

ideological debates over popular theatre. Pottecher left Paris and the Théâtre de l'Oeuvre to return to his hometown of Lorraine and establish the Théâtre du Peuple. While legitimating his project through appeals to regional authenticity, Pottecher also sought to make regional Lorraine stand in for greater France. He ensured a nationwide audience by marketing his theatre as part of the emerging middle-class tourist industry of the early twentieth century. Regarding this marketing campaign, Charnow remarks: "The search for authentic or traditional culture itself signifies that the latter exists only in the awareness of its loss" (202).

Theatre, Politics, and Markets in Fin-de-Siècle Paris: Staging Modernity effectively situates art and entertainment in their legal, journalistic, and entrepreneurial contexts. The book's discussion of theatre's social and historical contexts is stronger than its discussion of aesthetics, and I wish Charnow had focused more on the former—more "modernity" and less "staging." The book could also benefit from more theatrical self-reflection. Regardless, Charnow's well-researched, clearly written, and effectively structured book carefully delineates the intersection of social and cultural politics in fin de siècle France.



Print and the Poetics of Modern Drama. By W. B. Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006; pp. xi + 209, 12 illus. \$80 cloth.

Poetry of the Revolution: Marx, Manifestos, and the Avant-Gardes. By Martin Puchner. Translation/Transnation. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005; pp. xiv + 315, 12 illus. \$60 cloth, \$22.95 paper.

DOI: 10.1017/S0040557407000567

Reviewed by Matthew Smith, Boston University

The transformation of theatre studies over the past half-century owes much to the battle between literature and performance. As with any ancient conflict—and this one has persisted at least since Plato's privileging of the spoken over the written word—armies continue to clash as much from habit as conviction. Too many literature scholars are still writing about theatre as though it were the hammy stepchild of the book; too many performance scholars are still dismissing the printed page as a vast dead-letter office. The trouble with the conflict is not its antiquity; the trouble is that it prevents us from seeing the far more complex and more interesting relationships between those mutual foils.

Two recent books help point the way forward. The first is W. B. Worthen's *Print and the Poetics of Modern Drama*, a superb analysis of the relationship between print and theatre since the late nineteenth century. The book shows how paying attention to the materiality of the printed text alters our understanding of both literature and performance. Worthen's discussion of the process of the assimilation and subjugation of dramatic performance to the written text bears the stamp of one of the most productive developments in literary studies over the past couple of decades: increasing attention to the materiality of the book. The study

advances the work of scholars such as Jerome McGann (*The Textual Condition* [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991]; *Black Riders: The Visible Language of Modernism* [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993]), Roger Chartier (*The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries* [Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994]), and D. F. McKenzie (*Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999]). Worthen does an excellent job of situating his work relative to those larger discussions, though I found myself wanting to hear more about how he might relate his study to the important recent work of Julie Stone Peters, whose *Theatre of the Book 1480–1880* might be considered this book's prequel. Together, Peters's and Worthen's books could form the spine of an illuminating graduate seminar.

Issues of the materiality of the book are most familiar to theatre scholars in discussions of Shakespeare, and *Print and the Poetics of Modern Drama* accordingly begins with issues of Shakespeare editing. Given Worthen's insistence on the importance of print materiality, one might predict an attack on the sort of 1950s-era "New Bibliography" advocated by W. W. Greg and Fredson Bowers (and typified by Bowers's injunction that editors should "strip the veil of print" to get at the authentic text). One might similarly expect an enthusiastic defense of the more rigorously materialist methodologies of, for instance, Margreta de Grazia and Peter Stallybrass, who have argued for the preservation of the multiplicity and disorganization of early Shakespeare editions. But Worthen is less interested in taking sides in that debate than in placing it against the background of a changing performance culture. Thus he connects A. C. Bradley's character-oriented criticism, the novelistic Shakespeare of the New Bibliographers, and the "novelized" plays of Ibsen, Shaw, and O'Neill to a single, broader discourse of print and performance. He suggests the same of postmodern performance texts and a materialist editorial work such as the 1986 Oxford Shakespeare. "If Greg's Shakespeare sometimes looks like Shaw," Worthen concludes, "we might wonder whether the materialist Shakespeare resembles Samuel Beckett or Suzan-Lori Parks" (35).

It is with Shaw that the "booking" of modern Anglophone drama begins. While the idiosyncrasies of Shavian punctuation, spelling, and spacing are relatively familiar, the most distinctive aspects of Shavian "mise-en-page" are to be found in the broader layout and design of Shaw's carefully constructed editions. Shaw insisted that the printer fill the page with type, hyphenating words in order to use the entirety of the right margin and setting lines closely together. "Shaw's mania for blackening the page suggests that this is a moment of transition in the identity of plays" (50)—a transition away from the theatre and toward the armchair. As fluent as Shaw was with the living theatre, his attempts to absorb performance into print nevertheless exhibit the modernist "stage fright" of which Martin Puchner has written (in his book of that title). In that respect, Shaw's inheritors include Gertrude Stein, Harold Pinter, and Caryl Churchill, who continue in various ways to frame "a dialectical tension between the proprieties of the page and the identities of the stage" (62).

Building on his analysis of the complex relations between modern print and performance, Worthen turns to contemporary theatre and contemporary poetry. While contemporary poets Jerome Rothenberg and Charles Bernstein were both dismissive of the theatre, and took pains to distinguish their poetry from it, their brand of antitheatricalism ironically aligns them with theatre artists such as Jerzy Grotowski or, later, the practitioners of autoperformance monologue. Moving in the other direction, the printed plays of Sarah Kane, with their attention to the materialities of both page and stage, recall Language poetry's interest in the estrangement effects of material language. What emerges from Worthen's discussion is a new web of connections between contemporary poetry and performance. One wonders whether we are due for a renewal of that supposed dead-end of the modern stage, poetic drama—not through the verse forms of Eliot or Auden but through estrangement techniques inspired by Language poetry, or by the lyricism of Sarah Kane. In this chapter, as in the book as a whole, Worthen helps us view the relationship between page and stage, poetry and performance, as a complex and mutually fruitful dynamic. It is a change of perspective that opens up new realms of scholarship.

Among those new realms is a reconsideration of the manifesto. Situated somewhere between literature and propaganda, printed page and theatrical event, the manifesto is an object of study that begs many of the same questions that Worthen addresses. Its study demands a methodology equally versed in literary and performance theory, as well as in histories of avant-garde art, theatre, and politics. Martin Puchner ably spans this terrain with *Poetry of the Revolution: Marx, Manifestos, and the Avant-Gardes*, the best account of the genre yet published.

A central part of Puchner's argument is the claim that the manifesto is at once a theatrical and an antitheatrical genre. Puchner writes that "[t]heatricity seems to be something of a specter haunting the manifesto, the threat that its speech acts may turn out to be nothing but stage acts" (25). While the manifesto struggles to distinguish itself from theatricality on one hand, it plays a theatrical game on the other. Here again Puchner makes use of J. T. Austin's speech-act theory:

Saying that the manifesto is theatrical means that its speech acts occur in an unauthorized and unauthorizing context [. . .]. However, the manifesto does not rest comfortably in this unauthorized space; indeed, it tries to exorcise its own theatricality by borrowing from an authority it will have obtained in the future. (25)

The *Communist Manifesto* especially suffers from this quandary. With every year that passes after the failure of the February Revolution, editors must struggle to maintain the *Manifesto*'s position as a (increasingly antiquated) point of origin while not challenging its authority as living speech act.

The heart of Puchner's book is an analysis of the transformations of the manifesto as the genre is embraced (or satirized, or rejected) by a succession of avant-gardes. Of particular interest to theatre historians will be his discussion of Artaud's "manifesto theatre." In Puchner's account, Artaud's experiments gained

much of their energy from an extraordinarily violent friction between manifesto and theatre in his work. It is hard to avoid the irony that, while Artaud has been best known for his vehement advocacy of live performance over the written word, he has been almost entirely encountered through print. In general, it is not Artaud's theatre but his writing that has survived—and especially his “theatre of cruelty” manifestos. What Puchner is arguing is not simply that Artaud contradicts himself, embracing liveness while centrally employing the written word; what he is arguing, more provocatively, is that Artaud's manifestos were an attempt to *realize* the theatre of cruelty. Such a heavy reliance on the manifesto subjected the genre to enormous pressure, and Artaud's ambivalence about the manifesto represents, in extremis, the ambivalence of avant-garde artists more generally. As Puchner puts it:

Artaud's oeuvre demonstrates that the more the avant-garde wanted from the theatre, the more it would find the actually existing theatre inadequate; the more it depended on the value of theatricality, the more this value had to be detached from the theatre and transposed to some other form, for example, that of the manifesto. (208)

The book ends with an analysis of the role of the manifesto in the history of *TDR*. Soon after taking the reigns as editor in 1962, Richard Schechner lamented the fact that “[t]here are no manifestoes to collect and dissect, no stylistic innovations to brag about” (245). He soon found himself in a public debate with the former editor, Robert Corrigan, who insisted that manifestos were “a useless appendage to a quarterly magazine” (246). The conflict was no mere academic squabble but a microcosm of the much broader debate between cold-war modernism and the (neo)avant-garde. On one side: Esslin, Bentley, Barzun, Abel, Dürrenmatt, Miller, a certain sort of Brecht. On the other side: the Group Theatre, the Federal Theatre Project, the Living Theatre, Cage, Schechner, performance art, another sort of Brecht. To the latter group also belonged Artaud's paradox: an aesthetics of liveness combined with an embrace of the written manifesto. However, the energies of that avant-garde too were short-lived, and by the seventies Schechner was already speaking of a “deep freeze” of experimental performance, and a consequent decline of manifestos. With no new theatres to write new manifestos, what would become of *TDR*? By the eighties, Schechner's answer was simple: *TDR* would *become* the avant-garde. Just as *Tel Quel* and the *Situationist International* had once seized the mantle of the avant-garde for themselves, so too *TDR* would enact—through the printed word—the revolutionary performance for which it longed. In this last turn, *TDR* once more stands for a much broader cultural formation, the convergence of academic writing and the manifesto. The manifestos of our cultural moment, Puchner suggests, are more likely to be the products of academics than artists; think of Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990), Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), or Cary Nelson's *Manifesto of a Tenured Radical* (New York: New York University Press, 1997).

The old battle between literature and performance, once so central to theatre studies, has come to feel increasingly overstated and belated—which makes these two studies especially welcome. Worthen’s astute analysis of the complex relations between print and performance and Puchner’s sustained reflection on manifesto and theatre help to loosen up the logjam. In short, these two works do for their separate categories what Philip Auslander’s *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture* (London: Routledge, 1999) did for the similarly frozen opposition of performance and media. Like *Liveness*, too, Worthen’s and Puchner’s latest books should become required reading for scholars of modern performance.



Coal and Culture: Opera Houses in Appalachia. By William Faricy Condee. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2005; pp. xii + 210, \$34.95 cloth.
DOI: 10.1017/S0040557407000580

Reviewed by Jonathan Chambers, Bowling Green State University

Nearly halfway through his excellent cultural and historical study *Coal and Culture: Opera Houses in Appalachia*, William Faricy Condee notes the marginal status of the Appalachian region within the larger landscape of the United States in the last years of the nineteenth century and the first years of the twentieth: “In a country that increasingly perceived itself as being unified and homogenous, Appalachia was perceived as different” (57). Though viewed as “different” (and, indeed, ignored) by many living outside the region, Appalachia nonetheless held a crucial position in the economy of the United States, providing much of the coal that powered the country’s industrial development during this period. Within this era of development of the coal industry and, by extension, industrial America writ large, numerous small towns sprung up in rural western Pennsylvania, West Virginia, southern Ohio, and eastern Kentucky. More often than not, the local opera house constituted the geographic and cultural center of these new and developing communities. Thus, Condee contends that fundamental to the understanding of this often overlooked, forgotten, and disparaged region were these small-town opera houses. Additionally, he rightly holds that a truly inclusive history of theatre in the United States requires a thorough consideration of the interconnectivity of community and opera house in these now disregarded Appalachian towns.

Condee divides his study into three sections. The first, “The Opera House Project,” includes two chapters wherein the author outlines his cultural and historical approach and posits his thesis: in accommodating, as they did, a variety of entertainments and community activities, the opera houses of Appalachia, from the 1860s through the 1930s, were significant and, indeed, crucial to the lives of these small towns. In the first of these chapters, “The Birth of the Opera House,” the enormity and significance of Condee’s undertaking becomes evident. The chapter is based on his review of more than 125 opera houses within