



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1093/oq/kbu032](https://doi.org/10.1093/oq/kbu032)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Willson, F. (2015). Future History: Wagner, Offenbach, and "la musique de l'avenir" in Paris, 1860. *OPERA QUARTERLY*, 30(4), 287-314. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oq/kbu032>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**Future History:
Wagner, Offenbach, and “la musique de l’avenir” in Paris 1860**
Flora Willson (fnw20@cam.ac.uk)

Flora Willson is a Junior Research Fellow at King’s College, Cambridge. Her work has previously appeared, or is forthcoming, in *Cambridge Opera Journal*, *19th-Century Music* and the *Cambridge Verdi Encyclopedia*; she is also editor of a new critical edition of Donizetti’s *Les Martyrs* (to be published by Ricordi).

Pense beaucoup à l’avenir,
peu au passé et oublie le présent.
Champfleury

In 1863, Jules Verne sketched a vision of urban life as it might be a century later.¹ His early novel, *Paris au XX^e siècle*, imagines the city’s future as a dystopia driven by money-making, technological progress, and mechanical efficiency.² What cultural production remains bears the grim imprint of an exclusively industrial age. Verne’s protagonist, Michel Dufrénoy, is an aspiring poet—resolutely in the antiquated mould. Thanks to this embattled devotee of literary classics, the novel is littered with references to canonical figures, from Rabelais and Montaigne to Balzac and Victor Hugo. Although these lions are all long dead in Verne’s futuristic chronology, Michel resembles them in being a remnant of an earlier age: he is peculiarly out of time with the “twentieth century” in which he lives.

In a brief episode towards the middle of the novel, Michel spends an evening with two similarly anachronistic figures: Jacques, who harbors military ambitions of an ancient, chivalric bent; and Quinsonnas, a frustrated composer, who expounds on the problems of modern music. Today’s harmony, the latter says, may be difficult to analyze but can be produced all too easily. Simply sitting on the piano keyboard will result in “a perfect chord for our times”—such “gut-wrenching harmony” is generated almost without effort, understanding, or respect for the once-treasured ideals of Art.³ Responsibility for this pitiful state of musical culture lies, according to Quinsonnas, with a single man:

We’ve reached this point by the force of events; in the last century, one Richard Wagner, a sort of messiah who has been insufficiently crucified, invented the music of the future, and we’re enduring it.⁴

Wagner’s appearance stages yet another encounter between Verne’s imagined future and his present-day reality. Unlike the pantheon of cultural greats already mentioned, however, Wagner is unmoored from his own time. He is problematic precisely because he cannot—unlike Montaigne, or even Victor Hugo—be subject to nostalgic recollection: his destructive, anti-artistic tendencies have persisted; his compositional and theoretical soothsaying of a century earlier has come all too true, taking its place alongside the skyscrapers, high-speed global communication, and fast food of Verne’s future. Yet the sitting-on-the-piano joke could potentially also have returned Verne’s time-travelling readers directly to their Parisian present. A similar gag was reported almost verbatim, for instance, by Pauline Viardot’s daughter Louise. Gioachino Rossini had, she recounted, sought to illustrate Wagner’s compositional achievements by assaulting the keyboard with his own, famously ample nether regions.⁵

But Verne's contemporary readership had no opportunity to recognize such echoes: *Paris au XX^e siècle* was not published during its author's lifetime and was rediscovered only in the late twentieth century.⁶ Reading it now can thus be an unsettling experience—its uncanniness deriving both from its resonances with our own time and with those of a distinctly non-fictional past. The latter is not just associated with Wagner (and the other historical figures who inhabit Verne's text) but also with “la musique de l'avenir”—the music of the future—a concept that figures prominently in the novel's musical discussion. At precisely the time when Verne was writing, this phrase enjoyed high-profile exposure in the Parisian press, almost invariably in connection with Wagner. Treated with varying degrees of earnestness and humor, the notion was both welcomed and abhorred; its discourse reinforced partisan lines among critics and generated, in due course, its own historiographical category: the *Wagnérisme* now so fundamental to accounts of later nineteenth-century French music.⁷

In this article, I am principally concerned with Parisian discourse about Wagner in early 1860—discourse that will inevitably include the voluminous outpourings of music critics but will also feature, in the form of Jacques Offenbach's *Le Carnaval des revues*, an attempted *musical* response to the Wagnerian phenomenon. More than a year before that famous way station in the via dolorosa of French Wagnerism, the “Paris” *Tannhäuser* and its debacle, it was a time when the majority of Parisian commentators could not claim first-hand experience of a staged Wagner opera. I will focus for the most part on the commentary produced by three concerts at the Théâtre Italien in January and February 1860. Organized and conducted by Wagner, they featured a program of orchestral excerpts intended to rally support for the composer. For many these constituted a first public audition of Wagner's music—already much discussed in the Parisian press, although not as frequently as its notorious theoretical counterpart. Yet the extracts programmed were neither the “advanced” works adumbrated in the composer's Zurich writings, nor were they presented as anything other than concert performances stripped of dramatic paraphernalia. The discourse surrounding these events in 1860 thus provides an entry-point for assessing the lacuna between Parisian ideas of Wagner's theories, and of how his music might actually sound.

More specifically, I am interested in the concept of “la musique de l'avenir” as it was understood by French musicians, critics, and literati. The phrase had accrued significant resonance in Paris by 1860; but it could float very free from the writings and intent of its supposed inventor, who made repeated attempts—some of them in French—to distance himself from it.⁸ My focus, then, is on the complex, multiple meanings of the phrase at a moment when it could be taken literally—referring to music not yet experienced, even forever out of reach; or could be thought a clue to Wagner's ideologies; or (often at the same time) could mean whatever music by Wagner was available in 1860. Ultimately, and perhaps particularly in the wake of Offenbach, we will be left with a series of conundrums about the experience of Wagner's music: in particular about how a concept that emerged from such blurred temporal and epistemological categories was *imagined* to sound, and how it *did* sound, in Paris in 1860.

Prehistories

The first thing to stress is that, in Paris in 1860 as elsewhere, “la musique de l'avenir” was a concept with pre-Wagnerian roots. As Herbert Schneider has shown, the phrase

had been in use at least since the 1840s and initially had no Wagnerian associations. The earliest appearance of its German equivalent—“die Musik der Zukunft”—seems to derive from Schumann, writing in 1841 about Berlioz and Chopin.⁹ Other German critics followed in the later 1840s, with Berlioz again their subject. In French, “l’art de l’avenir” had been used in 1833 by the critic Joseph d’Ortigue, whose forays into cultural futurology were encouraged by the Neo-Catholic movement with which he was involved and which would later merge with the Saint-Simonians.¹⁰ As discussed in detail by Ralph Locke, music was accorded considerable importance in Saint-Simonian thought: musicians were to join other artistic geniuses in leading the way to the future, where they would play a central role in the new religious ceremonies.¹¹ Nonetheless, despite the association of many prominent French musical figures with the movement—and the high-ranking status of music in its future-oriented doctrine—the first iterations of the precise phrase “la musique de l’avenir” did not appear in the French press until the end of the 1840s.

Schneider cites an “anonymous” 1849 article in *La France musicale*, “L’Avenir de la musique et la musique de l’avenir,” as the term’s first outing—a claim in need of revision on two counts.¹² The article is in fact signed by Wladimir Gagneur, a Fourierist writer, agricultural reformer, and politician.¹³ Small surprise, given its author’s sympathies, that the piece has a strong utopian subtext. Gagneur contrasts the current state of music in France with a future in which its social and industrial applications will be expanded to figure (as for the Saint-Simonians) in the vanguard of social reform. Similarly Saint-Simonian is an emphasis—in the title “L’Avenir de la musique” is printed much larger than “et la musique de l’avenir”—on potential developments in music’s status, not what form individual pieces might take. More significant, though, is the fact that the phrase was in use at least a year earlier, spreading during and in the immediate wake of the 1848 revolutions.¹⁴ The earliest usage I have been able to locate is in July 1848, when it appears in an open letter—in French—to the editor of *The Musical World* by Hector Berlioz. Written immediately after his return to Paris following a six-month visit to London, Berlioz congratulates the latter’s musical public and performers on their taste and intelligence, and expresses his relief in discovering in London the conditions necessary for the “entire development of the music of the future.”¹⁵ What is clear from Berlioz’s letter, as from Gagneur’s article of the following year, is that “la musique de l’avenir” signifies music *in the future*: something still undecided, not some avant-garde product already available in the present.

Not surprisingly, these and similar “unmarked” applications of the phrase seem largely to have disappeared following the publication in late 1849 of Wagner’s *Das Kunstwerk der Zukunft*. After that, the words become highly charged. The essay (or at least its title) gradually gained music-critical currency in France as elsewhere, with the “musical future” increasingly associated with its iconoclastic prophet and soi-disant savior.¹⁶ This was not an instant development: other composers—most often Berlioz and Liszt—retained links during the 1850s; indeed, Berlioz further encouraged a personal connection by publishing his *Euphonia ou la ville musicale* as a “nouvelle de l’avenir” in 1852.¹⁷ But with the notoriety of Wagner’s Zurich writings continuing to spread as the decade progressed, others were relegated to cameo roles, eclipsed by the apparently self-declared “prophète sonore.”¹⁸

However, the majority of mid-century Parisian critics discussing Wagner’s ideas had little or no personal experience of his writings. The first French translation of his mature theorizing appeared only in November 1860—prompted in part by responses to his Paris concerts earlier that year—with the publication of “Une Lettre

sur la Musique.” Setting out aspects of his current theories (and rejecting Parisian accusations of musical futurism), Wagner’s letter initially functioned as the preface to the first French translation of four of his operas; but it was followed shortly afterwards by the German publication of the original essay, now entitled “Zukunftsmusik”—the inverted commas supplied, with heavy irony, by Wagner himself.¹⁹ That no French translations were available of the Zurich essays (despite the frequent references to them in Parisian Wagner discourse in 1860 and earlier) is further implied by the fact that Charles Baudelaire resorted to reading an English translation of *Oper und Drama* when writing his 1861 essay “Richard Wagner et *Tannhäuser* à Paris.”²⁰ Indeed, as Louis Lacombe complained in 1860, some months before the publication of “Une Lettre sur la Musique:”

In France we’re only vaguely familiar with Richard Wagner’s doctrines. The truth is, it’s quite difficult to get to grips with them without having read his books. But plenty of people don’t consider this preamble necessary, and they strike first, even if they have to think later.²¹

Lacombe draws attention to a strange dynamic that emerged between Wagner and his Parisian public. The notion of the “music of the future” evidently exercised considerable imaginative sway over listeners and critics at mid-century; but it did so at least in part because it was liberated from the hermeneutic constraints occasioned by detailed acquaintance. As Gillian Beer has observed in dealing with another osmotically absorbed nineteenth-century discourse (that of evolutionary theory), “Ideas pass more quickly into the state of assumptions when they are unread.”²²

Crucial to Wagner’s elevation as a paragon of musical futurism was a series of long articles devoted to him by the distinguished critic François-Joseph Fétis. These appeared in the *Revue et Gazette musicale* in the summer of 1852.²³ Fétis’s aim was to chart Wagner’s direction “as a man and as an innovator.”²⁴ He rooted his quest in an exposition and discussion of Wagner’s recently published theories—albeit, as Katharine Ellis has observed, deriving his summary and interpretation largely from *Eine Mitteilung an meine Freunde* and *Oper und Drama* of 1851.²⁵ According to Fétis, Wagner’s errors were legion. Presenting the composer above all as a revolutionary pretender, fixated on the future since he was spurned by the present, Fétis objected to the very idea of musical progress: “ideal beauty does not age [...] only material beauty fades in the hands of time.”²⁶ For Fétis, Wagner’s musical future was both materialist and destructive—a sacrilegious threat to the relics of the past.²⁷ He concluded

Running the risk of being unable to rebuild, he [Wagner] first had to demolish; in short, the hope of creating the art of the future—whether in good or bad faith—could not be carried out if the creator-in-waiting had not beforehand done away with the art of the present.²⁸

By no means all mid-century Parisian critics shared Fétis’s cultural politics—attitudes that, suffused as they were with the philosophies of Auguste Comte and Victor Cousin, produced his delineation of a Wagner *matérialiste*.²⁹ His 1852 articles nevertheless set the tone of a great deal of subsequent French commentary and did much to popularize the notion of Wagner as self-appointed gatekeeper of the musical future.

At least as significant in the present context, however, is that discourse about Wagner’s “musique de l’avenir” continued to accumulate in 1850s Paris almost

entirely without musical accompaniment. Wagner's earlier works—*Der fliegende Holländer*, *Tannhäuser*, and *Lohengrin*—were available in German scores and popular extracts were gradually entering wider circulation in arrangements heard on street corners, in dance halls, or on the parlor piano. Yet the only high-profile Wagner performances in the city before 1860 were: his 1835 overture *Christophe Colomb* at a concert hosted by the *Gazette musicale* on 4 February 1841; a single airing of the *Tannhäuser* overture by the Société Sainte-Cécile on 24 November 1850; and another of the same piece by Le Concert de Paris at the Hôtel Osmond in February 1858.³⁰ Small wonder, then, that musical discussion was largely absent from Fétis's study, or from those that followed.

Critical speculation functioned once again to ornament the gaps, with reports of the divided reception of Wagner's works reaching the French capital from elsewhere. Such reportage seems largely to have bolstered, rather than dismantled, the critical edifice accumulating around "the music of the future." In February 1858, for instance, Gustave Chadeuil used his *feuilleton* in *Le Siècle* to analyze Wagner's current status across the Rhine:

In Germany, Wagner has his fanatics and his detractors. His fanatics claim that his music is a revelation of the future. [...] Wagner has appeared, a new Columbus who has himself discovered at first hand a new world.

His detractors, no less impassioned, maintain that he is on the contrary the composer of the past, redoing what has been done, discovering what has been discovered, walking backwards like a crab.³¹

Chadeuil's language invokes voyages of discovery and time travel in either direction: Wagner emerges as a fantastical figure—as much a fictional hero as a flesh-and-blood nineteenth-century composer. Just as significant is the particular alignment of praise and criticism. Wagner's supporters, according to Chadeuil, locate the composer quite literally ahead of his time: so progressive are his ideas that his music brings the future into the present. Those who criticize Wagner, on the other hand, insist on his roots in the past, recasting his "progress" as movement in the wrong direction.³²

Chadeuil's précis, however, demands broader contextualization. The unquestioned elision of future-good vs. past-bad is underpinned by a "revolutionary" conceptualization of time. Reinhard Koselleck has identified this altered configuration of the relationship between the past and the future as gradually emerging during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, before being given further impetus by the French Revolution. The new understanding of temporal categories was reliant on the increasing intellectual and cultural weight accorded to "history" but nonetheless sought change in an unknowable posterity. To use Koselleck's words: "Progress opened up a future that transcended the hitherto predictable, natural space of time and experience, and thence—propelled by its own dynamic—provoked new, transnatural, long-term, prognoses."³³ It was in precisely this context, of the much-vaunted social and technological "progress" proclaimed by the Second Empire regime, and of the apparent acceleration of French society towards a future endlessly subject to prophecy but as unpredictable as ever, that "la musique de l'avenir" came to prominence.

Yet its utopian—even futuristic—shades also drew on a further, specifically French corollary of the epistemological shift identified by Koselleck. The term *avenir* itself gained a new sense around 1800, one that became widespread in subsequent decades. It had long incorporated the idea of "posterity" alongside its literal meaning of "future;" now, however, *avenir* gained the connotation of "prosperity" and "future success;" people began to be spoken of as having (or lacking) a future, according to

their chances of achievement. The future thus gained an explicitly positive connotation: one that evidently underpinned Chadeuil's description of Wagner's critical reception in Germany—and that would continue to inform Parisian reactions to the composer and his music as he strove for local success.

A German in Paris

In September 1859 the pseudo-messiah of so much critical hearsay arrived in the French capital, moved into temporary (and unsustainably deluxe) accommodation on the rue Matignon, and set about cultivating sources of institutional leverage. Twenty years after his first, frustrated sojourn in the city from 1839 to 1842, Wagner was once more determined to bring about stagings of his operas. This time his exertions would result in the three riotous performances of *Tannhäuser* at the Opéra. Indeed, and as mentioned earlier, the “Paris” *Tannhäuser* has been raised to canonic status in the annals of operatic history, as the foundational moment of late nineteenth-century *Wagnérisme*.³⁴ However, and as should now be clear, these performances were an endpoint of sorts, one prepared by polemic and fantasy for at least ten years previously, and coming to a first climax with Wagner's three concerts in the Salle Ventadour of the Théâtre Italien.³⁵ These took place on successive Wednesday evenings—25 January, 1, and 8 February—with the same program repeated on each occasion (see Figure 1).³⁶ It was for the most part a predictable selection from Wagner's principal works then performable, plus the prelude to *Tristan*, an opera only recently finished, whose premiere remained five years away. The extracts were evidently those most easily isolated from their theatrical context and (with the exception of *Tristan*) already enjoying a secondary existence in sheet music arrangements.³⁷

INSERT FIGURE 1

Figure 1: Program of Wagner's first Paris concert, 25 January 1860; reproduced from Auguste de Gasperini, *Richard Wagner* (Paris: Heugel, 1865), 55.

It should come as little surprise that the extracts from *Tannhäuser*—by far the most internationally popular work of those performed—received the most favorable reception. Yet, as Annegret Fauser has pointed out vis-à-vis *Tannhäuser* at the Opéra, this accessibility was turned against Wagner.³⁸ Chadeuil's report of Wagner's German reception proved prophetic: once again, Parisian critics complained that his musical future borrowed generously from older (often French) models. As Paul Bernard asked of the *Tannhäuser* march, “is this really the music of the future? [...] I found [...] all the allure of our poor music of the present.”³⁹ A satirical missive penned by one Ludwig van Beethoven in *L'Univers musical* went further still, telling Wagner that “your Music of the Future is entirely that of the present and even a little of the past.”⁴⁰ However, the concerts could hardly have been bettered as publicity material, particularly given the attendance of musical luminaries including Auber, Meyerbeer, Berlioz, and Gounod.⁴¹ What is more, and despite the fact that the press had not been issued with official invitations, almost all Paris's high-profile critics contributed lengthy responses;⁴² the most famous was Berlioz's in the *Journal des débats*—which Wagner considered sufficiently damning (and prominent) to merit a published response.⁴³ Indeed, given that these were concerts of orchestral excerpts rather than a stage premiere, critical reception was unusually extensive. Part of the reason was that the first concert was understood by many—whether pro or contra Wagner—to mark the final arrival of the music of the future. Writing in *Le Ménestrel*, Paul Bernard called the event “ce 93 musical”—he meant 1793—claiming that “only the tower of

Babel or meetings of the Convention nationale can give a vague idea of the feverish excitement that reigned in the auditorium, even before the first note.”⁴⁴

Such hype was symptomatic of the intensification of Wagnerian discourse in early 1860. Insofar as the verdict of individual contributions can be neatly summarized, the majority pronounced against Wagner. Indeed, as Ellis has made clear, most established French periodicals (and most high-profile critics—Fétis above all) were anti-Wagnerian during the 1860s; the composer’s supporters largely published in less prestigious, less long-lasting or simply less specialist venues.⁴⁵ Those writing in Wagner’s favor nonetheless tended to do so with considerable enthusiasm: rhetorical extravagance quickly emerged as the reigning critical tone on both sides of the divide. Newly ardent Wagnerian Champfleury was typical in his wild hyperbole. Having now heard Wagner’s music for himself, he announced that he was eager to revise his past misapprehensions. He had previously been put off, he confessed, by claims that such works were characterized by:

Strange orchestration, bizarre couplings of instruments with conflicting timbres, peculiar melodies broken suddenly as if by an evil goblin, formidable armies of instrumentalists and choristers, [and] telegraphs carrying the orders of the conductor to other sub-conductors in other rooms.⁴⁶

Champfleury’s description is revealing: the “music of the future” outlined here belongs as much to Verne’s fictional world as to anything deriving from Wagner’s own theoretical writings. More specifically, Champfleury’s (presumably tongue-in-cheek) sketch, of supposedly futuristic performances so massive that telegraph relays were required, seems indebted to Berlioz’s *Euphonia*; above all to its vast orchestra and system of “télégraphie” by which instructions are issued by the conductor.⁴⁷ Yet Champfleury’s account is also noteworthy for the positive response with which he replaces these second-hand impressions. The Théâtre Italien concert had, he insisted, left him “unfatigued, happy, and full of enthusiasm”—but it had nevertheless transported him to “unknown worlds.”⁴⁸ Following the sudden shrinking of its temporal distance from the Parisian present, Wagner’s musical future has been metaphorically refigured in spatial terms—relocated at a great geographical remove from its listeners.

Mapping the future as unknown territory ripe for exploration was a rhetorical device used by other Parisian critics. Recall Chadeuil’s description of German Wagner supporters in 1858 envisioning the composer as a “nouveau Colomb”—with suitable undertones of both individual heroism and world-changing discovery. That the composer’s own writings refer to Christopher Columbus makes this new-world metaphor all the more intriguing. For Wagner, the Columbus of music was none other than Beethoven, described in *The Artwork of the Future* as “the hero who explored the broad and seeming shoreless sea of absolute music to its very bounds.”⁴⁹ Revisiting the metaphor in *Opera and Drama*, however, Wagner suggested that “The error of Beethoven was that of Columbus, who merely meant to seek out a new way to the old known land of India, and discovered a new world instead.”⁵⁰ Beethoven’s mistake, in other words, was to continue writing instrumental music; but in his idiosyncratic exploration of its limits, he nevertheless revealed the new horizons to be traversed by Wagner himself.

In this context of a questing Wagner Hero—the purveyor of new vistas and catalyst for untrammelled flights of critical fantasy—the composer’s own account of the earliest Paris rehearsal of the *Tristan* prelude might take on new significance. The prelude was, we can assume, the most obviously “Columbian” of the extracts.⁵¹

Wagner described to Mathilde Wesendonck how hearing the new work for the first time had allowed him to see “how immeasurably far I have travelled from the world during the last 8 years. This short Prelude was so incomprehensibly new to the musicians that I had to guide my people through the piece note by note, as if to discover precious stones in a mine.”⁵² The same rhetoric (now with an unmistakable biblical tinge) appears here as in the concert reviews already discussed; with the same use of spatial distance to convey the approach to startling novelties. Yet not even Wagner’s personal tutelage was enough to make the prelude anything other than incomprehensible; it was met for the most part by critical muteness among supporters and detractors alike.⁵³

There can be little doubt that Parisian critics, finally exposed to the Wagnerian œuvre, were determined to scrutinize the 1860 concerts for evidence of his much-discussed musical future. But they did so largely without reference to the one programmed extract with some claim to embody “Zukunftsmusik.” Instead, jostling for space alongside the vague hyperbole of the many general responses, were references to other extracts in terms that are frequently startling. *Le Constitutionnel*’s P.-A. Fiorentino, for instance, described “a series of piercing chords, of high-pitched whistling, of the screeching of enraged brass,” which might at first glance seem continuous with Champfleury’s exaggerated fears of an imagined musical future—except that the extract in question was the overture to *Die fliegende Holländer*.⁵⁴ The anti-Wagnerian Oscar Comettant went so far as to make a claim for the *Holländer* overture as “the prototype of the music of the future.”⁵⁵ More frequently, yet barely easier to make sense of today, the *Lohengrin* extracts were heard as the clearest embodiment of Wagner’s musical future: Champfleury credited the opera with providing his transport to unknown worlds;⁵⁶ according to *L’Artiste*’s 1861 account, its 1850 Weimar premiere had marked the moment at which “the music said to be ‘of the future’ began to make waves.”⁵⁷ And it was *Lohengrin*—not *Tristan*—that attracted the most arresting criticism: according to the prominent anti-Wagnerian critic and Italophile Paul Scudo: “It’s an acoustic experience, but it’s not music.”⁵⁸ Quite how the Act 3 introduction of *Lohengrin* could have been heard thus when experienced after the “incomprehensibly new” sounds (to reuse Wagner’s own words) of the *Tristan* prelude is difficult to imagine. Perhaps, though, Scudo’s criticism offers a useful hint about the inner workings of the Wagnerian discourse-machine in Paris in 1860: condemnation of the *Lohengrin* extract as a non-musical “acoustic experience” may suggest that precisely the opposite was true—that Scudo could dismiss the extract precisely because he was able to comprehend it as music in the first place. To put this another way, *Lohengrin* may have functioned as an instantiation of “la musique de l’avenir” because it was comprehensible in the present.

Wagnerian acolytes, on the other hand, listening to *Tristan* as prospective music of the future had to look—forward—to a time when they might understand it, or perhaps even truly *hear* it, for the first time. Léon Leroy launched a rare defense of *Tristan*’s impenetrability in striking terms: “It is always the case that certain very vivid, immaterial impressions cannot be perceived perfectly at first,” he noted. It was surely correct, he went on, that this should occur in music, which deals in “ethereal feelings of the heart:”

In the [musical] circumstances of which we speak, memory is in some way the alembic destined to condense, to distil, to quintessentialize the whole of which the ear is only the physical conductor.⁵⁹

In Leroy's metaphorical concoction, the mid-nineteenth-century music critic (memory-conscious keyholder to the operatic museum) threatens to merge with a more sinister figure: the mad scientist in his laboratory. His defense of the Wagnerian musical future ultimately operates via a denial of its musicality—its material recast as alchemical matter.

For all that he was writing positively, Leroy's comments might be read in dialogue both with discussions of Wagner's potential destruction of musical language and with ongoing debates about his music's material or even, *pace* Fétis, materialist qualities. In particular, the composer's distribution of program notes detailing the plots of his operas led some to ponder the extent to which his music depicted staged events. The idea of Wagner as realist became widespread: the accusation that he was the "Courbet de la musique" attracted significant attention after the comparison was first made by Scudo in 1852.⁶⁰ Taking Scudo's cue, many mocked Wagner for trying to depict in music absurd narrative details, even material objects; Comettant ridiculed Wagner for writing "allegedly imitative music, which indeed imitated everything — with one thing excepted, however: music itself."⁶¹ The composer's realism was even seen to reach beyond the confines of his scores to encroach on their human performers. In the wake of the Opéra's 1861 *Tannhäuser*, Comettant returned to the problem. He identified a two-step process: by making impossible expressive demands on his (famously absolute) music, Wagner required the hermeneutic assistance of his operatic characters; the characters were, by this means, reduced to ciphers:

Wanting to reduce lyric characters to a state of abstraction [...] and to a state of walking, speaking clarinets, flutes, or bassoons [...] is quite simply to destroy opera rather than regenerate it; it is to make the singers into machines or, if you will, living program notes.⁶²

Comettant's description of imitation pushed to its limits presents an alternative future altogether more ominous than the vistas revealed elsewhere. Music could portray anything and everything if its performers become mere exegetical vessels; the threat of dehumanization loomed.⁶³ Reading this diatribe in its broadest sense, we are returned to the notion of Wagner-as-destroyer, familiar from Fétis. But while in 1852 Fétis was principally concerned with Wagner's devaluation and desecration of the past, some critics in 1860 considered nothing less than the very stuff of music to be in peril.

Melody was thought particularly endangered if not wholly banished from his works; harmony was extended and forced almost beyond recognition.⁶⁴ For many, though, the entire compositional fabric was shot through with "difformités musicales."⁶⁵ There was little pleasure to be gained from listening to such mutant works; as Berlioz put it, in one of many labored gestures towards balanced argument in his *feuilleton*:

Music, without a doubt, does not have as its exclusive object to be pleasant to the ear; but a thousand times less is its object to be unpleasant, to torture it [the ear], to assassinate it.⁶⁶

For critics with a penchant for hyperbole, then, attending Wagner's concerts in 1860 threatened physical harm. Yet more pressing even than this were Wagner's effects on the long-term survival of music. The tidy chiasmus of the formula "la musique de l'avenir et l'avenir de la musique"—its component parts reversed since Gagneur's 1849 article—was exploited by several in the wake of the Théâtre Italien concerts.⁶⁷

Countless others took literally the idea of soothsaying, whether in earnest or for satirical effect; in all cases, the stakes were unmistakably high. As Bernard put it in *Le Ménestrel*, “50 years on this path and music will be dead, because we will have killed melody, and melody is music’s soul.”⁶⁸

Acoustic commentary

In this context—of a “music of the future” understood to call into question the entire future of the art form—one reaction to Wagner’s concerts stands out by offering a markedly different riposte. Offenbach’s *Le Carnaval des revues* opened at the Théâtre des Bouffes-Parisiens on 10 February 1860, two days after and a few meters away from Wagner’s final appearance at the Salle Ventadour.⁶⁹ A satirical take on the traditional new-year revue format, *Le Carnaval*’s prologue and nine tableaux lampooned various aspects of Parisian theatrical life while creating plentiful opportunities for interpolated hits from Offenbach’s own recent works at the Bouffes. Mark Everist’s brief discussion of *Le Carnaval* in two recent book chapters places the revue within what he identifies as Offenbach’s long-term effort to embed operetta within the more august generic institution of *opéra comique*.⁷⁰ Yet Offenbach’s engagement with august repertoires in *Le Carnaval* extends beyond that particular genre. The revue boasts a satirical treatment of *grand opéra* in a skater’s waltz on a “motif du *Prophète*” (tableau 2, scene 1) and in airs borrowed from *La Juive* and *Robert le Diable* (tableau 5, scene 5). Flippant as it is towards the past, however, the revue also delves into the tension between such older repertoires and new works—a tension that formed the subject of the sixth tableau and provided the occasion for two specially composed numbers.⁷¹

The scene in question involves a chance meeting on the Champs Elysées between four now-canonized composers of the past, Grétry, Gluck, Mozart, and Weber, who congregate over a game of dominos. They appear to the sound of their own hit melodies and congratulate each other on the continuing success of their works—an obvious gesture to recent revivals at the Théâtre Lyrique.⁷² This happy scene is subject to a series of comic intrusions: first a “Jeune Homme”—an aspiring composer—complains that, with all the ancient works now staged in the city, he can’t get his operas performed; then a comically-accented German extolling Meyerbeer’s virtues, who triggers two further grand-operatic appropriations;⁷³ then a scantily clad diapason-in-distress, reeling from the pitch reforms of February 1859 and delivering the pun, “quel abaissement!” Finally—making the noisiest entrance of all—comes “Le Compositeur de l’avenir,” heralding his revolutionary presence and the destruction of the musical past. He conducts an impromptu performance of one of his compositions: a “Marche des fiancés” that he advertises as “une musique étrange, inouïe, indéfinissable, indescriptible!” (tableau 6, scene 6). Having appalled his venerable audience, he rattles off a “tyrolienne de l’avenir” before being chased from the scene.

A role apparently sustained with some verve by company tenor Bonnet, this Composer of the Future could hardly have been misidentified by the Parisian public. As *Le Figaro*’s Benoît Jouvin put it, “If parody had the power to kill in France, Richard Wagner would at this very moment be a dead man.”⁷⁴ *Le Ménestrel* went further, making a direct connection to Wagner’s concerts: “the music of the future [at the Bouffes] has won a victory that will make the fanatics of the Salle Ventadour blanch.”⁷⁵ Notwithstanding the parody’s multiple subjects—and *pace* Everist’s dismissal of the “Compositeur de l’avenir” as “almost too easy a target”⁷⁶—it was clearly Bonnet’s Composer who caught the imagination of the critics, while

Offenbach's mock-futuristic music enjoyed an afterlife beyond the *Revue's* otherwise moderate success of 46 performances. Both the march and the *tyrolienne* were later excerpted and repackaged for domestic use, the former renamed "La Symphonie de l'avenir" and sold in four-hand piano arrangement.

Highly episodic in structure, this march-cum-*symphonie* follows the progress of a couple's wedding day, the incidents of which are shouted out by its composer to mark their representation in music. As in the visual caricatures so typical of the time and place, exaggeration is all: following grand opening gestures, there is a chromatic pile-up in the strings; over the resulting cluster chord, flute and piccolo play an absurdly chromatic dotted motif and trumpets herald wildly. Gentle *opéra-comique* diatonicism then takes over, serving as a bland, march-like backdrop against which interruptions by incongruous timbres, dynamic shifts, unprepared diminished chords, and occasional gestures towards bitonality are all the more out of place. A chromatically tangled melody, comically constricted in pitch, emerges on clarinet and oboe over tremolo upper strings as the bride's mother weeps; it evaporates into diatonic *politesse* when the soup arrives. The gift of riding boots to the groom invites further disruptive trumpet fanfares and precipitates a final galop. The piece threatens to unravel once again into the chaos whence it emerged, but at the last resolves into a formulaic, double-speed coda.

Offenbach's satire is by any measure a piece of musical ephemera; but it is nevertheless striking in the ambiguity of its relationship to its musical target. Indeed, to hear it today (particularly with the comments of contemporary Parisian critics in mind) raises important questions about how Wagner's "music of the future" might have been perceived in 1860—whether by those who attended the Théâtre Italien concerts, or those whose Wagnerian experience was gained entirely through critical commentary. Admittedly, even the most sensitive efforts to cultivate a "period ear" will inevitably miss the referential scope of a work such as Offenbach's *Symphonie*. As many literary scholars have emphasized, the rooting of satire in a particular community—one sharing a corpus of values and experiences—is essential to its success.⁷⁷ Yet Offenbach's *Symphonie* is not simply a response but also a contribution—however parodic—to an imagined corpus of "music of the future." As such, we might listen to it as a written trace of a past listening experience, taking a cue from Peter Szendy's recent paean to the authors of musical arrangements, transcriptions, translations, and travesties of all kinds as "the only listeners in history to *write down* their listenings, rather than describe them (as critics do)."⁷⁸ We might, that is, scrutinize the *Symphonie* for hints about how its putative musical subject was heard by Offenbach and his contemporaries.

It is immediately obvious that Offenbach made no attempt to quote literally from Wagner's compositions, whether those performed in 1860 or any others.⁷⁹ Less clear, unfortunately, is whether Offenbach had heard any of Wagner's music before penning his sketch, although it seems likely that he would have enjoyed some prior exposure. Not that the *Symphonie* is entirely divorced from a Wagnerian sound world, however Offenbachian its musical material. Rather than direct quotation, though, the satirical mode is a broad, gestural one: a tracing (albeit exaggerated) of the constantly shifting surface of Wagner's scores, and of their sudden changes of timbre and dynamic level. Understood thus, the fundamental doubleness of Offenbach's *Symphonie de l'avenir*—its distanced, mediating caricature and simultaneous reproduction of Wagnerian gesture—has much to add to an exploration of "la musique de l'avenir" in the Paris of 1860. Rooted firmly in the present by its own ephemerality, the satire provides us with one particular snapshot of Wagner's critical

reception, frequently mirroring the specific rhetoric gathering around him in the city. Still more valuable, though, is that the *Symphonie*'s ambiguity suggests that searching for traces of Wagnerian inspirations secreted within it may be to miss the point, to overlook the real joke. What Offenbach's sketch reveals most usefully is that, in the wake of Wagner's Paris concerts as in the decade before them, "la musique de l'avenir" was a discursive concept spanning past and future—both what was known and audible, and what was to come in operatic posterity.

Paris of the future

My earlier description of the *Symphonie* organized the piece into two contrasting types of musical material. Hyperbolic discords and musical shocks seem to present a direct mirroring of critics' similarly exaggerated complaints about "la musique de l'avenir." Example 1 shows the *Symphonie*'s opening, its attention-grabbing cluster chord built on E-flat in mm. 5 to 8 and subsequently adorned with a similarly chromatic "melodic" figure in the high woodwind from m. 9, complete with its own bass-drum punctuation.

INSERT EXAMPLE 1

Example 1: Offenbach, *Le Carnaval des revues*, "No. 8 Symphonie de l'Avenir," mm. 1-12. Reproduced from Jacques Offenbach, *Carnaval des Revues: Le Compositeur de l'Avenir aux Champs-Élysées* [orchestral score], ed. Jean-Christophe Keck (Berlin: Bote & Bock, 2007).

Notwithstanding its four-square phrase structure, Offenbach's opening material seems to delight in its apparent abandonment of convention in favor of on-the-spot destruction of any sense of tonal center or melody. On the other hand, the more familiar (diatonic) language of *opéra comique* that appears in Example 2 provides occasional bland respite from the chromaticism and prevents the *Symphonie* from collapsing into unnavigable chaos. This melody, recognizable to Offenbach's audiences as the mid-century Parisian hit "Quadrille des lanciers," is now homophonically scored and slowed to a comically grandiose *Largo moderato*, its progress unperturbed by the brief outbreak of (bitonal) trumpet fanfare in m. 48.⁸⁰

INSERT EXAMPLE 2

Example 2: Offenbach, *Le Carnaval des revues*, "No. 8 Symphonie de l'Avenir," mm. 45-52. Reproduced from Jacques Offenbach, *Carnaval des Revues: Le Compositeur de l'Avenir aux Champs-Élysées* [orchestral score], ed. Jean-Christophe Keck (Berlin: Bote & Bock, 2007).

We might perhaps hear these latter elements of *opéra comique* as the conventional background against which Offenbach paints his caricature: as, if you will, a semantically neutral constant against which his "music of the future" sounds all the more absurd. We might even detect in its traces of *opéra comique* the sound of the musical past and of assimilated experience; and in its moments of brash chromaticism and abrupt contrasts a comic projection of musical things to come.

There is little doubt that the *Symphonie* took seriously the claims that Wagner's works were nonsensical, full of unfathomable harmonies, devoid of melodic beauty, and far too concerned with orchestral effect. In this sense, Offenbach composed out impressions of the Théâtre Italien concerts written by critics such as Fiorentino, whose review had characterized the Wagnerian musical future as one of dissonance, whistling, and screeching. Yet there is an alternative way—and perhaps a more stimulating one—in which we might listen. Rather than locating the piece's force solely in its most obviously cartoonish features, we might hear the *Symphonie*'s most interesting comment in precisely those elements of its construction that seem

most conventional—those most rooted in the musical past. Indeed, in the context of this article, the most far-reaching comedy in Offenbach’s satire is his bland, *opéra-comique* undercoat. Partially obscured beneath more explicit gestures towards musical futurism, this conventional backdrop is not far removed from moments of the *Tannhäuser* overture or march, or, especially, to parts of the *Dutchman* overture. Such links between the *Symphonie* and Wagner’s “music of the future” (at least as identified by Parisian critics in 1860) are, I would argue, at least as convincing as those gestural similarities between Offenbach’s parody and its target outlined earlier.

For many in 1860, Wagner’s “music of the future,” with its pseudo-prophetic paraphernalia and vistas of unknown worlds, above all marked a decisive rupture with the musical past and its conventions and constraints. The major irony of this widely perceived rupture was that such revolutionary caesurae—and the ideas that underpinned them—were not themselves novel: several critics drew direct comparison between Wagner’s theorizing and Gluck’s operatic reforms of a century earlier.⁸¹ Elsewhere in the press, with music history realigned about a resolutely French axis, Wagner was even described as “the Rameau of the nineteenth century.”⁸² Nor was this deflationary historicization limited to discussion of Wagner’s theoretical maneuvers. As in the verdicts of Bernard and “Beethoven” mentioned earlier, many critics detected traces of the musical past in Wagner’s “music of the future.” Some even pointed to specific operatic models in his concert program: Meyerbeer is mentioned several times, as are Gluck and Grétry, in each case representing an operatic past deemed emphatically French. Ultimately, and with Parisian critics scrambling to assess the relationship between Wagner’s “future” and their own musical present, what emerges is the same cast of characters who populate Offenbach’s sketch—an ensemble of composers past *and* future, vying for attention on the Parisian stage of the present.

This last collision of future and past—one also crucial to Verne’s futuristic novel with which we began—calls, finally, for a more specific historical and geographical grounding: for a more explicit contextualization in the urban milieu of Second Empire Paris in which Wagner, Offenbach, and Verne were working. Indeed, these three figures might even be seen variously to epitomize aspects of life in the city that would be celebrated, in hindsight, as “Capital of the Nineteenth Century.”⁸³ Napoleon III’s regime has traditionally been hurried over in our histories of music: it was until recently dismissed by many as frivolous, mediocre, and conservative—an age marked by degeneracy and ruled by degenerates, who courted political disaster while tipping glasses to the dance tunes of Offenbach’s latest operetta.⁸⁴ But Second Empire Paris was, perhaps above all, a city undergoing enormous topographical change. Both native inhabitants and visitors reported a sense of disorientation as parts of the city were apparently transformed from one day to the next. The period’s most iconic observer, Charles Baudelaire, lamented in 1861 that old Paris had vanished; that “the form of a city/ Changes more quickly—alas!—than the human heart.”⁸⁵ In more practical terms, an 1867 English guidebook to that year’s *Exposition universelle* advised: “The Paris of today is so different from the city bearing the same name and existing a quarter of a century ago, that those who have not visited it for some time have literally no idea of the appearance of the city.”⁸⁶ Overseeing these radical alterations was the Prefect of the Seine, Baron Georges-Eugène Haussmann, whose program of urban renovations aimed to create a suitably modern, sanitized capital city to match the Empire’s insistence on social and technological progress.⁸⁷ Just as important, if less explicitly advertised, the renovations were also intended to prevent those harboring revolutionary ambitions exploiting the chaotic layout of the medieval

quartiers. Yet, as the old city was cleared to make way for the new, monumental *grands boulevards*, inhabitants seemed to become suddenly aware of the “vieux Paris” they were losing. The birth of modern Paris was thus accompanied by an upsurge in interest in the city’s past, manifested in the opening of new museums and archives, and in an urgent sense that what was being destroyed must somehow be recorded.⁸⁸

Still more important in the present context is that, in the more rarefied climate of the city’s opera houses, revivals of the past were increasingly widespread; sustained popularity for new works seemed ever more difficult to achieve and the focus of operatic culture gradually shifted towards historical objects.⁸⁹ It was clearly this retrograde movement in Second Empire operatic production that Offenbach was lampooning by means of his self-satisfied, domino-playing immortals, whose recent (posthumous) revivals at the Théâtre Lyrique had attracted significant attention. As already discussed, both the critical responses to the Théâtre Italien concerts and Offenbach’s sketch gesture at times towards an understanding of Wagner’s place in the musical present in Paris whereby even this “musician of the future” could be seen to hark back to operatic times past. But there is one remaining figure in Offenbach’s parody whose presence may shed new light. So insignificant as not to merit a name, the revue’s “Jeune Homme” is the first of the scene’s characters to interrupt the undead composers in their game of dominos. It is this Young Man who lists the recent revivals of their various operas, only to be interrupted in each case by exclamations of pleasure from the author in question:

YOUNG MAN	They’ve revived <i>Richard Cœur de lion</i> .
GRÉTRY	My dear boy!
YOUNG MAN	They’ve revived <i>Robin des Bois</i> and <i>Oberon</i> ...
WEBER	The two brightest jewels in my crown!
YOUNG MAN	They’ve revived <i>le Mariage de Figaro</i> ...
MOZART	A gem!...
YOUNG MAN	They’ve revived <i>Orphée</i> , they’re going to revive <i>Don Juan</i> ...
MOZART	Where’s the harm in that?..
GLUCK	I’m played on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays...
MOZART	I’ve got Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays...
WEBER	Grétry and I, we’re played on Sundays...
YOUNG MAN	But what about me? When will my music be played? ⁹⁰

The final blow comes with Grétry’s advice that the Young Man should find some money (“seven or eight thousand francs... a trifling sum!”) and set up his own theatre—only for each of the composers to suggest a work from their corpus that might best be revived on this new stage.⁹¹

This “Jeune Homme” is clearly a vehicle for some of Offenbach’s own frustrations as a composer: he made headway in Paris only once he had set up the Bouffes-Parisiens in 1855. What is more, the increasing prominence of revivals of *anciens chefs-d’œuvre* during the period raised serious concerns about the institutional precariousness of younger composers—those thought quite literally to embody the future. Yet at the same time, as canon formation akin to that in instrumental music half a century earlier gathered momentum in Parisian operatic culture, new operas were added to the canon precisely with an eye on what was to come: on a work’s potential, its capacity to win over posterity. At this transitional moment in Paris’s operatic practices, there were, in consequence, multiple incompatible visions of the musical future on offer. On the one hand was Offenbach’s “Jeune Homme,” writing

new operas but unable to get them performed on stages now occupied by revivals of revered old masterpieces; on the other, the quartet of domino-playing immortals and their fellow-travelers, encased for posterity in a developing, backward-reaching canon.

Finally, though, and most famously, there was Wagner and his “music of the future.” In 1860 Paris, whether reported by critics after direct encounters at the Théâtre Italien or as refracted through Offenbach’s *Symphonie*, “la musique de l’avenir” was—in spite of its explicit engagement with the future—an idea in ever more complex relation to, even symbiosis with, the musical past. As we have seen, traces of venerable predecessors were detected in Wagner’s music at the same time that he came under fire for having laid waste much that had been sacrosanct. Many feared that he risked destroying music as a whole—that music *in* the future was endangered by “the music *of* the future.” Wagner himself would, of course, go on to ensure his position in operatic posterity by taking the fictionalized Grétry’s advice and building his own opera house: one where, true to Offenbach’s parody, revivals would constitute the entire repertory. Indeed, Wagner’s own future would encompass elements of all three compositional stances parodied in Offenbach’s *Le Carnaval des revues*. Verne’s projection of Wagner’s presence into his sci-fi future while damning him in his own present was, as elsewhere in his novel, strikingly prescient: we are, after all, still “enduring” Wagner’s music even as we speed ever further beyond his musical future. Yet the greatest concern in Paris in 1860 was that “la musique de l’avenir” might not exist. How justified those fears were would become fully evident only a century later, as the future foretold by Verne gradually approached and then slipped into history. In a final twist of comedy, the dystopian fear behind so much satire was deadly accurate: with the slow, inexorable shift away from the production of new works to the revival of the old, the music of the future would indeed prove to be none other than the music of the past.

¹ I am grateful to Carolyn Abbate, John Deathridge, Katharine Ellis, Axel Körner, Roger Parker, Alex Rehding, Ben Walton, and an anonymous reader for *Opera Quarterly* for their stimulating feedback on earlier drafts of this article.

² Jules Verne, *Paris au XX^e siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 1994).

³ “un accord de nos jours;” “une harmonie déchirante;” Verne, *Paris au XX^e siècle*, 83; translation adapted from Jules Verne, *Paris in the Twentieth Century*, trans. Richard Howarth (New York: Random House, 1996), 86-7. All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

⁴ “nous en sommes arrivés là par la force des choses; au siècle dernier, un certain Richard Wagner, une sorte de messie qu’on n’a pas assez crucifié, fonda la musique de l’avenir, et nous la subissons;” Verne, *Paris au XX^e siècle*, 84.

⁵ Louise Héritte-Viardot, *Mémoires de Louise-Héritte-Viardot: Une famille de grands musiciens* (Paris: Stock, 1923), 102-3; cited in Mina Curtiss, “Bizet, Offenbach and Rossini,” *Musical Quarterly*, 40/3 (July 1954), 356.

⁶ *Paris au XX^e siècle* was Verne’s second novel, written shortly after his debut with *Cinq semaines en ballon* (Paris: Hetzel, 1863). The manuscript was discovered in 1994; see Timothy Unwin, *Jules Verne: Journeys in Writing* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005), 33.

⁷ The classic recent account of Wagnerian influence in later-nineteenth-century French music is Steven Heubner’s *French Opera at the Fin de Siècle: Wagnerism, Nationalism and Style* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999). See also Annegret Fauser and Manuela Schwartz, eds., *Von Wagner zum Wagnérisme: Musik, Literatur, Kunst, Politik* (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1999).

⁸ See Wagner, “À M. Berlioz,” *Journal des débats* (22 February 1860), 2. The composer closed his 1860 “Lettre sur la musique” by claiming that the intention behind his innovations was “anything but the tendency to be governed by absolute musical considerations of which people have taken upon themselves to accuse me with their ‘Music of the Future;’” see “Music of the Future,” in *Three Wagner Essays*, trans. Robert L. Jacobs (London: Eulenberg, 1979), 44.

⁹ Schneider's valuable unearthing is summarized in his "Wagner, Berlioz, und die Zukunftsmusik," in Detlef Altenburg, ed., *Liszt und die neudeutsche Schule* (Laaber: Laaber, 2006), 80-81. See also Christa Jost and Peter Jost, "Zukunftsmusik: Zur Geschichte eines Begriffs," *Musiktheorie*, 10 (1995), 119-35.

¹⁰ D'Ortigue was one of the founding editors (and music critic) of *L'Avenir*, a short-lived messianic newspaper founded in 1830 as the main organ of the Neo-Catholic movement. For an alternative account of the pre-Wagnerian history of the concept "la musique de l'avenir," focused on the term's political usage and subtext in 1830s and 1840s France, see Matthias Brzoska, "Richard Wagners französische Wurzeln ossia Warum Wagner kein Zukunftsmusiker sein wollte," in Fauser and Schwartz, eds., *Von Wagner zum Wagnérisme*, 39-49.

¹¹ Ralph P. Locke, *Music, Musicians, and the Saint-Simonians* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), especially 15-63.

¹² See Schneider, "Wagner, Berlioz und die Zukunftsmusik," 80.

¹³ W. Gagneur, "L'Avenir de la musique et la musique de l'avenir," *La France musicale* (27 May 1849), 1-3. Gagneur (1807-1889) spent most of the Second Empire in exile in Belgium as a result of his role in opposition to Napoleon III's 1851 coup d'état; in 1869 he returned to France and was elected *député* of the Jura, a post he occupied until his death.

¹⁴ Brzoska, "Richard Wagners französische Wurzeln," 42.

¹⁵ "l'entière développement de la musique de l'avenir," *The Musical World* (8 July 1848), 1.

¹⁶ The avid Wagnerian Champfleury (Jules Fleury-Husson) took his cue from the composer in crediting a Cologne-based journalist, Ludwig Bischoff ("une sorte de Fétis allemand") with having derived the phrase from the title of the Wagner's essay, *Grandes figures d'hier et d'aujourd'hui: Balzac, Gérard de Nerval, Wagner, Courbet* (Paris: Poulet-Malassis et de Broise, 1861), 129. Wagner insisted that "l'inventeur de la musique de l'avenir, ce n'est pas moi, mais bien M. Bischoff, professeur à Cologne;" see "À M. Berlioz." With the concept established in the French press, an equivalent "musica dell'avvenire" attracted significant attention from around 1860 in Italy; the Italian debate remained redolent of the Parisian discourse, albeit with a greater emphasis on the place of Verdi and Italian opera in such a future; see Axel Körner, "Music of the Future: Italian Theatres and the European Experience of Modernity Between Unification and World War One," *European History Quarterly*, 41/2 (April 2011), 189-212 (esp. 199-200).

¹⁷ Berlioz's novella was serialized in the *Revue et Gazette musicale* in 1844 before being included in his *Soirées de l'orchestre* (Paris: Michel Lévy Frères, 1852). For more on *Euphonia* and a Berliozian music of the future, see Inge van Rij, "Back to (the Music of) the Future: Aesthetics of Technology in Berlioz's *Euphonia* and *Damnation de Faust*," *Cambridge Opera Journal*, 22/3 (2010), 257-300; Katherine Kolb, "Plots and Politics: Berlioz's Tales of Sound and Fury," in Peter Bloom, ed., *Berlioz: Past, Present, Future* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2003), 76-89 (especially 79-80); and Emily I. Dolan, *The Orchestral Revolution: Haydn and the Technologies of Timbre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 211-19.

¹⁸ Paul Bernard, "Théâtre Impérial Italien: Richard Wagner et La musique de l'avenir," *Le Ménestrel* (29 January 1860), 66.

¹⁹ *Quatre poèmes d'opéras traduits en prose française, précédés d'une Lettre sur la musique [à Frédéric Villot, Paris, 15 septembre 1860] par Richard Wagner. Le Vaisseau fantôme, Tannhäuser, Lohengrin, Tristan et Iseult* (Paris: A. Bourdillat, 1861); "Zukunftsmusik" *Brief an einen französischen Freund (F. Villot) als Vorwort zu einer Prosa-Übersetzung seiner Operndichtungen* (Leipzig: J. J. Weber, 1861). Although the German edition makes clear the French origins of the essay, it is clear that Wagner wrote it in German and that it was translated by Paul Challemeil-Lacour, also the (uncredited) translator of the four libretti. For more on the genesis and significance of Wagner's "Zukunftsmusik," see Carolyn Abbate, "Opera as Symphony, a Wagnerian Myth," in Abbate and Roger Parker, eds., *Analyzing Opera: Verdi and Wagner* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 96-100 (esp. fn. 16).

²⁰ See Margaret Miner, *Resonant Gaps: Between Baudelaire & Wagner* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1995), 65 (fn. 7).

²¹ "On connaît vaguement en France les doctrines de Richard Wagner. A la vérité, il est assez difficile de s'en rendre compte sans avoir lu ses livres. Mais bien de gens ne jugent pas ce préambule nécessaire, et ils tapent d'abord, quitte à raisonner après;" Lacombe, *Revue germanique*, 9 (31 January 1860), 437. The *Revue germanique* was largely supportive of Wagner, as of German culture more generally.

²² Gillian Beer, *Darwin's Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot and Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 4.

²³ The articles were published on 6, 13, 20, 27 June, 11 and 25 July, and 8 August 1852; with one exception (25 July) they appeared on the *Revue*'s front page.

²⁴ "comme homme et comme novateur;" Fétis, "Richard Wagner (troisième article)," *Revue et Gazette musicale* (20 June 1852), 201.

²⁵ See Ellis, "Wagnerism and Anti-Wagnerism in the Paris Periodical Press, 1852-1870," in Fauser and Schwartz, eds., *Von Wagner zum Wagnérisme*, 51-83.

²⁶ "le beau idéal ne vieillit pas [...] la beauté matérielle seule disparaît sous la main du temps;" Fétis, "Richard Wagner (troisième article)," 203.

²⁷ As Ellis has discussed, Fétis found Wagner's theories dangerously systematic (a "système" rather than the milder "procédé"); this enabled him to make the "wild gesture of dubbing Wagner a Comtian positivist;" see Ellis, *Music Criticism in Nineteenth-Century France: "La Revue et Gazette musicale de Paris," 1834-80* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 208.

²⁸ "au risque de ne pouvoir reconstruire, il fallait que d'abord il démolit; enfin, l'espoir bien ou mal fondé de la création de l'art de l'avenir ne pouvait se réaliser, si préalablement le créateur en expectative ne faisait disparaître l'art du présent;" Fétis, "Richard Wagner (septième et dernier article)," *Revue et Gazette musicale* (8 August 1852), 257.

²⁹ For more on the relationship between Fétis's conception of musical ontology and broader currents in nineteenth-century philosophy and intellectual history, see Rosalie Schellhous, "Fétis's 'Tonality' as a Metaphysical Principle: Hypothesis for a New Science," *Music Theory Spectrum*, 13/2 (Fall, 1991), 219-40, especially 221-3; and Ellis, *Music Criticism in Nineteenth-Century France*, 33-45.

³⁰ For a brief account of pre-1860 performances of Wagner's music in Paris, and the composer's activities and contacts there, see Gerald D. Turbow, "Art and Politics: Wagnerism in France," in David C. Large and William Weber, eds., *Wagnerism in European Culture and Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), 136-8. The 1858 performance of the *Tannhäuser* overture is not mentioned by Turbow but appears in Georges Servières' sprawling study, *Richard Wagner jugé en France* (Paris: Librairie illustrée, 1887), 35.

³¹ "en Allemagne, M. Wagner a ses fanatiques et ses détracteurs. Ses fanatiques prétendent que sa musique est une révélation de l'avenir. [...] M. Wagner est arrivé, nouveau Colomb, qui, lui, a découvert d'emblée un nouveau monde.

Ses détracteurs, non moins passionnés, affirment qu'il est au contraire le compositeur du passé, refaisant ce qui a été fait, découvrant ce qui était découvert, marchant à reculons comme l'écrevisse;" Chadeuil, *Le Siècle* (19 February 1858), 2.

³² Brzoska briefly outlines the tendency to consider the composer in terms not only of the musical future but also of the past; see his "Richard Wagners französische Wurzeln," 47. Although his summary is helpful, I question his dismissal of this tension between past and future contexts as mere word-play: more was at stake than rhetorical niceties.

³³ Reinhard Koselleck, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. Keith Tribe (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 22.

³⁴ One influential source for the historiographical emphasis on *Tannhäuser*'s Paris premiere was Baudelaire's "Richard Wagner et *Tannhäuser* à Paris," first published in the *Revue européenne* (1 April 1861). For three important studies of the "Paris" *Tannhäuser*, focused respectively on Wagner's alterations to the score, its press reception, and its relationship to the contemporary trend for revivals of old operatic works, see Carolyn Abbate, "The Parisian 'Vénus' and the 'Paris' *Tannhäuser*," *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 36/1 (Spring 1983), 73-123; Annegret Fauser, "Cette musique sans tradition: Wagner's *Tannhäuser* and its French Critics," in Fauser and Mark Everist, eds., *Music, Theater, and Cultural Transfer: Paris, 1830-1914* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 228-55; and William Gibbons, "Music of the Future, Music of the Past: *Tannhäuser* and *Alceste* at the Paris Opéra," *19th-Century Music*, 33/3 (2010), 232-46. Gibbons's broad concern with the relationship between forward- and backward-facing impulses in Second Empire operatic culture—and with Wagner's place within it—is similar to mine. Unlike Gibbons, however, I am interested above all in the Parisian reception of a concept ("la musique de l'avenir") rather than of a particular work.

³⁵ None of the literature dedicated to Wagner's Paris reception offers detailed discussions of the 1860 concerts; the most useful *en passant* appear in Turbow, "Art and Politics: Wagnerism in France," 140-5, and Katherine Kolb, "Flying Leaves: Between Berlioz and Wagner," *19th-Century Music*, 33/1 (Summer 2009), 25-61; especially 36-43.

³⁶ In the second and third concerts the "Song to the Evening Star" from *Tannhäuser*, sung by baritone Jules Lefort, was added at the end of the first half.

³⁷ John Deathridge has noted the irony of the massive commercial success of an album of set pieces from *Lohengrin* (compiled by Wagner himself in 1854), given that the opera was the first the composer

wrote from beginning to end (prelude excepted) without regard for operatic numbers; see his *Wagner Beyond Good and Evil* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 43. In financial terms the concerts were an unequivocal disaster, making a loss of over 10,000 francs according to one report (see Servières, *Richard Wagner jugé en France*, 65). Minna Wagner's breakdown of costs listed 8000 francs for the rent of the Théâtre Italien (not including staffing or lighting); the same sum for the orchestra; 3000 francs for the chorus; plus advertising and rental of the Salle Herz for rehearsals. See letter from Minna Wagner to Emma Herwegh (n.d.); cited in Ernest Newman, *The Life of Richard Wagner, Vol. III: 1859-1866* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1941), 29. Newman estimated the total deficit as around 11,000 francs.

³⁸ See Fauser, "Cette musique sans tradition."

³⁹ "est-ce bien là la musique de l'avenir? Pour ma part j'ai trouvé dans ce morceau toutes les allures de notre pauvre musique d'aujourd'hui;" Bernard, *Le Ménestrel* (29 January 1860).

⁴⁰ "il [Beethoven's informer: a Théâtre Italien subscriber who had died after attending Wagner's first concert] ajoute que votre *Musique de l'Avenir* est tout à fait du présent et même un peu du passé;" A. Elwart, *L'Univers musical* (5 February 1860).

⁴¹ According to Curt von Westernhagen, "The court was represented by Marshal Magnan, the Académie by Auber. Meyerbeer, Berlioz, Gounod, Reyer, the Belgian composer Gevaert were all to be seen in the front few rows;" Westernhagen, *Wagner: A Biography*, trans. Mary Whittall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 273. The same list appears almost verbatim in Newman, *The Life of Richard Wagner, Vol. III*, 6. Wagner's skills as a self-publicist were, of course, formidable; see Nicholas Vazsonyi, *Richard Wagner: Self-Promotion and the Making of a Brand* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

⁴² The one major exception was Paul de Saint-Victor of *La Presse*, whom Servières names as "l'un des plus hostiles au *Tannhäuser* en 1861, [qui] ne daigna pas dire un mot des concerts de Wagner;" *Richard Wagner jugé en France*, 49.

⁴³ See "À M. Berlioz," *Journal des débats* (22 February 1860).

⁴⁴ "Je ne connais que la tour de Babel ou les séances de la Convention nationale qui puissent leur donner une faible idée de l'agitation fébrile qui régnait dans l'auditoire, même avant la première note;" Bernard, *Le Ménestrel* (29 January 1860), 65.

⁴⁵ See Ellis, "Wagnerism and Anti-Wagnerism in the Paris Periodical Press," especially 51-3. The main exception to this wide scattering of Wagnerian sentiment was Adolphe Giacomelli's *La Presse théâtrale et musicale* (1854-92), which Ellis (68) describes as "the only thoroughly Wagnerian music periodical of the 1860s."

⁴⁶ "Des orchestrations étranges, des accouplements bizarres d'instruments à timbres ennemis, des mélodies singulières rompues tout à coup comme par un méchant gnôme, des armées formidables d'instrumentalistes et de choristes, des télégraphes portant le commandement du chef d'orchestre à d'autres sous-chefs dans d'autres salles;" Champfleury, *Richard Wagner* (Paris: Bourdilliat, 1860), 7.

⁴⁷ Berlioz gestures towards a communication system by which "les directeurs des répétitions n'ont à faire qu'un simple signe avec une ou deux mains et le bâton conducteur, pour indiquer aux exécutants qu'il s'agit de faire entendre;" *Soirées de l'orchestre*, 324. Ironically, when Champfleury revised the original text of his 1860 pamphlet for inclusion in his longer 1861 study, he appended a line to the end of his musical description: "comme nous en avons pu voir dans certains concerts de M. Berlioz" (*Grandes figures d'hier et d'aujourd'hui*, 116). For Champfleury, if for few others by the early 1860s, Berlioz represented an alternative route to a (dystopian) musical future, which could be compared to Wagner's reforms to the German's advantage. As van Rij has observed, however, Berlioz's futuristic visions in *Euphonia* and elsewhere function above all as exotic *couleur locale*: as a distraction from and comment on tendencies he disliked in his own time, as distinct from the literal futurism he claimed to detect in Wagner's music in 1860. Van Rij's gloss (*pace* Berlioz) that *Euphonia* and his review of Wagner's concerts actually share similar concerns is salient here but is, I would argue, more broadly applicable to the reception of the concerts as a whole. See van Rij, "Back to (the Music of) the Future," 260-1 and 296.

⁴⁸ "sans fatigue, heureux et plein d'enthousiasme;" "mondes inconnus;" Champfleury, *Richard Wagner*, 12.

⁴⁹ Wagner, *The Artwork of the Future*, trans. William Ashton Ellis (1895; rpt. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), 115.

⁵⁰ Wagner, *Opera and Drama*, trans. William Ashton Ellis (1893; rpt. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1995), 70-1.

⁵¹ In 1860 *Tristan* was also unique among Wagner's works written during the 1850s (and thus since his Zurich theorizing) to have been published—albeit only in Germany.

⁵² Letter from Wagner to Mathilde Wesendonck (28 January 1860); Stewart Spencer and Barry Millington, eds. and trans., *Selected Letters of Richard Wagner* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1988), 484.

⁵³ Léon Leroy was typical of the pro-Wagner camp in his insistence that, of the works performed, *only* the *Tristan* prelude “n’a pas été bien compris;” *L’Orchestre* (3 February 1860).

⁵⁴ “C’est une série d’accords stridents, de sifflements aigus, de grincements de cuivres enrégés;” P.-A. Fiorentino, *Le Constitutionnel* (30 January 1860), 2.

⁵⁵ “L’ouverture du *Vaisseau-Fantôme* est le prototype de la musique de l’avenir;” Comettant, *Musique et Musiciens* (Paris: Pagnerre, 1862), 403.

⁵⁶ See Champfleury, *Richard Wagner*, 12.

⁵⁷ “que la musique dite de l’avenir a commencé à agiter le monde musical;” *L’Artiste* (1861), 141.

⁵⁸ “C’est une expérience d’acoustique, mais ce n’est pas de la musique;” Scudo, *Revue des deux mondes* (March-April 1860), 233.

⁵⁹ “il est constant que certaines impressions immatérielles très-vives ne sauraient être perçues parfaitement tout d’abord. Nous sommes convaincu que cela est vrai, en musique, et surtout dans la musique qui traduit les sentiments éthérés du cœur: dans les circonstances dont nous parlons, la mémoire est, en quelque sorte, l’alambic destiné à résumer, à distiller, à quintessencier l’ensemble dont l’oreille n’est que le conducteur physique;” Leroy, “Concert de Richard Wagner au Théâtre Italien,” *L’Orchestre* (3 February 1860).

⁶⁰ The apparently double insult of linking Wagner with Courbet was publicized by Champfleury, who attributed the label (incorrectly) to Fétis and rushed to the defense of both composer and painter: “Que pouvait être un Courbet en musique?” he asked, observing that “Le grand peintre [...] est un artiste remarquable avant tout par la puissance de son pinceau;” *Richard Wagner*, 4. Scudo’s original comparison appears in “Littérature musicale. Publications récentes en France, en Russie et en Allemagne,” *Revue des deux mondes*, 6/15 (1 July 1852), 815-24; especially 821.

⁶¹ “une musique prétendue imitative, qui imitait tout en effet, une chose exceptée pourtant: la musique même;” Comettant, “Richard Wagner. La musique de l’avenir et l’avenir de la musique,” *Almanach musical*, 8 (1860), 43.

⁶² “Vouloir réduire les personnages lyriques à l’état d’abstraction [...] et l’état de clarinette, de flûte ou de basson ambulants et parlants [...], c’est tout bonnement anéantir l’opéra au lieu de le régénérer, et faire passer les artistes à l’état de machines, ou si vous aimez mieux, de programmes vivants;” Comettant, *Musique et musiciens*, 384.

⁶³ One might note the striking similarities between Comettant’s machine-like Wagnerian performers and Adorno’s description of the relationship of singers and music in Wagner’s music dramas, in which the stage is compelled to follow the orchestra: “The infantile actions of the singers—the opera often seems like a museum of long-forgotten gestures—are caused by their adaptation to the flow of the music. They resemble the music, but falsely; they become caricatures, because each set of gestures effectively mimics those of the conductor;” *In Search of Wagner*, trans. Rodney Livingstone (London: Verso, 1981), 104.

⁶⁴ In addition to his pre-eminent position as a music critic, Fétis was also, of course, one of the great nineteenth-century music theorists. His theory of harmony—expounded most fully in his *Traité complet de la théorie et de la pratique de l’harmonie* (Paris: Schlesinger, 1844)—provides several interesting *points d’appui* in the context of the Parisian discussion of Wagner’s supposed harmonic deformations.

⁶⁵ Léon Escudier, *La France musicale* (29 January 1860).

⁶⁶ “La musique, sans doute, n’a pas pour objet exclusif d’être agréable à l’oreille, mais elle a mille fois moins encore pour objet de lui être désagréable, de la torturer, de l’assassiner;” Berlioz, *Journal des débats* (9 February 1860), 2.

⁶⁷ The most famous example was Comettant’s essay “Richard Wagner. La musique de l’avenir et l’avenir de la musique.”

⁶⁸ “Cinquante ans sur cette voie et la musique serait morte, car on aurait tué la mélodie, et la mélodie c’est l’âme de la musique;” Bernard, *Le Ménestrel* (29 January 1860), 66.

⁶⁹ *Le Carnaval des revues, revue de carnaval en deux actes et neuf tableaux par MM. Eugène Grangé et Ph. Gilles, musique de Jacques Offenbach* (Paris: Michel Lévy, 1860). Ludovic Halévy also contributed to the libretto, but declined to be credited when it was published; see Jean-Claude Yon, *Jacques Offenbach* (Paris: Gallimard, 2000), 228.

⁷⁰ Benoît Jouvin described how “le spectateur assiste au défilé complet du répertoire des Bouffes-Parisiens (répertoire de Jacques Offenbach, s’entend);” *Le Figaro* (16 February 1860), 3. See Mark Everist, “Jacques Offenbach: the Music of the Past and the Image of the Present,” in Fauser and Everist, eds., *Music, Theater, and Cultural Transfer*, 72-98 (esp. 76-7); a similar but still more

compressed account of *Le Carnaval* appears in Everist, *Mozart's Ghosts: Haunting the Halls of Musical Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 61-2.

⁷¹ In addition to a new “Polka des timbres,” which attracted little critical attention (although it was published in piano arrangement), two further numbers marked “air nouveau de J. Offenbach” appear in the libretto. One is on the subject of the Bouffes-Parisiens (prologue, scene 6); the other (tableau 5, scene 2) about *La Pénélope normande*, a play in five acts by Alphonse Karr that had opened shortly before Offenbach’s revue, on 13 January 1860, at the Théâtre du Vaudeville.

⁷² Grétry’s *Richard, Cœur-de-lion* (1856); Gluck’s *Orphée* (1859); Mozart’s *Les Noces de Figaro* (*Le nozze di Figaro*; 1858) and *L’Enlèvement au sérail* (*Die Entführung aus dem Serail*; 1859); and Weber’s *Robin des bois* (*Der Freischütz*; 1855), *Obéron* and *Euryanthe* (both 1857). Everist identifies Offenbach’s “calling card” quotations as “Et zig et zog” (*Richard, Cœur-de-lion*), “J’ai perdu mon Eurydice” (*Orphée*), “Mon cœur soupire” (*Les noces de Figaro*), and “Chasseur diligent” (*Robin des bois*); “Jacques Offenbach,” 76-7.

⁷³ The march from *Le Prophète* is heard off-stage (tableau 6, scene 3); and a scrap of *Les Huguenots* is gifted with new words making reference to its composer’s apparently weakening powers and inability to finish his latest work: “En Meyerbeer j’ai confiance;/L’Africaine enfin paraîtra,/Et le succès lui reviendra!...” (tableau 6, scene 4).

⁷⁴ “Si la parodie [...] avait le pouvoir de tuer en France, Richard Wagner serait un homme mort à l’heure qu’il est;” Jouvin, *Le Figaro* (16 February 1860), 3.

⁷⁵ “La musique de l’avenir a remporté là une victoire à faire pâlir les fanatiques de la salle Ventadour;” [Anon.], *Le Ménestrel* (12 February 1860), 86.

⁷⁶ Everist, *Mozart’s Ghosts*, 61.

⁷⁷ See, for instance, Jonathan Greenberg, *Modernism, Satire and the Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 7. In a similar vein, Henri Bergson’s seminal study of laughter (the starting point for most later theories of comedy) bases its entire argument on the didactic and disciplinary functions fulfilled by comedy in society—a logic once more implicitly reliant on the notion of a collective consciousness or mentality shared between the satirist or comedian and his [sic] audience; Bergson, *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic*, trans. Cloudesley Brereton and Fred Rothwell (London: Macmillan, 1911).

⁷⁸ Peter Szendy, *Listen: A History of Our Ears*, trans. Charlotte Mandell (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008), 36.

⁷⁹ Although it lacks literal Wagnerian quotations, the *Symphonie de l’avenir* appropriates the melody of a French lullaby—at least according to Grétry’s response to the piece in the libretto: “Ah ça! mais, on dirait l’enterrement de Bastien... c’est l’air des *Bottes de Bastien!*...” (tableau 6, scene 6). The lullaby had recently been given theatrical exposure by a one-act vaudeville by Charles Blondelet and Michel Bordet, *Ah! Il y a des Bottes, Bastien*, premiered at the Théâtre Beaumarchais on 5 March 1859; unfortunately, only its refrain (and not the melody of the verses) seems to have survived in twenty-first-century France, and it does not bear any resemblance to the material in Offenbach’s *Symphonie*.

⁸⁰ Signaled by the words “N’entendez-vous pas les Lanciers?” this quotation of the “Quadrille des Lanciers” is almost exact; it was first identified by Fauser in “*Tannhäuser* and its French Critics,” 235.

⁸¹ See, for instance, Scudo’s reference to “la théorie de M. Wagner, qui n’est autre que la vieille théorie de Gluck;” *L’Année musicale*, 132.

⁸² “M. Richard Wagner, le musicien de l’avenir, est le Rameau du dix-neuvième siècle;” Anon., *L’Artiste* (1861), 141.

⁸³ The phrase appears most prominently as the title of Walter Benjamin’s two “exposés” in which he laid out plans for the huge study of nineteenth-century Paris, published posthumously as *The Arcades Project*, ed. Rolf Tiedemann, trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin (Cambridge MA: Belknap Press, 1999).

⁸⁴ One particularly hyperbolic early twentieth-century example is attributed to Reynaldo Hahn, who was reported to have damned the Second Empire in 1925 as “an essentially anti-musical period. Its music resembled its furniture: it was ill-assorted, mediocre, and heavy;” quoted in Vincent Giroud, *French Opera: A Short History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 161. A similar image is depicted—but is also subjected to considerable critical and theoretical pressure—in Siegfried Kracauer’s *Offenbach and the Paris of His Time*, trans. Gwenda David and Eric Mosbacher (London: Constable, 1937). There are still few English-language monographs dedicated to the period’s musical culture, although recent contributions from scholars including Katharine Ellis, Mark Everist, Annegret Fauser, and William Gibbons have begun to address this lacuna. Some of the most stimulating writing on the period for my purposes is nonetheless to be found in Anselm Gerhard’s now-classic *The*

Urbanization of Opera: Music Theater in Paris in the Nineteenth Century, trans. Mary Whittall (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

⁸⁵ “Le vieux Paris n’est plus (la forme d’une ville/ Change plus vite, hélas! que le cœur d’un mortel);” “Le Cygne,” in Baudelaire, *Les Fleurs du Mal*, ed. Claude Pichois (Paris: Gallimard, 1996), 119.

⁸⁶ *Black’s Guide to Paris, and the Exhibition of 1867* (Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1867), 17-18.

⁸⁷ Haussmann’s works thus form an important element of the backdrop to Richard Sennett’s magisterial account of changes to urban society since the eighteenth century in *The Fall of Public Man* ([1977] London: Penguin, 2002). For two contrasting assessments of the Prefect’s role and influence from a more purely historical perspective, see Michel Carmona, *Haussmann: His Life and Times, and the Making of Modern Paris*, trans. Patrick Camiller (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2002); and David H. Pinkney, *Napoleon III and the Rebuilding of Paris* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958), which places Napoleon III rather than Haussmann at the helm of the city’s Second Empire renovation.

⁸⁸ In his major structuralist study of nineteenth-century historiography, Hayden White names the years 1830-1870 as the “second, ‘mature’ or ‘classic’ phase” of historical thinking: the earlier part of this phase was characterised by the huge narrative accounts of historians such as Michelet and Tocqueville; its later years by the writings of Marx, who produced “the most consistent effort of the nineteenth century to transform historical study into a science;” see White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 39-40. A huge amount has been written on the growing importance of and self-consciousness about the past during the Second Empire, in relation both to Haussmann’s renovations and to other manifestations of Parisian modernity—much of it in dialogue with the image of nineteenth-century Paris developed by Benjamin. Particularly important texts include Marshall Berman, *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (London: Verso, 1983); Richard Terdiman, *Present Past: Modernity and the Memory Crisis* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993); Jeanne Gaillard, *Paris, la ville (1852-1870)* (Paris: L’Harmattan, 1997); T.J. Clark, *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and his Followers* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999); and David Harvey, *Paris, Capital of Modernity* (New York: Routledge, 2006).

⁸⁹ For the strongest claim yet made for an emerging operatic canon during this period, see Katharine Ellis, “Systems Failure in Operatic Paris: the Acid Test of the Théâtre-Lyrique,” in Fauser and Everist eds., *Music, Theater, and Cultural Transfer*, 49-71.

⁹⁰ “LE JEUNE HOMME On a repris *Richard Cœur de lion*. / GRÉTRY Mon enfant bien aimé! / LE JEUNE HOMME On a repris *Robin des Bois* et *Obéron*... / WEBER Les deux plus belles perles de mon écrin! / LE JEUNE HOMME On a repris *le Mariage de Figaro*... / MOZART Un diamant!.. / LE JEUNE HOMME On a repris *Orphée*, on va reprendre *Don Juan*... / MOZART Où est le mal?.. / GLUCK Je suis joué les lundis, mercredis et vendredis... / MOZART Moi, les mardis, jeudis et samedis... / WEBER Grétry et moi, nous sommes joués les dimanches... / LE JEUNE HOMME Eh bien! et moi, Messieurs, quand me jouera-t-on?” Grangé and Gilles, *Le Carnaval des revues* (tableau 6, scene 3), 15.

⁹¹ “sept ou huit cent mille francs... une bagatelle!” *Ibid.*, 15.