

lors qu'il s'agit de créer, financer, exposer, conserver, vendre, collectionner, restaurer, assurer, taxer, transporter ou simplement critiquer une œuvre d'art contemporain.

Ce raisonnement aide à comprendre comment ce monde « s'est à la fois internationalisé et spécialisé, en se refermant socialement sur un milieu beaucoup plus restreint que le grand public qui, au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle, se rendait au Salon de Peinture » (p. 315). L'indifférence, voire l'hostilité, d'une partie du « public cultivé » peut notamment s'analyser en termes de paradigme. Il serait passionnant de voir des sociologues étudier les manifestations des structures analysées par N. Heinich dans des domaines très imprégnés par l'art contemporain, tels que la littérature, la danse, le théâtre ou le cinéma.

Si l'argument est convaincant, l'ouvrage pâtit parfois de son ambition. Proposer un tel panorama en moins de 400 pages oblige N. Heinich à traiter des pans entiers de la réflexion par des formes argumentatives condensées, des récits d'anecdotes ou des renvois bibliographiques qui frustreront le lecteur autant qu'ils le stimulent. La sociologue approfondit peu un aspect dont on la sait pourtant experte : celui des appuis philosophiques et politiques du discours sur l'art et les artistes. On aimerait ainsi mieux comprendre la popularité de *Mille Plateaux* dans les présentations d'œuvres et d'artistes. On est également surpris de voir la question des contestations être traitée de manière interne au milieu (pp. 329-339), comme si les artistes n'interrogeaient plus le politique au-delà de la subversion des institutions culturelles. D'une manière plus générale se pose la question des outils théoriques avec lesquels le monde de l'art contemporain peut se décrire. De quelle manière la sociologue articule-t-elle ses références (Goffman, Kuhn, Goodman...) avec celles qu'emploient les acteurs réflexifs — parfois lecteurs de sociologie de l'art — qu'elle étudie ?

*Le paradigme de l'art contemporain* marque une étape majeure dans l'œuvre de N. Heinich, d'une part aboutissement d'une réflexion sur la querelle qui agite les mondes de l'art depuis les premières transgressions de Duchamp, d'autre part affirmation d'un regard qui dépasse le débat esthétique tout en l'incluant dans une perspective cohérente. L'ouvrage démontre que la posture goffmanienne, que N. Heinich revendique avec force, ne condamne pas ses tenants à la microsociologie. Inspiré des *Cadres de l'expérience*, le recours à l'anecdote comme « saillance de l'accroc à la norme » (p. 20) s'articule ici avec des considérations macrosociologiques, économiques et juridiques, révélant les structures de ce paradigme : « ce portrait du monde l'art contemporain ne prétend pas être exhaustif mais il se veut, globalement, juste — aussi juste du moins que peut l'être une carte, qui s'appuie sur les saillances mais ne prétend pas restituer l'intégralité du paysage » (p. 342).

Olivier Caïra

Centre Pierre Naville, Université d'Évry Val d'Essonne,

2, rue du Facteur Cheval, 91000 Évry, France

Adresse e-mail : [o.caira@free.fr](mailto:o.caira@free.fr)

Disponible sur Internet le 13 avril 2015

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.soctra.2015.03.011>

**Jazz, les échelles du plaisir, O. Roueff. La Dispute, Paris (2013). 268 pp.**

Writing the history of a subject from a sociological point of view has emerged as a genre in its own right. In the wake of Pierre Bourdieu's writings on the genesis and structure of the literary world, and of Paul DiMaggio's depiction of the transformation of orchestral concerts, Olivier Roueff has fashioned a history of jazz in France which focuses on the role of intermediaries as links between musicians and the public. Using a keenly manipulated framework of analysis, O.

Roueff depicts how such figures led movements variously of popular and educated taste among publics in the French jazz world. The book depicts a major rupture in the late 1940s between proponents of traditional and *avant-garde* jazz, a dispute that I sense went deeper than its parallel did in the United States.

O. Roueff designed the introduction to the book as a brief starting-point for his analysis rather than as an extended theoretical essay. He traces his conception of the scales to the effort of Erving Goffman to analyze how leaders of a cultural world define that social space and its ability to form groups of adherents and adapt to changing cultural and economic circumstances. Drawing on the work of Raymonde Moulin, Paul DiMaggio, and Richard A. Peterson, among others, Olivier Roueff focuses on the key roles played by intermediaries negotiating within the production, distribution, and interpretation of art objects while tastes change under the pressure of competing ideologies. He borrowed from Michael Baxandall an ethnographic sense of how a common language evolved between painters and their patrons which can be seen as parallel to that between jazz players and music critics.

The problem of race is central to the analysis, and O. Roueff shows that in early jazz such aspects were even more complicated in France than in the U.S. Show producers and commentators talked variously about African, American, and African-American *nègres* and gave racial identity to the number called “the Kikapoo”. In 1925 a periodical called the *Revue nègre* tried to sort all this out by identifying “a black origin” or “an American sublimation” (understood as white).

Organized around an historical narrative, the book traces the acclimatization of jazz in France, the influence of radio and recordings, the impact of the two world wars, and the evolution of free jazz from the 1960s. O. Roueff links historical and sociological developments to explain how jazz arrived in France with the cake-walk, a dance style formed by Afro-American slaves that began appearing in Parisian music halls around 1902. He shows that early jazz served bourgeois hedonism more directly than in the U.S., since its precedents can be traced back to a type of cabarets (*cafés chantants*) of the 1860s and the Olympia Music-Hall of the 1890s. Critical to his argument is proof that the cake-walk began tending to a well-off audience and was somewhat esoteric and indeed, to a considerable extent, a high culture (*une culture lettrée*, p. 161).

In analyzing the succeeding periods of French jazz, the book shows how a corpus of works prescribed by specialized professionals evolved through the work of intermediaries who pursued their own self-interest while negotiating between musicians and the public. Thus did leading critics such as Robert Delaunay, Hughes Panassié, and André Hodeir come into conflict through strategies independent of — indeed, in some contexts competing with — demand manifested by consumers. That social process evolved with a series of recordings called *Jazz Hot* that begun in 1928 and culminated in an epochal feud in 1947 between critics promoting popular or *avant-garde* taste. In France the term “hot jazz” was seen from the start as the opposite to “straight jazz”, indeed the better versus less well educated listeners. The dispute centered around Panassié’s writings in *Jazz Tango* and the music performed by an organization called the *Hot Club de France* based in a university jazz club. Delaunay was excluded from the Hot Club, and clubs in regional cities supported the traditional conception of jazz. Even though Panassié favored traditional jazz styles, he nonetheless drew on the notion of the sublime by which classical music had been interpreted. By contrast, Hodeir and his followers promoted bebop, the improvisatory style begun in the 1940s, as a new wave that identified Panassié’s taste as out of date.

I am nevertheless suspicious of Roueff's definition of canon formation through the term *pantheonization*, since it involves distracting historical implications that lead away from understanding what was going in a particular area of musical life. This is especially a problem because jazz developed a fragmented set of canonic tendencies, in some ways similar to what happened in the world of opera. In neither field did a unitary concept emerge that had as broad an impact as *on classical music* did within concert life from the early nineteenth century. Stéphane Dorin (2010) suggested such fragmentation in his history of jazz in India.

The conclusion of the book suggests how in recent years norms of legitimate taste were redefined to a greater extent in eclectic rather than factional terms. Having published a study of the jazz public in Burgundy with Wenceslas Lizé (see <http://www.crjbourgogne.org/?id=46>), O. Roueff argues that the jazz public became older and included more women, but has also become more deeply rooted in rural areas. He sees a profound enigma in the problem of race found in the jazz world: "where does this form that links a tone, or a sentence, to a racial identity with such unanimity come from?" he asks. The answer has to be historical, he argues, given what happened in French musical life at the turn of the twentieth century with the adaptation of the Afro-American rhythmic pulse to bourgeois musical culture.

In the end, *Jazz, les échelles du plaisir* follows and deepens other histories of jazz in France, like *New Orleans sur Seine* by Ludovic Tournès (1999), another early book written by Roueff with Denis-Constant Martin (Martin and Roueff, 2000) and one by Damon Phillips (2013). It is nicely supplemented by a companion website which features various materials, and can be found at <http://www.plaisirsdujazz.fr/>.

## Référence

- Dorin, S., 2010. *Jazz and Race in Colonial India. The Role of Anglo-Indian Musicians in the Diffusion of Jazz in India*. *Jazz Research Journal* 4 (2), 123–140.
- Martin, D.-C., Roueff, O., 2000. *La France du jazz. Musique, modernité et identité dans la première moitié du xx<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Parenthèses, Marseille.
- Phillips, D.J., 2013. *Shaping Jazz: Cities, Labels, and the Global Emergence of an Art Form*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Tournès, L., 1999. *New Orleans sur Seine. Histoire du Jazz en France*. Fayard, Paris.

William Weber  
California State University, 1250 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90840,  
United States of America  
E-mail address: [william.weber@csulb.edu](mailto:william.weber@csulb.edu)

Available online 17 avril 2015

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.soctra.2015.03.013>

**Masculinités. Enjeux sociaux de l'hégémonie, R. Connell. Ouvrage traduit sous la direction de M. Hagège et A. Vuattoux. Éditions Amsterdam, Paris (2014). 288 pp.**

Depuis la fin des années 1980 se sont développées dans les universités anglophones — notamment en Australie — des analyses centrées sur les *Men's studies*, s'appuyant sur des revues (comme *Men and Masculinities*) et des cadres théoriques spécifiques (Carrigan et al., 1985 ; Donaldson, 1993 ; Connel, 1995 ; Demetriou, 2001). Au cœur des *Gender Studies*, ces