



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Advancing Knowledge, Driving Change

AMS AMERICAN
MUSICOLOGICAL
SOCIETY

Review

Author(s): Steven Huebner

Review by: Steven Huebner

Source: *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 63, No. 3 (Fall 2010), pp. 690-703

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jams.2010.63.3.690>

Accessed: 24-06-2016 16:53 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

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.



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

In Goethe's *Wahlverwandschaften*, Otilie, the mysterious manifestation of earthly beauty, remains so even in death, where in the final scene she and her beloved Eduard lie enclosed in a chapel like Sleeping Beauty and her prince, waiting for the "freundlicher Augenblick" (friendly moment) when they might awaken.⁸ Following Benjamin, Kramer does not attempt to unravel the mysteries of artistic creation, but by the concluding page of *Unfinished Music*, he has succeeded in demonstrating that while the work of art may well be the death mask of intuition and conception alike, it also "masks in these two contradictory senses, concealing, altering, disguising the throe of intuition even as it reveals, limits, sets the work in some formal language that allows of its apprehension" (p. 379). For this, and for many other enlivening insights found throughout this remarkable piece of criticism, we can be grateful.

DENNIS F. MAHONEY

Composing the Citizen: Music as Public Utility in Third Republic France, by Jann Pasler. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2009, xxi, 789 pp.

Maurice Ravel famously prefaced his *Valses nobles et sentimentales* (1912) by extolling "the delicious and always new pleasure of a useless occupation," an *art pour l'art* banner unfurled from his Baudelairean instincts. Most critics today recognize, with Arnold Hauser, that "there are no works of art which are either pure form or pure content"¹ and that in between runs a continuum colored by intent, cultural context, and reception. So too did Ravel perhaps, but his posture in the epigraph nonetheless suggests a reaction against utilitarian and political understandings of composition. What might have rankled him lies at the core of Jann Pasler's ambitious and important exploration of music in France as "public utility."² A useful relationship, writes Pasler, "satisfies needs and/or desires; communicates value, importance, wealth" (p. 70). Serving public utility, the State channels usefulness into the common good by "negotiating the conflicting desires of its citizens" (pp. 68–69). Ravel's epigraph serves Pasler near the beginning of the volume as one of several springboards—an instructive counterexample, actually—into a musical culture

8. Goethe, *Werke* 6:490.

1. Arnold Hauser, "The *l'art pour l'art* Problem," *Critical Inquiry* 5 (1979): 425–40, at 431.

2. The American expression "public utility" is something of a false friend to the intended concept of *utilité publique*, which has wider significance than electricity providers and the like to embrace, for example, monuments and schools.

ostensibly more amenable to privileging a productive combination of aesthetics and public utility than its European neighbors. German-speaking lands and romantic aesthetics surface occasionally as additional foils.

Pasler returns to Ravel in the book's coda to focus on *La Valse* (1920) and its cataclysmic conclusion, which she hears as a "powerful critique of war" (p. 700). Ravel's own intentions are murky. In 1924 he told one journalist that some critics had interpreted the work as a representation of the end of the Second Empire or of postwar Vienna, and that "they are wrong."³ This statement does not of course preclude the possibility that Ravel drew parallels between *La Valse* and war-torn Europe himself at some point, either before or after the ink had dried on the autograph. Distress at his mother's passing in 1917 may have also shaped the piece, as Pasler intimates. Her concluding words: "Whether Ravel intended the work as a way to exorcise the war and the death of his mother, a sarcastic allegory of Western society, a nostalgic comment on a loss shared by all of Europe [. . .] we shall never know. But what is certain is that this music was hardly the expression of a 'useless' occupation" (p. 700). Ergo, Pasler folds hermeneutics and therapeutic work into music's multifarious "uses," which seems like musicology as usual insofar as it recognizes that compositions and ensuing interpretations do not occur in a vacuum, that they are created with a purpose. Although one could imagine that an antiwar interpretation of a piece such as *La Valse* might serve the common good, say, as articulated by pacifists, in Pasler's concluding formulation the thread of public utility gets interwoven with other areas of inquiry. This is a characteristic of the book as a whole, accounting for its girth but also for a certain lack of focus around its theme.

Although the range of "uses" articulated in the book's last paragraph does not appear very French, Pasler elsewhere underlines a specifically Gallic understanding of public utility. Her argument pivots on political context. Following the defeat of 1870, republicans took control of government, and by 1875 they had engineered the constitution of a new Republic. Republican politicians, ideologues, and bureaucrats developed ways of thinking shaped not only by the inherent fragility of the Republic's birth but also by trends in post-revolutionary French history. In the early 1870s, the combined forces of the Right almost voted them out of power; in the late 1880s, Georges Boulanger, a charismatic minister of war, sprang from the folds of republicanism to become a darling-of-the-right strongman who almost seized control; in the late 1890s, republicans contended with the specter of a rapidly growing socialist left. Whereas in liberal democracies today governments face opposition parties

3. André Révész, "The Great Musician Maurice Ravel Talks about His Art," in *A Ravel Reader: Correspondence, Articles, Interviews*, ed. Arbie Orenstein, 431–35 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), at 434. For a review of various interpretations of *La valse*, see Stephen Zank, *Irony and Sound: The Music of Maurice Ravel* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2009), 79–84.

that work within constitutional frameworks as they seek to win over populations, in late nineteenth-century France regime-change lurked as a possibility at the margins. Latent anxiety drove bourgeois republican leaders aggressively to promote their values as essential and self-evident to modern France. A revolutionary legacy identified by the great historian François Furet as replacing direct conflicts for power with “competition of discourses for the appropriation of legitimacy” remained relevant—as it did for all previous postrevolutionary regimes—and symbols, as well as literary and artistic discourses, played a key role.⁴ Following a venerable Jacobin tradition, a belief in the primacy of reason and the universal character of French civilization became cornerstones of official ideology. Republican leaders reduced the influence of the Church and created a self-consciously centralized educational system, free and compulsory at the primary level, with the goal of producing a climate in which their worldview would be perceived as the natural order among citizens. Republican ideas about citizenship, responsibility, and merit affected the civil service and all areas of public policy, including those related to culture and the fine arts. But the extent of this impact deserves evaluation on a case-by-case basis in light of rapidly changing economic and social conditions that did not always move in lockstep with official ideology. One key bureaucratic change did address the public utility of the arts: whereas for most of the Second Empire management of the fine arts emanated from the court, the Ministère de la Maison de l’Empereur, Third Republic politicians folded them into the jurisdiction of another ministry, that of Instruction Publique et des Beaux-Arts. Although the new arrangement underscored the didactic role of the arts in the new political order, it was actually anticipated in the closing months of the Second Empire. At that time the fine arts were combined in a new ministry with sciences and literature, and then became paired with Instruction Publique itself, suggesting that social and cultural forces in addition to republicanism might have also precipitated the reorganization of administrative structures.⁵

Pasler proposes that musical culture had a useful—the word crops up repeatedly—role to play in shaping *mœurs*, defined as “habits, customs, manners, and practices of society” and “morals, or the beliefs and principles underlying behavior” (pp. 171–72). A specifically republican *mœurs* engendered self-motivated civic responsibility, a harmonious fusion of private interests with the public sphere. One of the great strengths of this study is that it expertly describes the ever-shifting political landscape of the period. At different times, center and center-left republican politicians negotiated alliances with parties to both the right and left. Pasler argues that these political strategies resonated in musical culture, almost instantaneously in some cases—a speed of responsive-

4. François Furet, *Interpreting the French Revolution*, trans. Elborg Forster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 49.

5. For a summary of various administrative arrangements for the fine arts in France, see Antonin Proust, *L’art sous la République* (Paris: Bibliothèque Charpentier, 1892), 1–3.

ness of culture to politics that does not always seem convincing. In the early 1870s, the philosopher Jules Simon acquired substantial influence in government, including a stint as education minister, and his writings both nourished republican ideology with philosophical eclecticism (in Victor Cousin's sense) and inculcated the principle that "love of family gives rise to love of *patrie* (or fatherland)" (p. 173). Pasler argues that Ambroise Thomas's *Mignon* (1866) remained the most popular work at the Opéra-Comique in the early Third Republic in part because it "perhaps [. . .] best addressed the heart of Simon's concerns" (p. 179). Turned into a happy family reunification story—*Mignon* does not die in the Opéra-Comique version—Thomas's work harmonized with Simon's description of patriotism as "an extension of familial feelings" (p. 174). Many other compositions "provided explicit ways to make Simon's ideals of fraternity and love of *patrie* accessible" (p. 185). With its religious text harnessed to patriotic ends, Charles Gounod's *Gallia* (1871) was one of these, and it also played well within the "Moral Order" political frame of the time, as republicans built bridges to more liberal-minded monarchists and consequently toned down their anticlerical rhetoric. Jules Massenet's popular oratorio (styled *drame sacré*) *Marie-Magdeleine* (1873), with its alleged and unspecified "pornographic detail" (p. 209) around the figure of Christ, served similar social ends. Not very family-oriented, one would think, but Pasler suggests that the work struck a compromise by centering on the Magdalene's humanity. Léo Delibes's opéra comique *Le Roi l'a dit* premiered on 24 May 1873, the very day of elections that brought monarchists close to power again: it encouraged a good laugh at fumbling *ancien régime* aristocrats, but regardless of political persuasion everyone could embrace its "charming music [. . .] as French" (p. 209). Here public utility morphs into an essentialized attribute (or flaw, for those ill-disposed to "charm") of indigenous musical aesthetics and community-building values, a critical strategy applicable to a wide range of nations and political regimes.

Pasler moves beyond high art to consider the place of music at all levels of society, another great strength of her study. In the "Moral Order" period (1873–77), republicans tried to expand the role of singing in primary schools. As the republican inspector Félix Pécaut once noted, to turn song "into the harmonious soul of the schoolroom" was to "infuse greater strength into the national soul,"⁶ yet French resistance to this Europe-wide manifestation of public utility was such that music made it into school curricula only in 1881, after republicans had achieved a tighter grip on power. The newly confident republic also created 14 July as a national holiday and resurrected the tradition of popular festivals to celebrate the Revolution. Pasler allots much space to the

6. "Faites que le chant, au lieu de n'être qu'une leçon de plus, soit l'âme harmonieuse de l'école. [. . .] Vous aurez travaillé, à votre place et selon vos moyens, à doter l'âme nationale d'une puissance nouvelle." Félix Pécaut, *L'éducation publique et la vie nationale* (Paris: Hachette, 1907), 124–25.

original revolutionary festivals, with their demonstrably important musical component, to underscore the legacy absorbed by later republicans. The fin de siècle also saw a significant increase in historical studies of revolutionary music as well as revivals of works by Revolution-era composers such as Grétry and Méhul, seen in the early Third Republic through separate monarchist and republican lenses but eventually grouped together without specific political connotation to “serve a political function [by] encouraging a sense of fraternity” (p. 344). Concerts of old French instrumental music played the same role, as did the increased energy given over by musicians to gathering *chansons populaires* from all corners of the country.

With greater political stability in the 1880s, republicans consolidated previous colonial conquests and added new ones, a much-touted civilizing mission that operated in tandem with national pride and the development of new markets. As is well known from the work of Ralph Locke and others,⁷ composers flooded the musical scene with pieces on exotic themes, from low-brow marches to picturesque piano pieces, songs, ballets, and operas. In one instance of an expansive understanding of usefulness, Pasler describes exotic materials, especially libretti, as having “utility for composers” (p. 425) because they inspired a larger palette of orchestral resources. Elsewhere, Pasler colors utility with a more precise ideological hue as she maintains that evocations of the “Other” induced “sympathy for the republicans’ positions on progress, race, assimilation, and Western culture” (p. 413). That the protagonist in a work such as Delibes’s *Lakmé* (based on Théodore Pavie’s short story “Les babouches du Brahmane” and not on Pierre Loti’s novel *Le mariage de Loti* as intimated here) expresses herself in both exotic and uninflected “Western” idioms fed French fantasies of colonized peoples so enamored of Western civilization that they abandoned their own cultural practices (pp. 423–24). Pasler continues by showing how illustrations in mass-subscription Parisian periodicals of indigenous musicians playing western instruments communicated cultural assimilation, another shift of scholarly orientation from high art to popular culture that shines as one of the most impressive features of her book. The aperture on musical life remains open just as wide in the next chapter, about musical performances in department stores, parks, *cafés-concerts*, and music halls, as well as the competitive environment in which Parisian concert societies operated at the fin de siècle. All this entertainment, “banal or stimulating,” “brought people together in nonpolitical ways” to create a “new form of sociability” (p. 489) that had significant utility for republicans because it reflected their policy of trying to make music accessible to all sectors of society.

With the ascent of centrist *républicains opportunistes*, royalists made common cause with more conservative republicans. Showing renewed confidence, aristocrats boisterously celebrated the marriage of the daughter of the

7. For a synthesis see Ralph P. Locke, *Musical Exoticism: Images and Reflections* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Bourbon pretender to the future king of Portugal on 14 May 1886. *Ancien régime* culture consequently regained some of its lost luster, and Pasler argues that the new fad encouraged composers to take a greater interest in baroque dance genres. In response to the royalist *fête*, republicans passed a law in June that exiled all royal and imperial pretenders. Pasler notes that, at just this time, the director of the Opéra-Comique agreed to produce Chabrier's *Le Roi malgré lui*, an opera about a French king exiled to Poland who plots to return home (though the Opéra-Comique commitment actually came at the beginning of May, so a cause and effect argument does not seem very robust⁸).

At the same time artistic avant-gardes, reacting against republican ideological domination, looked to Wagner's music as a balm for the afflictions of materialism and populism. Here Pasler suggests a reaction *against* utilitarian understandings of music, art beyond politics. Whereas republicans held up "music as a metaphor for the order and harmony [. . .] in French society" (pp. 517–18) and saw it as a tool to help shape good citizens, "French Wagnerians considered music a form of contemplation stimulating self-growth for its own sake" (p. 519). Art-religion as a reinscription of official religion did not play well in the secular state. What made matters worse were diplomatic tensions with Germany in 1887: Pasler describes the events surrounding the single ill-fated performance of *Lohengrin* at the Eden-Théâtre in 1887, a story told often before in the secondary literature. She notes that the authorities ordered the run of performances stopped because of anti-German demonstrations, ironically resorting to repressive tactics not seen since the days of the "Moral Order." But what actually happened at the closed-door meeting between the conductor Charles Lamoureux, who faced personal intimidation from Boulangist hooligans, and the French prime minister, remains far from clear. Historian Kelly Maynard (in a dissertation cited elsewhere by Pasler) has recently drawn attention to new documents from police archives to show that the government went to considerable lengths to ensure order in the streets. Threats of terrorist bombs, possibly planted in the Eden-Théâtre itself, likely proved decisive in the cancellation.⁹ Pasler's assertion that "republicans may have worried that Wagner was becoming a new dogma and might squelch French diversity and eclecticism" (p. 517) seems to have little bearing upon the situation on the ground at the beginning of May 1887. She might also have underlined that political alignments in Wagner reception remain difficult to generalize because of the range of responses to his music. The enthusiasm of Émile Zola and Alfred Bruneau for Wagner's music that began in these

8. The Opéra-Comique production was first reported publicly on 10 May 1886. Chabrier alludes to approaching Léon Carvalho, director of the Opéra-Comique, as early as 18 April 1886. See letters dated 18 April 1886 and 10 May 1886 in Emmanuel Chabrier, *Correspondance*, ed. Roger Delage, Frans Durif, and Thierry Bodin (Paris: Klincksieck, 1994), 335–36 and 341–42.

9. Kelly Maynard, "The Enemy Within: Encountering Wagner in Early Third Republic France" (PhD diss., University of California at Los Angeles, 2007), 49–61.

years came from a realist and republican perspective, but Édouard Dujardin, founder of the *Revue wagnérienne*, was right-wing.

Camille Saint-Saëns, generally thought to have republican sympathies, was one who did veer towards an anti-Wagnerian position out of alarm about artistic dogmatism, as Pasler suggests. She interprets his Third Symphony as a “classical response” (p. 523) to *Parsifal*, partly because of a putative allusion at the beginning of the slow movement to the Last Supper theme in Wagner’s opera. Here and elsewhere the discussion does not always appear surefooted in musical matters. This particular connection seems scarcely tenable in light of the different contour, scale-degrees, and rhythmic character of Saint-Saëns’s melody; beyond this, the salience of Saint-Saëns’s “classicism” to larger arguments about utility might have been explained more clearly. Debussy and Satie receive extended treatment to illustrate an anti-republican perspective, perhaps too extended for the purpose at hand and with a suddenly more analytical orientation introduced for the former’s “Le balcon” (*Cinq poèmes de Baudelaire*) and one of the latter’s *Gnossiennes*. The claim that the harmonies linking stanzas one and three in “Le balcon” move “by fifths in the direction of the sharp keys” (p. 533) is not borne out in the score (one would presume articulation of a circle of fifths from C to B major at some point), nor is stanza two “closer to C major” (p. 533) than stanza one. Pasler’s application of the concept of arabesque to syllabic vocal lines that are carefully shaped around the prosody of the poetry proceeds without criteria to distinguish between ornament and structure. “His music has form, measured proportions, and formal closure, but they are neither conceived in conventional terms nor articulated with traditional means,” Pasler observes in order to illustrate Debussy’s anti-populist stance (p. 536).

Pasler concludes her study with a discussion of the 1889 Universal Exhibition followed by an examination of music against political realignments of the 1890s. Complementing Annegret Fauser’s recent book-length study of music at the same exhibition,¹⁰ she shows how the republican regime exploited the event to cast itself in the best possible light. Three principles motivated this initiative—fraternity, education, and progress—and a new perspective on the oft-noted performances of exotic music at the fair emerges when Pasler shows how non-Western repertoires nourished each of these goals. Javanese and Vietnamese music “proved more useful” (p. 593) than Western music in promoting avant-garde cultural orientations. According to one cliché in a report on exhibition music by Julien Tiersot, supposedly espousing a republican position, Hungarian music played off the beat expressed the gypsy’s sense of liberty; Pasler glosses, “freedom [was] a trope republicans never stopped promoting” (p. 573). The Exhibition also demonstrates, for

10. Annegret Fauser, *Musical Encounters at the 1889 Paris World’s Fair* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2005).

Pasler, how music's public utility had evolved "away from serving primarily a moral and educational role in forming citizens and contributing economically to the country's prosperity" to a concern for its "symbolic capacity" (p. 593). One might well ask why this made for a new phase instead of an accretion to the ongoing republican project involving citizenship and prosperity.

In a brilliant recapitulatory move Pasler goes on to analyze many of the themes discussed previously—*chanson populaire*, *musique ancienne*, popular festivals, department store music, debates about race—against a new moderate republican order that negotiated accommodation with previous political foes. Strong women such as Joan of Arc, Salammbô, and Dalila held the stage as France sought to project power in new diplomatic configurations abroad and as the *femme nouvelle* movement gained ground at home. Listening practices were increasingly associated with class, and both republicans and conservative aristocrats cultivated their own perspectives on the collusion of history with modernity. Public utility is not always easy to tease out from this material. In any event, Pasler suggests that by the turn of the century public utility began to be called into question as "a central value in French culture" and found itself replaced by "a new criterion of social value: hygiene, or what would contribute to the health of mind, body, and society" (p. 692). But, one might argue, public health would seem to be a subset of the public good. Both conservatives and republicans wanted music "to contribute to physical and psychic healing" (p. 693). "Food metaphors began to permeate musical discourse" (p. 693), and the avant-garde and unfamiliar were diagnosed as unhealthy.

The sheer erudition that sustains Pasler's kaleidoscopic sweep—as a social history of music in the early Third Republic the book has no equal—exerts pressure on the parameters of public utility announced in the title. Yet the expression "composing the citizen" in itself also promises a more focused understanding, and it is in this spirit that Pasler asserts, "leaders of the Third Republic looked to music to contribute to its success" (p. 84). Despite a brief warning that music was not "reduced to its *utilité publique*" and that "critics continued to foreground music's aesthetic qualities" (p. 83), any reader might be forgiven for thinking that music was actually an important element of official republican cultural policy, perhaps even of their policy in general. The argument modulates freely between hermeneutics involving a generalized republican *mentalité* and specific assertions about the tastes, public policy desiderata, and intentions of "republican" actors grouped together regardless of vocation—music critics, composers, politicians, bureaucrats. In light of her interest in official policy, Pasler might have greatly expanded her occasional and limited references to the archival record: bureaucratic and policy making structures such as the Beaux-Arts administrative apparatus within the Ministère de l'Instruction Publique et des Beaux-Arts, various advisory panels and commissions such as the Conseil Supérieur des Beaux-Arts, the voices of parliamentarians, the professional background of ministers and fine arts directors, or contacts between other prominent republicans and the musical world.

Except for a brief period of a Ministry of Arts in 1881—perhaps the high-water mark for government interest in culture at the end of the century—Beaux-Arts was tied to Instruction Publique for the whole period. As I have already suggested, this structure bespeaks perceptions of the didactic role of culture, but in practice it also meant that Beaux-Arts remained relatively subordinate within the overall bureaucracy. As historian Vincent Dubois points out, at the end of the 1870s a director, a few inspectors, five or six *chefs* and *sous-chefs de bureau*, and about ten clerks staffed the Beaux-Arts office for the entire French nation.¹¹ Decisions became difficult to execute because jurisdictions kept changing: one year the office would include museums, historical monuments and public buildings, and art instruction in schools, the next year perhaps not. Various advisory councils appointed by the government also clogged up the administrative machine. Where did music fit into all of this? As Pasler herself recognizes, there were only two seats for musicians on the Conseil Supérieur des Beaux-Arts from 1875 to 1905 out of several dozen members (p. 269). In a survey of the Beaux-Arts during the early Republic, published in 1892, Antonin Proust (earlier minister at the ill-fated Ministry of Arts) allots seventeen pages of 276 to music, and devotes these largely to a review of *cahiers des charges* at the Opéra and a plea for more varied repertory there.¹² If republicans thought so highly of the arts, one might suppose that they would have paid for them. But a global view of French budgets from 1880 to 1900 shows that 0.5 percent went to culture, half of today's proportion.¹³ Funding of musical institutions in particular remained relatively feeble throughout the period: in 1890, conservatories, musical societies, and concert organizations were allocated 6.5 percent of the Beaux-Arts budget; national theaters (the Opéra, the Opéra-Comique, Théâtre Français, Odéon) almost 18 percent. That might seem impressive, but fully 60 percent of the national theater amount went to the Opéra, funded by kings, emperors, and republican citizens. The Conservatoire, also supported during different regimes, consumed a large part of the first figure. At the creation of the Ministry of Arts in 1881, prime minister Léon Gambetta cautioned that the new structure "should not require an increase in the budget of the State."¹⁴ Despite fiscal restraint, parliamentarians frequently attacked the arts budget. Republican rufes from the provinces strode around the Louvre for the first time upon arriving

11. Vincent Dubois, *La politique culturelle: Genèse d'une catégorie d'intervention publique* (Paris: Éditions Belin, 1999), 101.

12. Proust, *L'art*, 81–98.

13. The late nineteenth-century figures are cited by Dubois, *La politique culturelle*, 65. Figures from 2007 are cited in *La France à la loupe: La politique culturelle de la France*, an information brochure published by the Ministère des affaires étrangères and available at <http://www.ambafrance-at.org/IMG/pdf/culture.pdf> (consulted 7 May 2010). These figures are offered as a very rough guide only, as jurisdictions were much different then and now.

14. Cited in Marc Fumaroli, *L'état culturel: Une religion moderne* (Paris: Éditions de Fallois, 1991), 66.

in Paris after elections only to rise the next day in the assembly to attack excessive spending on cultural luxuries. Arguments for and against the arts were marshaled—including those relating to economic utility and moral fiber raised in Pasler's book—but never resulted in a consistent and coherent policy beyond sporadic and well-meaning efforts to ensure accessibility, and these could trace their roots to well before the advent of the Third Republic. Artists themselves often felt unsupported. In a report on the budget of 1900, the painter and radical republican politician Henri Dujardin-Beaumetz opined, "It is fair to say that the current artistic climate is not that which one might have expected when a democratic government came to power. Artists have not seen the creation within the administration of the Beaux-Arts of an effective mechanism to address new aspirations."¹⁵

Notwithstanding lacunae on the official level, republican ideology did play out in the culture at large, and individual politicians forged relationships with certain artistic communities, as documented by Debora Silverman in her classic study of Art Nouveau.¹⁶ Art historian Miriam Levin details the republican colors of thinking by figures such as Jules Ferry, Victor Hugo, Édouard Lockroy, Antonin Proust, and Jules Simon (the latter given considerable attention by Pasler as well).¹⁷ But it would seem important clearly to make the distinction between public policy, on the one hand, and discourse within social and professional networks, on the other. And with music, evidence of such personal connections is much thinner, and theorizing less plentiful, than with the visual arts. Indeed, what emerges as particularly striking for a volume the size of *Composing the Citizen* is just how rarely fin-de-siècle politicians and political commentators had *anything* at all to say about music and how few people linked it to republican ideology. Without of course dismissing music from the ideological picture, this scarcity would seem to underscore the fragility of arguments about political motivations. Generously defining politics as "values underlying human relationships, what and with whom people associate [*sic*], what they hold dear" and observing that, because of this, "music had the capacity to be deeply political," Pasler notes that "republicanism could be shaped, not just by institutions and administrators, but also by composers, performers, and concertgoers in their choice of music and what meanings to draw from it." And she continues: "Republicans *thus* [my emphasis] looked to music and concert life to contribute to the realization of republican ideals" (p. 307). This amounts to saying that because republicanism *could* be shaped according to a modern understanding of politics applicable to anything from athletics to zoology, republicans consciously singled out musical culture, but she does so without really demonstrating that republicans endorsed the broad

15. Dubois, *La politique culturelle*, 93.

16. Debora L. Silverman, *Art Nouveau in Fin-de-Siècle France: Politics, Psychology, and Style* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

17. Miriam R. Levin, *Republican Art and Ideology in Late Nineteenth-Century France* (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press, 1986).

modern view to begin with. Contentions such as “Republicans envisaged an almost mechanical relationship between musical practices and social change for workers, bourgeois, and elites” (p. 162) go largely without identifying which “republicans” espoused this starkly functionalist view. Perhaps (we are left to assume from earlier discussion) they were educator Félix Pécaut in a small essay given over to music reprinted in an anthology of his press articles (p. 86),¹⁸ or the Beaux-Arts director Gustave Larroumet in vague remarks about how music could “knit together [. . .] identity and national unity” (p. 90), or the composer Louis-Albert Bourgault-Ducoudray when he asserted that choral music could produce “that warmth of soul and spirit of cohesion” characteristic of “fraternity” (p. 88).

The argument sometimes focuses on narrower political issues. Republicans manifestly needed to make representative democracy work, and “the language and practices of music [. . .] prepared people to engage in voting, a newly consequential mode of political activity” (pp. 162–63). Even if, say, amateur participation in choral societies and other musical pastimes qualified as activities to instill the practices of democracy (though one might imagine more effective ways to accomplish the same goals), it remains unclear how they operated like “discourses about republican politics,” as Pasler maintains, citing historian James Lehning on the political culture of the Third Republic (pp. 162–63n11). Even granting a view of political discourse that embraces social practice, it still might not be trivial to ask whether any contemporary “republican” imagined that choral singing would lead to a higher turnout at the polls. Pasler notes that “republicans considered learning ‘judgement’ as central to instruction and necessary for self-governance” (p. 203) and that they felt music could serve this purpose; she supports the claim with the treatise *Éléments d’esthétique musicale* (1884) by the venerable pianist and pedagogue Antoine Marmontel, but provides no substantiation for his republican colors or for contemporaneous reception of his book as infused with republican ideas. The Belgian composer and musicologist François-Auguste Gevaert turns up as a key witness to show how the juxtaposition of pre-Beethovenian *musique ancienne* and modern music at concerts could foster public intellectual life by promoting comparison and encouraging the development of judgment (p. 223), but this is a common-sense proposition that Gevaert does not attach to republicanism. At other times, composers themselves appear motivated by ideology in Pasler’s account. Saint-Saëns and Massenet (the latter identified as republican with no corroboration) “chose to integrate rather than reject less progressive aesthetic tendencies” in a kind of *entente cordiale* between the old and the new at the service of public utility that “became integral to the republicans’ notions of music” (p. 236). Massenet famously wished to please his public, as did many other composers, but when, where, and how he attached this desire to the concept of “public utility” remains unexplained.

18. Pécaut, “La musique ou le chant choral à l’école,” in *L’éducation publique*, 115–25.

Pasler does note that when Massenet and Saint-Saëns wrote religious music they manifestly did not operate as republicans. This might also suggest that in their professional lives republican ideology, if it mattered at all, was so colored by a host of other considerations—financial resources, availability of performers, aesthetic predispositions, professional schedules, personal health, and ties of friendship—that categorical statements about its importance or influence would seem to call for compelling primary evidence.

The book's argument seems especially debatable when it posits a particular republican aesthetic. With broad brush-strokes spanning two hundred years, Pasler seeks, for example, to account in aesthetic terms for why late nineteenth-century republicans looked to the Revolutionaries of 1789 and 1793:

Rhythm was particularly important to both musicians and politicians. Grétry believed that “rhythmic music” had the most impact. Submitting one’s body to a rhythm affects one more than following a melody or mentally inhabiting a tonal space. La Reveillère-Lépeaux, the president of the Directory [the regime in place between the Revolution and the Napoleonic era], concurred: music’s rhythm alone “imprints true character.” A hundred years later, the choral composer Camille de Vos also agreed, explaining that rhythm brings both movement and character to a melody. This focus on rhythm as the primordial musical element is significant. It devalues the more intellectual or sensuous aspects long associated with Western music, foreshadowing the importance Debussy and Stravinsky give to rhythm. [. . .] It also establishes a precedent for the way many have thought about contemporary popular music in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. This interest in rhythm in the late eighteenth century may explain the prevalence and importance of marches and marchlike music, and why energy was often associated with character, as if indispensable to it. (pp. 151–52)

The claim that rhythm mattered to politicians (it is difficult to see how it could not be important to musicians) depends on a single reference to a politician from the Directory, almost one hundred years before the Third Republic. In what sense did the later choral composer Camille de Vos articulate a specifically “republican” position? Ostensibly Pasler means to illustrate the visceral appeal of marches and march-like music in the revolutionary tradition as transmitted to the Third Republic, yet it seems worth adding that, at the time, instrumental marches were generically appropriate to matters of state in republics and monarchies alike—and very popular in grand opera processions, too, as a way to represent imperial power (think *Aida*).

Later, Pasler argues that “with grace, charm, and the aesthetic pleasure they produced, republicans saw ways that music could get inside listeners” (p. 392). Massenet and Delibes excelled in these aesthetic attributes, and Director of Fine Arts Gustave Larroumet once turned their achievements “into an aesthetic dictum, telling students to aspire to ‘charm’ and ‘elegance’” (p. 394). Larroumet’s speech at the annual Conservatoire prize-giving ceremony is one of the few writings on the arts by a republican politician that

appears in this study and exemplifies its use of primary material.¹⁹ The strongest point that Larroumet actually makes has nothing to do with charming qualities of French music, but rather with a plea to students to respect classical art and to pay little heed to voices that attacked the Conservatoire as a bastion of conservatism. Massenet crops up in Larroumet's speech not for an object lesson in aesthetics, but because he had been promoted to the rank of *grand officier* of the *Légion d'honneur* that year, and it was customary in such speeches to recognize the achievements of Conservatoire faculty. The word "charm" occurs once: after noting that Massenet honored French art (not *republican* French art, *nota bene*) by skillfully negotiating between tradition and innovation, Larroumet remarks that Massenet did so "with an exquisitely original personal charm."²⁰ As a characterization of Massenet's music this was utterly commonplace, similar epithets having flowed countless times from the pens of journalists of all stripes and in all manner of publication.²¹ Republican aesthetic "dictum"? Delibes goes unmentioned, but Larroumet does continue by heaping praise on Emmanuel Chabrier and then on Édouard Lalo for his recent success *Le Roi d'Ys*, neither of whom appeared as charmers to their contemporaries.

As salient as politics can be for understanding nuances in the actions of those involved in culture and music in this period, and as important as it is to understand the bureaucratic and institutional frames around works of art and the values implicit in those frames, to my mind this book often loses its focus on public utility by collapsing it into usefulness writ large, by frequently treating the constructs of "citizenship" and "identity" as coterminous, and by largely overstating the importance of republican ideology in fin-de-siècle musical culture. At the beginning of the volume Pasler poetically argues for continuity between the legacy of the Third Republic and the great state-funded cultural projects of the Fourth and Fifth Republics. In an alternative view, the historian Françoise Mélonio, citing Jules Ferry's declaration that "the role of the State is not to encourage artists, but rather to preserve certain traditions," notes that "the nineteenth century [in France], which knew neither the cultural State nor an official aesthetic, invented the State as guardian of the patrimony and as pedagogue," which she means in a specific sense as a builder of museums and schools.²² This program occurred as French culture became more democratized during successive regimes. To be sure, in the early Third Republic citizens sang patriotic songs on 14 July, republican ideas circulated,

19. The full version of the speech appears in Gustave Larroumet, *Discours prononcés à la direction des Beaux-Arts 1888–1891* (Paris: Hachette, 1899), 31–43; an abbreviated version appears in *Le Ménestrel*, 12 August 1888, 258–60.

20. Larroumet, *Discours*, 41.

21. See Steven Huebner, *French Opera at the Fin de Siècle: Wagnerism, Nationalism, and Style* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 160–66.

22. Cited in Françoise Mélonio, *Naissance et affirmation d'une culture nationale: La France de 1815 à 1880* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1998), 279.

composers wrote music for state occasions as they did everywhere else, ideologically tinged choices about what to preserve had to be made, and the 1890s were less *laissez-faire* with regard to cultural policy than the 1880s. But cultural *dirigisme* à la André Malraux or Jack Lang, or the two Napoléons for that matter, would not seem to have been the order of the day at the fin de siècle.

STEVEN HUEBNER

Janáček: Years of a Life, by John Tyrrell. Vol. 1 (1854–1914), *The Lonely Blackbird*. Vol. 2 (1914–1928), *Tsar of the Forests*. London: Faber and Faber, 2006–2007. xxxi, 971 pp.; 33 plates; xxviii, 1074 pp.; 28 plates.

Janáček, Back from the House of the Dead

The basic outlines of Leoš Janáček's career are well known to most scholars. Born in the small village of Hukvaldy near the Polish border in 1854, hard by Freiberg (Příbor), the birthplace of Freud, Janáček was taken to the Augustinian monastery in the Moravian provincial capital of Brno at the age of eleven to learn a musical craft and lighten the burden on his impoverished family. By his late twenties, after brief stints in Prague, Leipzig, and Vienna, he became the musical star of Brno. But he had reached the age of almost sixty without having made more than a slight impression on Prague, and having made no impression whatsoever on the rest of the world. That all changed with the belated, triumphal Prague premiere of *Jenůfa* in 1916, followed soon by productions in Vienna and Germany. By the time he died in 1928, Janáček was acknowledged across Europe as the leading Czech composer. However, aside from the occasional performance of *Jenůfa*, he made hardly any continuous impact on the international operatic firmament until the mid-twentieth century.

At that time various stars and constellations aligned to produce a remarkable resurgence. A memorable production of *The Cunning Little Vixen* by Walter Felsenstein in 1956 attracted attention and was followed by the devoted advocacy of the late Charles Mackerras in productions at Sadler's Wells and in his famous Decca recordings with the Vienna Philharmonic.¹ Subsequent productions across the operatic world have put Janáček easily among

1. Mackerras's death, just as this review is going to press, makes it all the more important to emphasize the crucial importance of his inspired advocacy for establishing Janáček's place in the repertoire. His subtle understanding of the works, dating back to his studies with Václav Talich in Prague during 1948, was unmatched by non-Czech conductors, yet working outside of Czechoslovakia allowed his powerful conducting (evidenced as well by his originality in the standard repertoire, most notably Handel, Mozart, and Beethoven) a freer reign. His contribution to subsequent generations of conductors' "living" understanding of the works is immense, if difficult to quantify, but his dedication to restoring the performing editions to Janáček's often more intricate original versions leaves a valuable textual legacy as well.