Review by Theresa Varney Kennedy, Baylor University.

It is true that some scholars in the humanities have been slow to embrace the digital humanities. Perhaps it is, as the editors of *Databases, Revenues, and Repertory: The French Stage Online, 1680-1793* suggest, an unwillingness to embrace new technical skills or to accept new approaches to analysis. Clearly, the recent pandemic, having limited scholars’ access to stacks or interlibrary loan or print sources, has forced us to reevaluate our resistance to new digital formats. This volume gives us the opportunity to think about how we might engage with online data in our research.

*Databases, Revenues, and Repertory: The French Stage Online, 1680-1793*, edited by Sylvaine Guyot and Jeffrey S. Ravel and dedicated to the memory of Christian Biet (1952-2020), is an inspiring collection of essays that explores a major initiative in the digital humanities: the Comédie-Française Registers Project (CFRP), which can be accessed at www.cfregisters.org. In French and in English, this project is an international online collaboration consisting of high-resolution reproductions of the detailed daily box office receipts for Paris’s Comédie-Française theater troupe from 1680 to 1793. The complete manuscript and print records of the Comédie-Française were originally preserved in the Bibliothèque Musée at the Palais-Royal in central Paris. The CFRP team digitized a set of 112 folio registers that give details on the nightly box office receipts from over 34,000 performances between 1680 and 1793. The research team extracted the sales data, made accessible online via three different search and visualization tools, and provided access to it on an application program interface. The new CFRP database makes it possible to undertake a wide array of research queries quickly and accurately. For the first time ever, it pairs performance history data with box office receipts and an array of other variables, enabling scholars to gain a more nuanced portrait of the relative popularity of playwrights and their works over time. The visualization tools on the CFRP interface allows users to explore the box office data from this period from their home computers anywhere in the world. The Comédie-Française Registers Project team deserves praise for making this unique database available to scholars of French theater, as well as to historians.

*Databases, Revenues, and Repertory: The French Stage Online, 1680-1793*, published in both French and English, explores this important archive to examine programming decisions made by the
royal troupe in Paris during the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. The essays in this volume explore the troupe’s full repertory during this period, which consisted of more than 1,000 plays written by more than 300 playwrights, for more than 33,000 nightly performances. Several essays in this collection examine the long-term trends in box office receipts and repertory decisions throughout the eighteenth century. Others explore the 1760s when the influence of Enlightenment ideas was at its height. A third set of essays discusses the use of digital humanities in the study of French theater history and in the humanities more generally. More specifically, the essays in this collection effectively address the crucial question: how do digital humanities expand or develop our understanding of the past?

Like the CFRP database, the authors of Databases, Revenues, and Repertory: The French Stage Online, 1680-1793 have made their resource fully available online. The user interface allows users to gain easy access to the essays. Readers can move smoothly back and forth between the essays and the online data. There are online tools from the CFRP directly imbedded in the online texts so that readers can explore the data further. Readers can even leave comments in the pages devoted to each essay, a unique feature that facilitates and encourages immediate dialogue between scholars. The way that these online texts are laid out encourages readers to explore the data themselves and to develop their own theories.

While we would all attest to the utility and value of this digital humanities project, it cannot be denied that technology is fallible. In the introduction to Databases, Revenues, and Repertory: The French Stage Online, 1680-1793, the editors and contributors acknowledge the difficulties they themselves experienced in creating an entirely online resource. In early June 2018, they received shocking news from the MIT Press editorial team that their online essays had accidentally been erased, and they had to move their project to a different platform at the MIT Media Lab. Their negative experience highlights the anxieties about digital technology that still exist among scholars. Indeed, as the editors of this volume state in their introduction, “If this could happen at MIT, how confident could we be about any of the digital technologies that are currently transforming the nature of scholarly work in the humanities and social sciences?”

All of that said, the editors and contributors of this volume maintain that we cannot allow fear or anxiety to limit our growth. The editors justifiably state in their introduction that as historians of the theater of the Old Regime, we understand that “the very object of study, the moment of past performance, is an ephemeral, ever-retreating event that is dauntingly difficult to study.” We must carry on with surviving manuscripts, printed traces of performances—sources that are already incomplete, fragmentary, and quickly disappearing. But it has become imperative to find a way to preserve and improve upon what we still have access to now. Digital humanities initiatives like the CFRP can facilitate archival research and the study of the theatrical past.

Databases, Revenues, and Repertory: The French Stage Online, 1680-1793 largely grew out of a series of events held in France and in the United States following the online publication of the CFRP in 2014. These events included two international conferences and a workshop: Remettre en jeu le passé: Métamorphoses du corpus des registres de la Comédie-Française 1680-1793/2013-2016 (Sorbonne and the Institut National d'Histoire de l'Art, 14-16 December 2015); Early Modern Theatre Practices and the Digital Archive: The Comédie-Française Registers Project (1680-1793) (Harvard and MIT, 19-21 May 2016); and Economic Approaches to the Registers of the Comédie-Française (MIT, 23 September 2016). The project team and conferences organizers published several print collections of essays that were inspired by these events. The current
volume adds to these studies. But, as the editors and contributors of this volume maintain, it is a unique contribution in three different ways: (1) it is fully available online; (2) its digital format enhances data visualization options; and (3) its essays specifically access and discuss the outcomes of online scholarship and how the online format can enhance and reflect on eighteenth-century French cultural and theatrical history.

This volume is divided into three sections: (1) “Interpreting Data, Visualizations, and Sound”; (2) “Eighteenth-Century Repertory and Revenues”; and (3) “Circa 1760.” Each section is followed by a helpful commentary that synthesizes the main points and highlights the areas in which the contributors’ discussions converge or, in some cases, diverge. The postface summarizes the arguments that were made in each section and discusses future CFRP research projects.

Directly following the editors’ introduction, the section on “Interpreting Data, Visualizations, and Sound” examines the benefits and issues surrounding digital approaches to the theatrical past. Jeffrey S. Ravel’s intriguing essay “The Comédie-Française by the Numbers, 1752-2020” examines three early print explorations of the Comédie-Française registers data: (1) those of Charles de Fieux, Chevalier de Mouhy, theater historian; (2) those of Alexandre Joannidès, historiographer of the Comédie-Française between 1901 and 1926; and (3) those of Henry Carrington-Lancaster, an American academic most famous for his monumental nine-volume History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century (1929-1942). Those of us who do scholarly research on historical theater frequently cite these historians in our publications, but Ravel’s account of the personal challenges they faced in completing their work gives us a greater appreciation for what they accomplished. The author argues that revisiting the work of these early historians is a useful reminder that innovative quantitative scholarship existed well before new computational methods. Their work helps us better understand the merits and limitations of our modern digital approaches. The most fascinating aspect of Ravel’s study is his comparison of search and visualization tools designed by the CFRP team to earlier formats employed by Mouhy, Joannidès, and Lancaster.

Jeffrey Peters’s essay “Looking at the Literary: Data-Driven Visualizations and the Comédie-Française Registers Project” poses a practical question: now that the daily receipt registers kept by the administrators of the Comédie-Française theater troupe between 1680 and 1793 have been made accessible, how might scholars use this data to further their research? As he notes, this research may help us determine which plays were performed most often, by whom, by which authors, and for how many spectators. The author points out that this is not to say that we could not find answers to these questions before. But with the CFRP’s high-resolution images, algorithmic sorting and cross-listing, exportable datasets, and searchable databases, it is possible to discover trends that we couldn’t see before. It is indeed exciting to think that, as Peters maintains, “new understandings about seventeenth-century theater-going audiences are now within our grasp.” He argues that humanities scholars now have a unique opportunity to broaden their horizons by testing the limits of research derived from data analytics. Peters alludes to exciting new studies by literary scholars (i.e., Natalie Houston’s work on Victorian poets and Franco Moretti’s data analysis on Shakespeare’s plays) to show all that can be done to enrich our understanding about cultural history through computational analysis. But by relating CFRP data visualizations to the studies advanced by these scholars, Peters also reminds us to be aware of the methodological presuppositions—and anxieties—we have about those who employ quantitative approaches to the literary past.
Juliette Cherbuliez’s thought-provoking essay “The Sound of Theater: Crowds, Acoustics, Oration” describes a formalist approach to understanding the data in the CFRP. She poses the crucial question: how might we integrate the multiplicity of sounds—the theater stage, the performance, the audience members—that were fundamental to the cultural production of the Comédie-Française into our study of the CFRP? And what do the sales receipts tell us about the spectators whose bodies in attendance contributed to each individual performance? Her essay successfully explores the methodological and historiographical issues at stake in working with the CFRP and highlights the many benefits of digital humanities projects. To give specific examples of the kinds of research that can be done using the CFRP, Cherbuliez revisits successful studies that have been done on the material history of the Comédie-Française, including that of Jan Clarke, whose work on archival plans, drawings, and reports sought to discover why the salle des machines had terrible acoustics. In the final section of her essay, Cherbuliez wisely reminds us not to attempt to recreate the past or to search for absolute truths in our research. A variable acoustic model does not recreate something in its entirety; it simply allows us to pose new questions and to further our research.

The three essays in the section on “Interpreting Data, Visualizations, and Sound” do an excellent job endorsing the new approaches in literary studies that digital humanities can facilitate, while also underscoring the limitations of digital analysis, which cannot always provide us with a complete picture of eighteenth-century stage culture. Dan Edelstein’s helpful commentary, cleverly titled “Back to the Future,” suggests that we should not view Ravel’s essay—which reminds us that data visualizations have a history in earlier efforts to clarify the registers of the Comédie-Française—as a challenge to Peter’s argument that the CFRP interface allows us to better visualize the data. According to Edelstein, Ravel’s work should be understood as “antedating” the moment of change. That is, it did not take this shift to digital humanities to introduce new relations between scholars and the cultural objects. This digitization does not change content; it just makes it more visually accessible. But as Peters reminds us in his essay, the CFRP does not give us unmediated access to the theatrical reality. To make the data say anything at all requires, as he states, “making and doing.” The data can help us form hypotheses, but we must also rely on the other external sources. Cherbuliez’s essay arrives at a similar conclusion that digital archives do not provide us with firm conclusions, but instead elicit new questions. She proposes, for instance, that the archive may allow us to think about the acoustic experience of theatergoers in eighteenth-century France, but whatever is missing from the archives, or from the data, may inspire us to go in search of more answers. In sum, the essays in the first section of this volume emphasize the important notion that data does not necessarily draw us to any absolute truths, but it may serve as a point of departure for more scholarly investigation.

The essays by William Weber and François Velde, which are found in the section on “Eighteenth-Century Repertory and Revenues,” rely heavily on the CFRP to provide insight into the choices made by the Comédie-Française with regard to programming and prices leading up to the French Revolution. Much of the data that the contributors analyze in these essays is due to the extraordinary resource offered by the CFRP. William Weber’s essay “The Parallel Canons at the Opéra and the Comédie-Française at the End of the Ancien Régime” discusses how the two institutions—the opera, founded in 1669, and the Comédie-Française, in 1680—both developed powerful canons of great works that changed dramatically in the 1770s and 1780s. While the Comédie-Française lost its monopoly in 1791 and was abolished in 1793, the opera still managed to maintain its monopoly through the 1820s. Of particular interest in this essay is the fourth
François Velde’s essay “An Analysis of Revenues at the Comédie-Française, 1680-1793” explores the economic issues that the Comédie-Française archives bring to light. He admits that he is not the first to analyze the record of the daily performances at the Comédie-Française, but as he acknowledges, the digitization allows much more to be done since the receipts have been transcribed. This is important research because it goes beyond the history of the theater; the registers can also shed light on macroeconomic history and how the theater reacted to monetary trends in Paris. Velde provides an analysis of long-term revenues of the Comédie-Française and relates changes in revenue to royal monetary policy and the troupe’s pricing strategies and programming decisions. Velde’s approach is to try to understand the Comédie-Française as a business that had to respond to any number of variables, some of which were out of its control. The first section of Velde’s essay is a history of the Comédie-Française and its relation with the state, an overview that is quite useful and well-written. The second and third sections of his essay compare the ticket sales at the Comédie-Française versus those at its main competitors—the Opéra and the Comédie-Italienne. His study concludes that between 1750 and 1788, the Comédie-Française was successful in maintaining its market share. He surmises that inflation may have played a role.

Indeed, Velde’s fascinating find is that the rising ticket sales in the second half of the eighteenth century can be attributed to a rise in incomes of certain social categories, such as the theatergoers belonging to the landed classes who were benefitting from grain inflation and the rise in land rents. Velde concludes that this inflation did indeed affect the Comédie-Française’s decision to increase pricing after 1753. In the final section of his study Velde examines programming strategies. His findings show that the Comédie-Française in the 1740s and 1750s was marked by a change in tastes, and that it had difficulty adjusting its programming strategy to these new tastes. In terms of repertory, the author notes an increase in variety after 1750, suggesting the Comédie-Française’s efforts to satisfy these new audience demands. He surmises that the Comédie-Française seemed to rely on the stability of proven classics while adding more novelty plays that did just as well. At the end of his study Velde concludes that there are limits to the conclusions that can be drawn from the data, and acknowledges that further empirical research is needed on the determinants of programming choices of the Comédie-Française to have a fuller picture.

In his stimulating “Defining Repertory,” Derek Miller applauds the contributions of Weber and Verde, which reveal the wealth of opportunities that the CFRP provides in order to better understand the Comédie-Française’s operations. But he also alludes to the limitations of their studies, sensing a large gap between the repertory that the data suggests and the repertory that the Comédie-Françaises’s production practices actually made in real time. Miller suggests that we study the repertory not as something already recorded as data but as something constantly in motion. He proposes a “time- and performer-dependent model” of repertory that takes into account the “embodied” or the performative aspects of repertory, which he defines as a set of programming decisions based on a large set of variables (e.g., the required rehearsal time before a play can be performed). He offers two models by which we can improve our knowledge of how the Comédie-Française programmed its works: (1) computer simulation (to estimate the relative
weight of different variables in choosing a week’s programming); and (2) role-playing (to estimate how the company weighed those factors from season to season). But even Miller acknowledges the gaps in his model. The reality is that we cannot ever arrive at a full understanding of the process by which works come into and go out of the repertory. Thus Weber, Velde, and Miller reveal the difficulties of arriving at one solid conclusion. The Comédie-Française was affected by multiple factors. The authors of these essays illustrate the argument made by Cherbuliez—that far from arriving at an absolute truth, this research leads to more questions that require further analysis.

Anne E. C. McCants’s insightful “Money, Prices, and Accounting for Taste: Theater Economics as Revealed by the Comédie-Française Registers Project” points out that theater serves to produce and capture “the spirit of an age”; yet as she rightfully suggests, we do not always consider the financial side of theater arts. As historians, we forget that the actors and actresses at the Comédie-Française were not just in it to pursue their artistic dreams: they were also in it for the money. She wonders how the performers, managers, and playwrights made performance and pricing decisions between 1680 and 1793, amidst tremendous social and political change. Her helpful comparison reveals the various approaches that Velde and Weber take in using the CFRP to understand these decisions: while Weber explores the diverging strategies used by the Opéra and the Comédie-Française to keep up with public tastes, Velde seeks to understand repertory choices as hard-headed business decisions needed to keep the theater afloat. She notes that Velde’s essay in particular shows how the Comédie-Française had little control over changing public taste and the socioeconomic events affecting ticket sales. McCants rightfully notes the extraordinary math skills that must have been required to understand and navigate the ever-shifting conditions that dominated early modern France. McCants concludes by acknowledging the value that the CFRP may have not only for scholarly research but also for pedagogical exploration, and suggests having students use the CFRP to explore the ways in which people managed a shifting financial system in their daily lives or how a business determined how much it should charge for a night at the theater.

The third and final section of essays, titled “Circa 1760,” focuses on the period of Voltaire’s greatest success at the Comédie-Française. In his fascinating essay, “Financial Difficulties and Business Strategies of the Comédie-Française During the Seven Years War,” Thomas M. Luckett argues that during the Seven Years War the Comédie-Française was forced to develop new strategies for avoiding financial ruin. His short-term analysis contrasts with Velde’s long-term analysis of increasing box office revenues. Of particular interest is the third section of his essay in which he uses the CFRP to explore strategies that the troupe used after 1760 to climb out of their financial hole and improve ticket sales overall. The most obvious way they improved revenues was to perform more often. Luckett notes that the number of performances rose sharply after 1760 to an average of 295 performances per year. Secondly, he found that the Comédie-Française selected the most popular plays to perform on the days that the Opéra was closed. And finally, Luckett’s most fascinating finding was that it was not the seventeenth-century classic playwrights (i.e., Molière, Racine, and Corneille) that the troupe turned to at the height of their wartime crisis. Surprisingly, it was Voltaire instead who helped return the Comédie-Française to financial stability. Luckett concludes by suggesting that during the Seven Years War, the Comédie-Française relied on a repertory of plays that might have brought in a larger audience, but they also relied on plays that created public scandal at the same time, thereby bringing the libelle genre to the stage.
In “The Voltaire Moment,” Pierre Frantz presents Voltaire as an epic poet above all else. Alongside Racine and Corneille, he remained one of the top playwrights in France for well over a century. Frantz poses the question: why then did he disappear in the nineteenth century? Frantz reexamines the “Voltaire moment”—which he defines as the moment when Voltaire’s collection of plays became a part of the Comédie-Française’s repertory. The author’s evidence is very convincing. He uses the CFRP to demonstrate that Voltaire’s theatrical works were performed 2,433 times as the first (or grand) play in the Comédie-Française’s evening lineup in the eighteenth century, placing Voltaire right behind Molière, Corneille, and Racine—and before Regnard and Thomas Corneille. Frantz also finds that during Voltaire’s most productive period, the number of performances of his most successful plays was equal to that of Racine and Corneille; and that between 1755 and 1760, and between 1760 and 1770, Voltaire’s plays dominated the repertory, constituting one fourth of the season’s performances. Voltaire, who first premiered a play in 1718 at the Comédie-Française, had established himself as a regular fixture by 1760; all sixteen of his plays were in the repertory. Frantz’s research thus confirms Luckett’s findings, revealing that the final recovery of the Comédie-Française was due to Voltaire’s success. In his conclusion, Franz suggests a brilliant truth: that in this case, “an author is performed.” While Molière, Regnard, Racine, and Corneille represent a kind of “heritage,” the Voltaire repertory may be seen as an “active affirmation of a historic moment.” In sum, Voltaire became popular due to his notoriety. Voltaire is thus intrinsically connected to the moment in time from which his plays emerge. His theater will always belong to the historical time period between the years 1760-1770, the period in which it struggled against the very political and social orders that it embodied and performed.

Lauren R. Clay’s interesting essay “The Strange Career of Voltaire, Bestselling Playwright of Eighteenth-Century France” examines why Voltaire’s theater has not maintained its popularity. She wonders how we can explain the strange career of this bestselling playwright, whose works defined an era and yet are hardly performed and rarely read today. While many critics attribute the decline of Voltaire to the death of a genre, Clay ponders the all-important question: “how do we reconcile Voltaire’s unmatched ability to pack in spectators at the Comédie-Française and to move his eighteenth-century public to tears with the widely shared critical assessment that his work constituted a chapter in the ‘decline’ and the ‘death’ of tragedy?” Clay uses the CFRP to bring to light what drew eighteenth-century Comédie-Française audiences to works by Voltaire. The second part of the essay examines the reasons behind Voltaire’s success. The final section of the essay surveys the changing critical interpretations of Voltaire’s repertory by analyzing literary criticism published between the Revolution and 1804, by which time the Comédie-Française had removed all but a very few of Voltaire’s plays from the repertory. As the author states, the new CFRP database makes it especially easy to track and compare best sellers, and the CFRP reveals surprising trends—mainly that Voltaire comes out well ahead of France’s most acclaimed tragic playwrights beginning in the 1740s and continuing through the 1780s.

The author makes an interesting point concerning the playwrights: whereas Corneille and Racine operated within a cultural system defined by patronage, writing principally for the king and other powerful patrons, Voltaire, writing for the stage decades later, had to write for the Paris public. It was indeed the spectators who determined the ultimate fate of a work. Voltaire therefore sought to impress theatergoers with enormous casts, spectacular sets, plots featuring betrayal, murder and ghosts—and he did not hesitate to harness controversy to draw in the crowds.” He also attacked literary adversaries openly onstage. The actors encouraged it because these rivalries drove sales. Clay’s essay successfully shows that eighteenth-century spectators were
drawn to Voltaire’s debuts because they wanted to see what he would do next! Since the CFRP database records only go through 1793, Clay uses Joannidès’s research to examine Voltaire’s performance history through the nineteenth century, after which his popularity plummeted. Clay’s research reveals that from the Restoration through the 1830s, Voltaire remained inextricably associated with the Revolution that had largely defined his works. But for many, the Revolution remained a painful rupture, and it was the actors themselves who retired Voltaire’s plays. Clay argues that while many revolutionaries still viewed Voltaire as a hero, the Counter-Enlightenment Catholic reactionaries argued that Voltaire had sowed the seeds for the destruction of the Catholic Church and of France itself. Others criticized his didactic approach to theater that led him to exploit his plays to present his political and philosophical viewpoints. It thus became impossible to disassociate nineteenth-century repertory decisions from the polemic surrounding Voltaire.

The commentary at the end of the section by Logan J. Connors entitled “Celebrating Voltaire in the 1760s” provides a rigorous summary and critique of all three essays. Connors notes that these essays differ in significant ways: Luckett provides a synchronic, fine-grained account of the financial workings and cultural politics of the Comédie-Française during the late 1750s and early 1760s; Franz reassesses the very notions of repertory and canon, proving that external elements, such as political events and engagements in social justice, drove ticket sales and determined exactly what it meant to be successful at the theater; and Clay most fully engages with the CFRP to rescore traditional rankings that she modifies with more detailed accounts of revenues. She successfully proves that Voltaire outperformed seventeenth-century playwrights at various moments in the eighteenth century and that the Enlightenment was not, in fact, irreconcilable with tragedy. For Connors, what links these essays together is not only their judicious use of the CFRP database, but their “recognition that any understanding of dramatic success, performance norms, or theatrical culture during the French Enlightenment requires serious engagement with Voltaire, a writer who perhaps unjustifiably, is largely absent from the stage today.”

The postface entitled “The CFRP, from Archaeology to Futurology,” by Christian Biet, Sara Harvey, and Agathe Sanjuan, briefly summarizes the strengths and merits of each of the contributors’ essays before moving onto a discussion about ongoing research efforts involving the CFRP. Inspired by the questions that came up during the first phase of their project, the editors and contributors of this volume intend to continue to explore the CFRP archives for data associated with plays performed between 1680 and 1793. For the second phase of their research, they intend to create several data sets: daily expenses (1680-1776), criticisms of performances in the press (1680-1793), and records of the troupes’ administrative meetings (1765-1793). We look forward to the next installment of this exciting project.

Indeed, if this volume is an invitation to experiment with knowledge-making and history through archives, then the editors and contributors have been successful. I am excited about the opportunities that Comédie-Française Registers Project may provide all of us in our research endeavors. Databases, Revenues, and Repertory: The French Stage Online, 1680-1793 is an invitation to all scholars to change the way that we think, not only about digital humanities projects, but also about the way we approach our research and how we engage with the scholarly community at large. The principals of investigation in the humanities are changing. Perhaps we need to think less about trying to reconstruct the past, and focus more on understanding and experimenting with alternative modes of research that can help us to see the past from a fresh perspective. I am
grateful to my colleagues for inspiring and urging all early modernists to take that giant leap into the twenty-first century.
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