforts to stimulate new social and political identities.”³⁴ To the extent that it constituted a unified or internally self-coherent politics, nineteenth-century anti-cosmopolitanism—like many contemporaneous strains of nationalism—was as much an expression of pan-European liberalism as it was a rhetoric of national exceptionalism.³⁵

Wagner's attack on Meyerbeer might appear to contradict this claim, insofar as its anti-Semitism explicitly employs a racial and cultural essentialism to juxtapose the German and the Jew, the rooted national and the cosmopolitan. Yet the charge that Jews were cosmopolitan seems primarily functional—as a put-down alone—rather than a stringent reflection on cosmopolitanism or Jewishness as either term was experienced or conceived on a broader level. As Slavoj Žižek famously pointed out, the figure of the Jew in nineteenth-century anti-Semitism is, if anything, marked by the sheer *multiplicity* of features that are attributed to him, and typically incommensurable features at that: upper and lower class, dirty and intellectual, voluptuous and impotent, etc.³⁶ Although the charge that Jews were cosmopolitan was clearly negative, it is less clear that we can extract from it anything more than the desire to make a charge. After all, Liszt—hardly a target of anti-Semitism—was as cosmopolitan a figure as any in the musical public sphere of nineteenth-century Europe. Yet his career promoted, rather than hindered, the aims of the New German partisans who sought to discredit Meyerbeer for his cosmopolitanism. In short, cosmopolitanism was not always a term of derision, and it did not belong solely to the arsenal of anti-Semitism.

But the case of Liszt also alerts us to one further complication, and that is that “the cosmopolitan” was a practice, not just a category of personhood.

33. On this point, see Achilles, “Re-forming the Reich,” 35.

34. Weber, *Great Transformation of Musical Taste*, 278. The reference is, of course, Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 47–65.

35. For a measured consideration of the relationship between German nationalism and pan-European liberalism, see Vick, *Defining Germany*. See also Cheah, “Introduction Part II,” in Cheah and Robbins, *Cosmopolitanism*, 25.

36. Žižek, *Sublime Object of Ideology*, 125.

And if we begin to look at cosmopolitanism in the musical cultures of nineteenth-century Europe more as a praxis than as an identity, a far more complex—if also less heroic—picture emerges. For one thing, attending to the practice of cosmopolitanism immediately points us towards larger and more varied milieus than a focus on the usual marquee suspects will allow. The logic of cosmopolitan-as-individual seems, almost by definition, to require a *lack* of cosmopolitanism in the (inevitably myopic and lamentably nationalist) communities against and out of which the cosmopolitan individual is defined. Yet what if cosmopolitanism were located initially, even primarily, in everyday musical communities, and not just the Liszts and Meyerbeers of feuilletonist intrigue? What if, instead of installing Liszt/Mendelssohn/Meyerbeer to replace Beethoven/Verdi/Wagner as a newly canonized roster of admirably cosmopolitan composer-heroes, we attended to the cosmopolitanism of their musical communities—communities that are disavowed the moment composers are given cosmopolitan credentials? In fact, what if the cosmopolitanism of those composer-heroes—whether good, bad, or indifferent—was not a rejection of the musical communities they left behind but an expression of them? Put another way: does musicology have room for a cosmopolitanism that is neutral, unremarkable?

Three brief examples should make the point; all stem from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, and all are German—not the first place or time one might look for a cosmopolitan embrace. Let us acknowledge, however, the following snapshots:

1. December 1880, a dinner celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the Cäcilien-Verein in Hamburg—a predominately Protestant, bourgeois mixed chorus which premiered works by Brahms and whose repertory centered around the Austro-Germanic canon. In the evening's program, each course of the meal was accompanied by quotations from *Il Barbiere di Siviglia*, Goethe, *Hamlet*, and the Bible (as well as an equal division of French and German wines).³⁷ This same chorus also sang concerts of foreign folk songs (Bohemian, Danish, Scottish, French, Russian) as well as Franck, the Verdi Requiem, and a healthy dose of Palestrina, Lully, and English madrigals.³⁸
2. The "Musik für Alle" series of simplified piano arrangements, published around the turn of the century by the Ullstein Verlag. In addition to German repertory, the popular series published arrangements of Auber, Meyerbeer, Gounod, Bizet, Offenbach, Adam, Halevy, Donizetti,

37. The program is in Box 1 of the Cäcilien-Verein's documents—not yet catalogued—at the Brahms-Institut an der Musikhochschule Lübeck. Many thanks to Wolfgang Sandberger and Stefan Weymar for sharing the chorus's archive with me.

38. Other concert programs can be found in the box "Konzert-Programme des Cäcilien-Vereins" at the Brahms-Institut an der Musikhochschule Lübeck. For more on the Cäcilien-Verein, see my *Choral Fantasies*, 163–98.

Rossini, all the standard Verdi operas, Leoncavallo, Russian folksongs, Mussorgsky, Sidney Jones's musical *The Geisha*, MacDowell, and other Americans.³⁹

3. September 1906, the Königliches Opernhaus in Berlin. That month's offerings consisted of five Wagner operas, two by Lortzing, and one opera each from Boieldieu, Gluck, Leoncavallo, Saint-Saëns, Auber, Thomas, Mascagni, Delibes, Verdi, Bizet, Weber, Massenet, Rossini, Gounod, and Humperdinck.⁴⁰ For comparison's sake: by the 1932–33 season across all German opera houses, a slightly higher percentage of German works was performed (eight of the top fifteen, of which four were by Wagner). Yet lest we associate cosmopolitan repertory with moral rectitude or a lack of virulent nationalism, that 1932–33 season should in turn be compared to the 1938–39 season—now fully under Nazi control—in which only six of the top fifteen operas were German, of which just one was by Wagner.⁴¹

These examples are all essentially random: there are other choral societies, other operatic seasons, and other popular means of disseminating art music to a broader populace. They are not heroic in any drastic sense; they merely reflect market forces and the desires of a large and diffuse German middle class at the fin de siècle. But are they cosmopolitan? Not according to the terms of the surrounding centuries: this “cosmopolitanism” is hardly at odds with a pervading militarism or national identity, and there is little sense of a conscious program, let alone a fully articulated oppositional politics. As a practice, however—unassuming and perhaps to some extent even unintended—these examples are cosmopolitan all the same, eschewing allegiance to a purely national repertory and actively exploring others with a breadth and depth most of today's musical institutions rarely replicate. And crucially, this nineteenth-century cosmopolitanism neither involves nor requires heroic individuals, just as it is neither the supremely ethical cosmopolitanism imagined by Kant nor the dystopian variety feared by twentieth-century nationalists. It is just cosmopolitanism: quiet, unmarked, everyday.

Is this how musicology envisions “cosmopolitanism in the century of nationalism”? If the terms of that project require cosmopolitanism to serve as a supremely good antidote to a supremely bad nationalism, or if the project itself is a clandestine bid at offering up the same heroic narratives under a new guise, it hardly seems worth the effort. If the intention is to understand the cultures of music and music making in nineteenth-century Europe—as well as our investment in them—the project might well have a future.

39. Many thanks to Zoë Lang for sharing her (as yet unpublished) work on “Musik für Alle”; for a brief but insightful introduction to the series, see Thorau, “Guides for Wagnerites,” 146.

40. *Deutscher Bühnen-Spielplan* 11 (1906/1907): 7. It is worth pointing out that in 1906 the Königliches Opernhaus was still the primary operatic institution in Berlin.

41. These statistics are taken from Levi, *Music in the Third Reich*, 192–93; see also Köhler, *Die Struktur der Spielpläne deutschsprachiger Opernbühnen*.

Opera Is Elite / Opera Is Nationalist: Cosmopolitan Views of Opera Reception in the United States, 1870–90

KATHERINE K. PRESTON

The topic of cosmopolitanism is not one that has seriously engaged those of us who study the cultivation of art music in nineteenth-century America.⁴² An examination of American musical culture through this particular lens, however, is perhaps a useful technique for understanding more clearly some of the varied and contradictory ways in which Americans of the period engaged with European culture. During the final turbulent decades of the century, the United States gradually became (in the words of one historian) “a full-blown modern, urban, industrial, multiethnic world power.”⁴³ Americans of the time were increasingly interested in how their country fit in with the rest of the world—politically, intellectually, and culturally. A desire for transnational connection, however, did not inevitably negate a quest for national identity, a concept that had intrigued American intellectuals and artists (including musicians) for most of the century. Both of these perceptions fascinated late-century Americans, as they grappled simultaneously with the repercussions of the Civil War and the implications of joining a world community. Music was used by Americans to engage with both of these viewpoints, either separately or simultaneously. Cosmopolitanism—perhaps because (in Martin Stokes’s words) it is a term that is “messy and compromised”—is potentially useful as a frame of reference.⁴⁴

There are many ways to apply the concept of cosmopolitanism to music studies. Because my ongoing project on operatic reception in late nineteenth-century America is cultural, however, I find William Weber’s foregrounding of repertory and institutions to be the most helpful approach.⁴⁵ Weber’s somewhat limited definition of “cosmopolitanism” as a repertory that was “widespread and therefore hegemonic in contexts where the music was performed” is one that can easily be applied to reception of a particular repertory by Americans of the period.⁴⁶ In particular, I would like to use the idea of cosmopolitanism to examine how two dramatically different groups of Americans consumed Italian opera during the 1870s and 1880s.

Opera performance in the United States during the nineteenth century was almost exclusively by itinerant companies; in the antebellum period the audiences were socially and economically heterogeneous, although frequently the

42. Probably the most extensive treatment of cosmopolitanism in nineteenth-century Americanist musicology is Bomberger, “*Tidal Wave of Encouragement*.” Horowitz also deals with the issue in a less direct manner in his most recent book, *Moral Fire*. See also Gienow-Hecht, *Sound Diplomacy*.

43. John D. Buenker, “The Gilded Age and Progressive Era: 1877–1919,” introductory essay to Buenker and Buenker, *Encyclopedia of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*, 1:1.

44. Stokes, “On Musical Cosmopolitanism,” 8.

45. Weber, *Great Transformation of Musical Taste*.

46. *Ibid.*, 48.

function of opera attendance differed according to class.⁴⁷ The true bifurcation of opera audiences (into elite/aristocratic and middle-class) occurred in the 1870s, when the wealthy class increased sufficiently in size (through the addition of the *nouveaux riches*, many of whom had become prosperous as a result of the Civil War) that they could support opera on their own, without the help of the middle classes.⁴⁸ Middle-class Americans, in their own right, became alienated from Italian-language opera by the high cost of tickets (especially during the Long Depression that followed the Panic of 1873), by the post-Panic solidification of the exclusive and aristocratic image of foreign-language opera, and by the overtly European identity of the genre, which simultaneously attracted the wealthy and repelled the middle classes who were caught up in the increasingly xenophobic climate of the 1870s and 1880s. These middle-class American operagoers turned, instead, to the performance of opera in English.

Both types of audiences consumed Italian opera during this period. The genre not only fits Weber's definition quoted above, it was also cosmopolitan by its very makeup, for Italian-language companies regularly performed works originally written in Italian (by Bellini, Donizetti, Mozart, and Verdi), German (Flotow, Wagner, and Weber), French (Auber, Bizet, Gounod, Massenet, and Meyerbeer), and English (Wallace and Balfe).⁴⁹ Furthermore, opera companies active in the United States at the time—both Italian and English—frequently included performers who were German, Italian, French, English, and American. The concept of cosmopolitanism, applied to both Italian- and English-language companies by their respective audiences, reflects the unstable meaning of the term: on the one hand it was a synonym for sophistication, worldliness, and exclusivity; on the other it was used in the service of nationalism.

The reception of foreign-language opera by wealthy Americans, especially in the 1870s and later, dovetails with Weber's description of Italian opera as playing "a central role in shaping cosmopolitan identity for the nobility and upper-middle class" in London and Paris and with his observation that in London Italian opera had "an especially sharp class identity."⁵⁰ Wealthy Americans clearly understood this, and used their own patronage of Italian opera to imitate the British nobility and to demonstrate their own connection with a cosmopolitan world beyond North America. But this group also used

47. The first established residential opera company in the United States—aside from the late eighteenth-century French opera troupe in New Orleans—was the New York Metropolitan Opera Company, founded in 1883. On the makeup of opera audiences in antebellum America, see Preston, *Opera on the Road*.

48. As late as the postwar 1860s and early 1870s, opera companies in New York needed the support of middle-class theatre-goers for solvency. See Graziano, "Opera for Every Taste."

49. For a list of the repertory performed in the United States by James Mapleson's Italian Opera Company (1878–96), see Cone, *First Rival of the Metropolitan Opera*, 192–227.

50. Weber, *Great Transformation of Musical Taste*, 21, 112.

the image of sophisticated worldliness as a marker of exclusivity, and considered operagoing an opportunity for the ostentatious display of wealth. This is a familiar image for the moneyed classes of America's Gilded Age: as an example one need think only of Edith Wharton's descriptions of the New York aristocracy in her novels (the opening scene of *Age of Innocence*, for example, plays out against the backdrop of Christine Nilsson singing Marguerite at the New York Academy of Music). This use of "cosmopolitanism" for exclusivity contradicts the open-mindedness that is implied in at least some philosophical constructions of the concept. As Martha Nussbaum has pointed out, the Cynics' idea of "citizen of the world" implied that class rank and status were secondary considerations.⁵¹ There is clear evidence, however, that wealthy Americans of this period used the combination of worldliness, European travel, and patronage of foreign-language opera as a marker of elitism: a New York critic in 1874 denigrated the audiences of Kellogg's English Opera Company, describing them as "unsophisticated" and "the rabble." Few of the "Americans among the audience," he pointed out, "had visited Europe"; those who had (whom he dubbed "the musical Patricians") were not interested in translated opera.⁵²

The Kellogg Company provides a convenient segue for discussion of the second and markedly different use of Italian-opera cosmopolitanism by Americans of the period. Weber defines nationalism (or, rather, regionalism) as the opposite of cosmopolitanism, but (as Dana Gooley points out in his introduction) many current scholars are reassessing that dichotomy.⁵³ Bruce Robbins, for example, observes out that "there is a growing consensus that cosmopolitanism sometimes works together with nationalism rather than in opposition to it."⁵⁴ In fact, this "nationalist cosmopolitanism" was precisely the approach employed by English-language opera companies in America during this period. The two most important American prima donnas of the 1870s and 1880s were Clara Louise Kellogg (1842–1916) and Emma Abbott (1849–1891). Both women either studied or performed extensively in Europe, so both were "citizens-of-the-world" musicians who, after travelling abroad, became "builders of musical nationalism at home."⁵⁵ Kellogg, who was her own musical director, launched her troupe in the fall of 1873, just as the Panic hit. But the economic disaster actually worked to her benefit, for the large number of middle-class theater goers who turned their backs on the

51. Nussbaum, "Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism," in Dalanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism*, 1:105.

52. Quoted from *New York Musik Zeitung* by Karl Merz in *Brainard's Musical World* 11, no. 33 (March 1874): 42.

53. Weber, *Great Transformation of Musical Taste*, 49.

54. Robbins, "Introduction Part I: Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism," in Cheah and Robbins, *Cosmopolitics*, 2.

55. Kellogg performed regularly in Europe, primarily in Italian-language opera. She sang in London, Paris, Vienna, and St. Petersburg.

expensive Italian-language companies flocked to Kellogg's performances, leaving the Italian troupes to face, in the words of a contemporary critic, "disastrous failure."⁵⁶

For four years, American critics attempted to explain Kellogg's success. Many agreed that low ticket prices and the high caliber of her company were factors, but in the end the general consensus was that Americans liked to hear opera "in their own vernacular."⁵⁷ Even more important is the reality that Kellogg's company provided the public with performances of a cosmopolitan repertory that they could also view as nationalist. As a critic for the *Folio* put it, Americans "take honest pride in the triumphs of our native prima donna"; another journalist, writing for the *Song Journal*, commented that the soprano was engaged "in the work of establishing a national opera."⁵⁸

This pattern of using the international operatic repertory to appeal to Americans' national pride is illustrated even more clearly by Emma Abbott, who (to a certain extent) exemplifies Martin Stokes's assertion that "it takes a musical cosmopolitan . . . to develop a musical nationalism."⁵⁹ Like Kellogg, Abbott took a quintessentially European operatic repertory, translated it, and performed it for middle-class Americans. But Abbott was even more skillful than Kellogg at turning her product into an identifiably *American* theatrical experience.

Abbott was a proud product of the American "West"—she grew up near Chicago in the 1850s. A gifted and ambitious young woman, she aspired to the operatic stage; Kellogg briefly served as her mentor. Abbott spent four years in the mid-1870s in Milan, Paris, and London, studying voice, acting, and languages, and thoroughly absorbing the cosmopolitanism of Italian opera. For a variety of reasons, when she returned to America in late 1877, she chose to pursue a career performing in English. "I was educated to Italian opera and I love it dearly and hated to give it up," she explained in 1879, "but English opera is what the people want."⁶⁰

Abbott, who is almost completely unknown today, was arguably the most successful operatic singer in the United States during the 1880s. Her English Opera Company performed all over the country for eleven years (1879–91) and never experienced a losing season; she became known as "the people's prima donna." Her success was due to her skill as a singer and to her determination to please her audiences; she bore the wrath of some critics (but pleased audiences) by frequently indulging in old-fashioned performance practices, such as adding virtuosic *fioriture* to her arias and interpolating songs into her performances.

56. Henry Watson, "Miss Kellogg in English Opera," *Watson's Art Journal* 22, no. 13 (23 January 1875): 150.

57. Tooker, "Concerts and Opera," *Folio* 12, no. 13 (March 1875): 85.

58. "Opera and Concert," *Folio* 10, no. 5 (May 1874): 148; and Ranger, "Correspondence. Letter from Boston," *Song Journal* 4 (April 1874): 729.

59. Stokes, "On Musical Cosmopolitanism," 9.

60. Sweet, "Correspondence of the Citizen," *Lowell Daily Citizen*, 31 Oct. 1879.

She also benefited immeasurably from a marketing campaign that was brilliant and overtly nationalist. She exploited middle-class Americans' distaste for the trappings of the aristocracy by mounting many of the same operas that were performed by James Mapleson's companies, but doing so in the realm of popular theater and at cheap prices.⁶¹ As one critic noted in 1887, Abbott provided "the public [with] an opportunity to hear grand operas of the highest standard at popular prices."⁶² But the soprano went well beyond undercutting her competitors' ticket prices. She honed her public persona as an unpretentious singer "from the heartland" whose ancestors hailed from Yankee New England. She deliberately cultivated personal characteristics that resonated with Americans: as an underdog; an individual who had achieved rags-to-riches success through perseverance and hard work; a church-going, principled woman who was moral and upright. She also honed a girl-next-door image, gave regular interviews to the press, never put on airs, and never canceled performances. She avoided the type of capricious behavior that many Americans attributed to foreign divas and provided cosmopolitan Italian opera in the guise of nationalist American entertainment.

Two different groups of Americans living in the 1870s and 1880s consumed a cosmopolitan repertory of Italian opera. Both groups used this art form to connect to a larger world beyond North America. But the two different sets of American opera-lovers engaged with and used the music in radically different ways. For the wealthy, the cosmopolitanism of Italian opera meant sophistication, worldliness, and exclusivity; for the middle class it was a tool for the expression of nationalism. Examination of the reception of opera by these two subsets of the American population through the lens of cosmopolitanism helps us to understand better the intersections—and also the significant differences—in the reception of one genre of European music in late nineteenth-century America.

Camille Saint-Saëns and Stoic Cosmopolitanism: Patriotic, Moral, Cultural, and Political

JANN PASLER

Is there such thing as autonomous individual creativity, or has it always been constituted in reference to, response to, or defiance of a constituted Other? How does the cosmopolitan help negotiate this divide and for what purposes?

61. Abbott's company performed works from the standard English-company repertory (Balfe's *The Bohemian Girl* and Wallace's *Maritana* as well as English translations of Flotow's *Martha*, Planquette's *The Chimes of Normandy*, Auber's *Fra Diavolo*, and Bellini's *La Sonnambula*), a handful of recent operettas such as *The Mikado*, *Iolanthe*, *Patience*, and *Yeoman of the Guard* (all by Gilbert and Sullivan), and translated standards from the Italian repertory (which included translations of other continental operas), including *Carmen*, *Mignon*, *Il barbiere di Siviglia*, *Paul et Virginie*, *Faust*, *Roméo et Juliette*, *Rigoletto*, *Il Trovatore*, *La fille du régiment*, *Linda di Chamounix*, and *Lucia di Lammermoor*.

62. "Amusements," *Denver Republican*, 8 March 1887, 4.

In the nineteenth century, even as historians were busily promoting totalizing narratives that domesticated difference by reference to a shared past, the construction of national identities, to which music contributed significantly, took place against the backdrop of collapsing borders. The hero of Gounod's *Faust*, by the end of the century the most popular opera in France as well as its colonies, symbolized the dilemma of the French who sought to get beyond themselves, yet, faced with the failure of the assimilationist project in their colonies, were increasingly forced to accept the limits of their ambitions. The career and music of Camille Saint-Saëns (1835–1921) not only shed light on the meaning of cosmopolitanism during French colonial expansion, they also help us to grasp its visionary potential in the Mediterranean.

Saint-Saëns shared with ancient Greek and Roman Stoics a kind of cosmopolitanism that arose with Alexander the Great's empire. As Martha Nussbaum described their notion of the future, the Stoics believed that "hope is hope in and for reason."⁶³ Similarly, Saint-Saëns saw reason as the basis for community. Although he had been dominated by "mystical logic" in his youth, as he wrote to the philosopher Gustave LeBon, he eventually substituted "the need to believe" with the "need to know."⁶⁴ Ever curious and adventurous, Saint-Saëns—like the Stoics—was interested in all facets of the mind and "aspired to take all knowledge for his province."⁶⁵ As a young boy, he dreamed of being an astronomer and later joined the Société astronomique where he befriended Camille Flammarion, who himself wanted to be a musician. He studied acoustics and sought to learn more about ancient Greek music from images of musical instruments in frescoes from Pompeii. Interested in archaeology, he toured the Egyptian ruins at Karnak. In his travels around the world, he collected seeds and botanical samples, exchanging them with friends. He also drew, and he wrote poetry, plays, and music criticism.⁶⁶

Like the Stoics, Saint-Saëns also saw himself as a "citizen of the world," not only believing that we are all part of humanity, but also traveling and living abroad, from North and South America to Indochina, with almost twenty long sojourns in both Algeria and Egypt. From openness to foreign cultures, he derived a certain freedom associated with cosmopolitanism.⁶⁷ This is a stance that values being neither totally in and of, nor totally outside a culture, where belonging is a choice, sometimes a temporary one, and often the result of a complex negotiation of differences. Cosmopolitanism allows for rootless-

63. Nussbaum, "Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism," in Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism*, 1:121.

64. LeBon's letter to Saint-Saëns, quoted in Adams and Pasler, "Saint-Saëns and the Future of Music," in Pasler, *Camille Saint-Saëns and His World*, 313.

65. Nussbaum, "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism," 156.

66. See *Camille Saint-Saëns and His World*.

67. On this freedom, see Sennett, "Cosmopolitanism and the Social Experience of Cities," 43.

ness, or the experience of exile, the sense of not belonging, feeling alienation from a single space or place.⁶⁸ The cosmopolitan may indeed be detached, but for Saint-Saëns this was not a “bloodless, artificial pose,” as sometimes assumed.⁶⁹ Given his musical choices, Saint-Saëns’s cosmopolitanism is better explained by Amanda Anderson’s notion of it as “a dialectic between detachment and engagement, between a cultivated distance and a newly informed partiality.”⁷⁰ This is characterized by flexibility and sometimes playfulness in the face of cultural differences. The pleasure of the cosmopolitan is the pleasure of access, a pleasure not available to all, to be sure, and one that is sometimes only superficial and temporary. Access begins in the local, made possible by travel, not just the imagination.

In addition to these general parallels between Saint-Saëns and the Stoics, we find four specific modes of his cosmopolitanism: patriotic, moral, cultural, and political. Saint-Saëns’s life and works suggest that it was possible to be both nationalist and cosmopolitan.⁷¹ In seeing themselves as part of the world, cosmopolitans negotiate the Other as part of, or in relationship to, the Self and tend to relativize differences. But, as Stoics noted, cosmopolitans need not give up local identities.⁷² They often maintain relationships, connections to the local, in part because they continue to exert influence there. Saint-Saëns not only cofounded the Société nationale after the Franco-Prussian war to promote the music of living French composers; as a member of the Institut de France, he returned to Paris regularly from his travels to take part in judging the annual Prix de Rome competitions. At the same time, cosmopolitans create new relationships abroad and pursue different career strategies there. Since they are often already known for their accomplishments, they enter new societies with high prestige.⁷³ Saint-Saëns was a close friend of two mayors in Algeria, and of the Gouverneur général of Indochina, earlier a neighbor in Paris, when he was in Saigon in 1895. Through performances of his music, he had personally met monarchs all over Europe. Yet, not an aristocrat, Saint-Saëns was a bourgeois republican, an anti-clerical democrat, who, like other *républicains opportunistes*, looked to the colonies as a place to expand French grandeur and test the universalism of republican values.

Nussbaum has pointed out both that nationalist and cosmopolitan forces are not mutually exclusive, and that cosmopolitan identity can even build on

68. Derrida, “On Cosmopolitanism,” in Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism*, 4:413–22.

69. Malachuk, “Nationalist Cosmopolitanism,” 141.

70. Anderson, *Powers of Distance*, 6, 17.

71. Kwame Anthony Appiah calls his Ghanaian father a cosmopolitan patriot, a term also applicable to Saint-Saëns whose patriotism was strident during World War I, even as he traveled and lived mostly abroad; Appiah, “Cosmopolitan Patriots,” 91, 107.

72. Nussbaum, “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism,” 158.

73. Merton, “Patterns of Influence: Local and Cosmopolitan Influentials,” in Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism*, 1:325.

national identity.⁷⁴ This raises a number of questions. If Saint-Saëns's music signified and was embraced as quintessentially French, his music could also serve as a form of diplomacy. Indeed, inspired by his trips to the Americas, he wrote not only a tango, but also a national anthem for Uruguay and "Hail California" (1915).⁷⁵ During the war, embracing French music was a way to counteract German influence abroad. But, politics aside, did his music there contribute to cosmopolitanism or to Europeanization, and what, if any, was the difference? How could he and his music be accepted as both foreign and part of these other musical cultures? In other words, was cosmopolitanism in Saint-Saëns's time itself a form of nationalism? Did colonialism, with its hierarchies and domination, preclude cosmopolitanism or, in some cases, encourage it?

Since the Greeks, moral cosmopolitanism has been the dominant form of cosmopolitanism because of its emphasis on universalism.⁷⁶ At the same time, because Stoics proposed that we should think of ourselves as surrounded by a series of larger concentric circles, they had no problem with imperialism, with expansion beyond the nation-state.⁷⁷ The most important larger circle to which France belonged was the Mediterranean, both a physical and an imagined community dating back to the ancient Egyptians and Greco-Romans. Moral cosmopolitanism had attracted the Saint-Simonians to Algeria in the 1830s.⁷⁸ Waves of colonialism, like geological layers in the earth, characterize the region. Some believed that because Latin civilization had flourished in North Africa, "France was merely repossessing what was hers by hereditary right"—a position never expressed by Saint-Saëns.⁷⁹ The region was also thought to have a shared musical past, with Phrygian scales in the music of both Algerian Kabyles and French Bretons. Saint-Saëns's music reinforced such connections, from early works on Hercules as symbolic of both Stoic virtue and the French people to many written in the 1890s and thereafter on Mediterranean subjects.⁸⁰ If, like other French in colonial contexts, Saint-Saëns may not have been a "strong moral cosmopolitan" who would "show not just equal moral concern for human beings everywhere," but also "afford them equal treatment," he was known for his personal generosity and public-

74. For similar perspectives on nationalism and cosmopolitanism as "mutually constructing," see Turino, *Nationalists, Cosmopolitans, and Popular Music in Zimbabwe*; Stokes, "On Musical Cosmopolitanism"; and Amado, "Fox Trot in Guatemala."

75. See also his *Hymne Franco-Espagnol* (1900) for military band.

76. Delanty, "Cosmopolitan Imagination," in Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism*, 2:377.

77. Nussbaum, "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism," 158.

78. See also Van der Veer, "Colonial Cosmopolitanism," 165–79.

79. Louis Bertrand, quoted in Lorcin, *Imperial Identities*, 200–201.

80. On Greece, *Chant saphique* (1892), *Antigone* (1893), *Phryné* (1893), *Pallas Athénée* (1894), *Déjanire* (1898), and *Hélène* (1903); on Provence, *Les Barbares* (1901); on Spain, *Caprice andalous* (1904); on Corsica, *L'Ancêtre* (1905); and on North Africa, *Africa* (1891), *Caprice arabe* (1894), *Souvenir d'Ismaïlia* (1895), Piano Concerto no. 5 (1896), *Sur les bords du Nil* (1908), *L'Étoile* (1907), *La Foi* (1909), and *Marche dédiée aux étudiants d'Alger* (1921).

spiritedness, engaging with the places he visited, though principally with the westerners there.⁸¹

Cultural cosmopolitans see societies as plural, having mobile and immobile elements, and believe in tolerating differences. Pure culture, for them, is an anomaly.⁸² New multivalent identities emerge from belonging in such a context, especially a belonging that reflects the French spirit of assimilation. Living in North Africa had a significant impact on Saint-Saëns's musical agendas. If in earlier Orientalist works, such as *Orient et Occident* (1869), the composer constructs a mythology of the west as musically distinct—the Orient characterized by melody and stasis, the Occident by counterpoint, modulation, and development—after his first visit to Algeria in 1873 he plays with tonal and metric simultaneities in the “Rhapsodie mauresque,” as if to signal the uneasy racial and ethnic coexistence of colonial life. As part of his *Suite algérienne* (1880), this is framed by French clarion calls and a French military march. Later, however, in his piano fantasy for piano and orchestra, *Africa* (1891), the composer tries to come to grips with enormous cultural diversity within the region. His African-inspired themes, the first from Biskra, a gateway to the Sahara, are not developed in a way that would reduce and eliminate their difference or suggest western domination. Instead, in a multipart rondo-like form, they are juxtaposed within and across the musical space to suggest coexistence. One of his sketches shows him transforming an Algerian tune into a pastoral western-sounding one, perhaps to suggest that the region produced music resembling French folk music, or that indigenous music could be compatible in western contexts, or that appropriation and westernization of indigenous music took place in the cities, populated by many Europeans and their music. This work suggests that Saint-Saëns was also interested in building musical relationships between the time of the distant past and the present, the space of home and abroad. With its theme in triplets, *Africa* ends in pure virtuosity, transcending national style by dissolving into pure sound.⁸³

Saint-Saëns considered another hybrid work, his Piano Concerto no. 5, the “Egyptian,” as an echo of his “long sea voyage” from Egypt to Indochina. Besides an Arabic-sounding *capriccioso* and a short pentatonic theme, it incorporates a simple Nubian boat song, typical of what tourists heard on Nile cruises. Framed by musical “halos,” long fermatas perhaps inspired by the mirages he enjoyed in the region, Saint-Saëns elevates this exotic signifier into a theme capable of Beethovenian development. One critic suggested that, in Saint-Saëns's hands, “the humble theme thus enters into the order, and as if

81. On weak vs. strong moral cosmopolitanism, see Miller, “Cosmopolitanism,” 387–88; and Delanty, “Cosmopolitan Imagination,” in Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism*, 2:377.

82. Waldron, “What is Cosmopolitan?,” 166; Delanty, “Cosmopolitan Imagination,” in Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism*, 2:380; Kleingeld, “Six Varieties of Cosmopolitanism in Late Eighteenth-Century Germany,” in Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism*, 1:173, 180–82; and Hall, “Political Belonging in a World of Multiple Identities,” 28–29.

83. Pasler, “Saint-Saëns and the Ancient World: From Africa to Greece,” in *Camille Saint-Saëns and His World*, 232–59.

within the divine circle, of universal beauty.”⁸⁴ With its aspiration to the universal in music, such a work supports older associations of cosmopolitanism. But this is more than the Kantian story of the universal emerging from the concrete. Through the cosmopolitan imagination of a Frenchman, music links the simple tune of Egyptian peasants to the classical ideals of ancient Greece. Especially coming after the sublime first movement which revels in perfect consonance, it also points to a third value esteemed by Saint-Saëns as having global validity: in addition to reason and freedom, beauty. Beauty was the endgame for this cosmopolitan, not universal peace and harmony, and this meant western notions of beauty.⁸⁵

Saint-Saëns’s cosmopolitan agenda in the Mediterranean, I would argue, was also political in that it addressed the future identity of France and the region. France, as a nation, grew out of two traditions: north and south. Its destiny was to assimilate and draw on the best of both. Nineteenth-century French music reflected this awareness. In *Faust* and *Mignon*, Gounod and Ambroise Thomas sought a *juste milieu* between German and Italian music; Massenet sought the “harmonious fusion” of German and French music. In the 1890s, however, northern traditions became fashionable, not only Wagner, but also Ibsen, Grieg, and Maeterlinck. D’Indy wrote his *Fervaal*, Debussy his *Pelléas et Mélisande*. French republicans, anxious about losing balance, referred to the excesses of this style as decadent. At worst, under its influence, they feared the end of civilization as they knew it. The South was seen as an antidote to such cultural alienation, and increasingly, French artists and intellectuals sought to promote traditions and values that linked France to the Mediterranean basin.

There were also larger political implications in promoting Mediterranean civilization—namely as a place to consider the future in global terms. The identity of the region was shifting, and in play was a new kind of struggle, more global than national and with racial implications. Would Mediterranean civilization remain Greco-Roman? French writers promoted Algeria as the site for the emergence of a new vital race, the product of modern cosmopolitanism. Its population was mixed, made up of the 40,000 French from Alsace and Lorraine who fled Prussian occupation and settled in Algeria in 1870, together with all those naturalized there as French: the Jews since 1870 and the Spanish, Italians, and Maltese living there since 1889. This newly configured “race,” which depended on migrations, settlements, tourism, and trade—and excluded Arabs who refused to give up their Muslim religion—was an attempt to organize multiple alterities, linking them to France and its imaginary ori-

84. Bellaigue, “De l’exoticisme en musique: A propos d’un nouveau concerto de M. Camille Saint-Saëns,” 467.

85. In *Powers of Distance*, Amanda Anderson notes that “the cultivation of detachment” can involve “an attempt to transcend partiality, interests, and context: it is an aspiration toward universality and objectivity” (33).

gins. If France dominated and administered the region, it could claim renewed grandeur. Alternatively, would the Mediterranean become a Pan-Arab civilization, tied together by religion? Religion recognizes no national differences. Ironically, in destroying traditional aristocracies, colonial conquest empowered Muslim proselytizing and contributed to an increasing Muslim identity in North Africa.⁸⁶

Saint-Saëns's music and frequent performances of it from Algiers to Cairo, Spain to Italy, and Orange to Athens, helped raise consciousness of the region as an interconnected whole. His patriotic, moral, cultural, and especially political cosmopolitanism helps us to understand how his concept of the future differed from not only that of peers like d'Indy or Massenet, but also that of young turks like Debussy and Ravel. What Saint-Saëns could not imagine, however, was a world in which North Africans too could be cosmopolitan, not by embracing western musical practices and ideologies, not even by leaving their homes, but by claiming an identity based on global rights.

Works Cited

- Achilles, Manuela. "Re-forming the Reich: Symbolics of the Republican Nation in Weimar Germany." PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2005.
- Adams, Byron, and Jann Pasler. "Saint-Saëns and the Future of Music." In *Camille Saint-Saëns and His World*, edited by Jann Pasler, 312–23.
- Amado, Andrés. "The Fox Trot in Guatemala: Cosmopolitan Nationalism among Ladinos." *Ethnomusicology Review* 16 (2011). <http://ethnomusicologyreview.ucla.edu/journal/volume/16/piece/457>. Accessed 5 June 2012.
- "Amusements." *Denver Republican*, 8 March 1887, 4.
- Anderson, Amanda. *The Powers of Distance: Cosmopolitanism and the Cultivation of Detachment*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Cosmopolitan Patriots." In Cheah and Robbins, *Cosmopolitanism: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, 91–115.
- . *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton, 2006.
- . *The Ethics of Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Applegate, Celia. "Mendelssohn on the Road: Music, Travel, and the Anglo-German Symbiosis." In *The Oxford Handbook of the New Cultural History of Music*, edited by Jane Fulcher, 228–44. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Bellaigue, Camille. "De l'exoticisme en musique: A propos d'un nouveau concerto de M. Camille Saint-Saëns." *Revue des deux mondes* (1 January 1897): 462–68.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture, with a New Preface by the Author*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

86. New religious communities were formed in response to military intervention and occupation. See Diouf, "Senegalese Murid Trade Diaspora and the Making of a Vernacular Cosmopolitanism," in Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism*, 3:343–45.

- . “Unsatisfied Notes on Vernacular Cosmopolitanism.” In *Text and Nation: Cross-Disciplinary Essays on Cultural and National Identities*, edited by Laura García-Moreno and Peter C. Pfeiffer, 191–207. Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1996.
- Bomberger, E. Douglas. “A Tidal Wave of Encouragement”: *American Composers’ Concerts in the Gilded Age*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002.
- Bourget, Paul. *Cosmopolis*. Paris: Lemerre, n.d. [1894].
- Brown, Garrett Wallace, and David Held, eds. *The Cosmopolitanism Reader*. Cambridge, UK, and Malden, MA: Polity, 2010.
- Buenker, John D., and Joseph Buenker, eds. *The Encyclopedia of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*. 3 vols. Armonk, NY: Sharpe Reference, 2005.
- Calhoun, Craig, ed. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992.
- Cheah, Pheng, and Bruce Robbins, eds. *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Cultural Politics 14. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- Cohen, Brigid. *Stefan Wolpe and the Avant-garde Diaspora*. New Perspectives in Music History and Criticism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Cone, John Frederick. *First Rival of the Metropolitan Opera*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Confino, Alon. *The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory, 1871–1918*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Delanty, Gerard. “The Cosmopolitan Imagination: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Social Theory.” *British Journal of Sociology* 57 (2006): 25–47. Reprinted in Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism: Critical Concepts*, 2:374–97.
- Delanty, Gerard, and David Inglis, eds. *Cosmopolitanism: Critical Concepts in the Social Sciences*. 4 vols. Abingdon, UK, and New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Derrida, Jacques. “On Cosmopolitanism.” In Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism: Critical Concepts*, 4:413–22. Originally published in French in 1997.
- . *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. Translated by Mark Dooley and Michael Hughes. Thinking in Action. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Deutscher Bühnen-Spielplan* 11 (1906/1907). Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1907.
- Diouf, Mamadou. “The Senegalese Murid Trade Diaspora and the Making of a Vernacular Cosmopolitanism.” Translated by Steven Rendall. *Public Culture* 12 (2000): 679–702. Reprinted in Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism: Critical Concepts*, 3:343–64.
- Fleischer, Oskar. “Zum Geleit.” *Zeitschrift der internationalen Musik-Gesellschaft* 1 (1899): 4.
- Gerhard, Anselm. *The Urbanization of Opera: Music Theater in Paris in the Nineteenth Century*. Translated by Mary Whittall. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Gienow-Hecht, Jessica C. E. *Sound Diplomacy: Music and Emotions in Transatlantic Relations, 1850–1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Gooley, Dana. “Liszt, Heinrich Börnstein, and the German Exile Cause.” In *Liszt et la France: Musique, culture et société dans l’Europe du XIXe siècle*, under the direction of Nicholas Dufetel, Malou Haine, Dana Gooley, and Jonathan Kregor, 45–58. Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 2012.
- Graziano, John. “An Opera for Every Taste: The New York Scene, 1862–1869.” In *European Music and Musicians in New York City, 1840–1900*, edited by John

- Graziano, 253–72. Eastman Studies in Music 36. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2006.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by Thomas Burger in association with Frederick Lawrence. Studies in Contemporary German Thought. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993.
- Hall, Stuart. “Political Belonging in a World of Multiple Identities.” In Vertovec and Cohen, eds., *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism*, 25–31.
- Horowitz, Joseph. *Moral Fire: Musical Portraits from America’s Fin de Siècle*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.
- Inglis, David, and Gerard Delanty, eds. *Cosmopolitanism: Critical Concepts in the Social Sciences*. See under Delanty, Gerard, and David Inglis, eds.
- Kant, Immanuel. “Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose.” In *Kant: Political Writings*, edited by Hans Reiss and translated by H. B. Nisbet, 41–53. 2nd ed. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Kleingeld, Pauline. “Six Varieties of Cosmopolitanism in Late Eighteenth-Century Germany.” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 60 (1999): 505–24. Reprinted in Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism: Critical Concepts*, 1:172–90.
- Köhler, Franz-Heinz. *Die Struktur der Spielpläne deutschsprachiger Opernbühnen von 1896 bis 1966*. Coblenz: Statistisches Amt, 1968.
- Levi, Erik. *Music in the Third Reich*. London: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1994.
- Lorcin, Patricia. *Imperial Identities: Stereotyping, Prejudice and Race in Colonial Algeria*. Society and Culture in the Modern Middle East. London and New York: Tauris, 1995.
- Loya, Shay. *Liszt’s Transcultural Modernism and the Hungarian-Gypsy Tradition*. Eastman Studies in Music 87. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2011.
- Magaldi, Cristina. “Cosmopolitanism and World Music in Rio de Janeiro at the Turn of the Twentieth Century.” *Musical Quarterly* 92 (2009): 329–64.
- Malachuk, Daniel S. “Nationalist Cosmopolitics in the Nineteenth Century.” In *Cosmopolitics and the Emergence of a Future*, edited by Diane Morgan and Gary Banham, 139–62. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Merton, Robert. “Patterns of Influence: Local and Cosmopolitan Influentials.” In *Social Theory and Social Structure*, 441–74. Enlarged ed. New York: Free Press, 1968. Reprinted in Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism: Critical Concepts*, 1:314–46.
- Miller, David. “Cosmopolitanism.” In Brown and Held, *Cosmopolitanism Reader*, 377–92.
- Minor, Ryan. *Choral Fantasies: Music, Festivity, and Nationhood in Nineteenth-Century Germany*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. “Kant and Cosmopolitanism.” In *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant’s Cosmopolitan Ideal*, edited by James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann, 25–57. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997.
- . “Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism.” *Journal of Political Philosophy* 5 (1997): 1–25. Reprinted in Delanty and Inglis, *Cosmopolitanism: Critical Concepts*, 1:101–27.

- . “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism.” In Brown and Held, *Cosmopolitanism Reader*, 155–62.
- “Opera and Concert.” *Folio* 10, no. 5 (May 1874): 148.
- Parakilas, James. *Ballads Without Words: Chopin and the Tradition of the Instrumental “Ballade.”* Portland, OR: Amadeus Press, 1992.
- Pasler, Jann. “Theorizing Race in Nineteenth-Century France: Music as Emblem of Identity.” *Musical Quarterly* 89 (2006): 459–504.
- , ed. *Camille Saint-Saëns and His World*. Bard Music Festival Series. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012.
- Preston, Katherine. *Opera on the Road: Traveling Opera Troupes in the United States, 1825–60*. Music in American Life. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993; paperback ed., 2001.
- Ranger. “Correspondence. Letter from Boston.” *Song Journal* 4 (April 1874): 729–30.
- Schlereth, Thomas J. *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought: Its Form and Function in the Ideas of Franklin, Hume, and Voltaire, 1694–1790*. Notre Dame, IN, and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.
- Sennett, Richard. “Cosmopolitanism and the Social Experience of Cities.” In Vertovec and Cohen, *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism*, 42–47.
- Smith, Barbara Herrnstein. *Contingencies of Value: Alternative Perspectives for Critical Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Steinberg, Michael P. “Mendelssohn’s Music and German-Jewish Culture: An Intervention.” *Musical Quarterly* 83 (1999): 31–44.
- Stokes, Martin. “On Musical Cosmopolitanism.” The Macalester International Roundtable 2007. Paper 3. <http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/intlrtable/3>. Accessed 14 November 2012.
- Sweet, Susie. “Correspondence of the Citizen.” *Lowell [Mass.] Daily Citizen*, 31 October 1879.
- Taruskin, Richard. “Nationalism.” *Grove Music Online*. *Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press. <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article.grove.music/50846>. Accessed 23 January 2013.
- . “Non-nationalists and other Nationalists.” *19th-Century Music* 35 (2011): 132–43.
- Thorau, Christian. “Guides for Wagnerites: Leitmotifs and Wagnerian Listening.” In *Richard Wagner and His World*, edited by Thomas Grey, 133–50. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Tooker, T. D. “Concerts & Opera.” *Folio* 12, no. 13 (March 1875): 85–86.
- Turino, Thomas. *Nationalists, Cosmopolitans, and Popular Music in Zimbabwe*. Chicago Studies in Ethnomusicology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Tusa, Michael. “Cosmopolitanism and the National Opera: Weber’s *Der Freischütz*.” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 36 (2006): 483–506.
- Van der Veer, Peter. “Colonial Cosmopolitanism.” In Vertovec and Cohen, *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism*, 165–79.
- Vertovec, Steven, and Robin Cohen, eds. *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Vick, Brian. *Defining Germany: The 1848 Frankfurt Parliamentarians and National Identity*. Harvard Historical Studies 143. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

- Wagner, Richard. *Gesammelte Schriften und Dichtungen*. Leipzig: E. W. Fritsch, 1872.
- . *Richard Wagner's Prose Works*. Translated by William Ashton Ellis. 2nd ed. 8 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1895–1912.
- Waldron, Jeremy. “What is Cosmopolitan?” In Brown and Held, *Cosmopolitanism Reader*, 163–75.
- Watson, Henry. “Miss Kellogg in English Opera.” *Watson's Art Journal* 22, no. 1 (23 January 1875): 150.
- Weber, William. “Cosmopolitan, National, and Regional Identities in Eighteenth-Century European Musical Life.” In *The Oxford Handbook of the New Cultural History of Music*, edited by Jane Fulcher, 208–27. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- . *The Great Transformation of Musical Taste: Concert Programming from Haydn to Brahms*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Wharton, Edith. *The Age of Innocence*. New York: Modern Library, 1943.
- Žižek, Slavoj. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London and New York: Verso, 1989.