



Project
MUSE[®]

Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

which makes for good reproductions of the visual material. Unfortunately, the photographs and illustrations are reproduced only in black and white. While this is not a problem for the majority of the images, it does hinder the illustrative purposes of a few, particularly those that accompany the article on the Brighton School filmmakers' "Quest for Natural Colour."

Given the wide range of subject matter, many historians and cultural theorists are likely to find something of interest here. While this is not the place to look for in-depth analysis or innovative theory, it does serve as a useful overview of the wide array of topics available for study in the field of Victorian visual culture. Because many of these essays can be used as starting points for further research, the book can serve as a catalyst for future work.

BETH A. KATTELMAN
The Ohio State University

SHAKESPEARE AND THE AMERICAN POPULAR STAGE. By Frances Teague. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006; pp. ix + 221. \$96.00 cloth, \$35.99 paper.

As has now been widely acknowledged, Shakespeare has been part of American life since the eighteenth century. The past few years have witnessed a renewed enthusiasm for the notion of "Shakespeare in America" as a pedagogical and critical opportunity. In 2003, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) announced the "Shakespeare in American Communities" initiative to support a nationwide, hundred-community tour of Shakespeare. In 2007, Public Radio International (PRI) and the Folger Shakespeare Library presented a radio documentary on Shakespeare in American life, with such episodes as "Shakespeare Becomes American." The same year, a six-month festival titled "Shakespeare in Washington" was held in the District of Columbia. Frances Teague's *Shakespeare and the American Popular Stage* asserts that Shakespeare was "an unacknowledged agent" of radical change in American popular theatre (5). Teague's book expands our understanding of Shakespeare's multifaceted presence in America before the Revolutionary War through a historically grounded assessment of the ways in which Americans used Shakespeare as they broke away from Britain. The term "Shakespeare's American figure" is used throughout the study to refer to the complex "manifestations of Shakespeare," including "the historical Shakespeare, his works, and the cultural institution that clusters around his name—principally in the United States" (3).

While Shakespeare's impact on American aesthetic and intellectual life, particularly the plays on stage and on screen during the latter half of the twentieth century, has been more thoroughly examined, there has been no systematic analysis of the appropriation and reception of Shakespeare in such popular theatre forms as the musical. Teague's treatment of Shakespeare in popular theatre of the antebellum period and in early twentieth-century musical comedy complements other post-1980 works that explore the Americanization of Shakespeare such as Lawrence Levine's *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America* (1988), Michael Bristol's *Shakespeare's America, America's Shakespeare* (1990), and Kim Sturgess's *Shakespeare and the American Nation* (2004).

Teague reframes what may appear to be a familiar history of Shakespeare's global career within the concept of heritage. She invokes David Lowenthal's distinction between history as that which "seeks to convince by truth" and heritage as a "declaration of faith in [our] past" (175). The book's conclusion suggests that "in appropriating Shakespeare, dreaming about Shakespeare, and employing Shakespeare to satisfy dreams," Americans have found a heritage that is "just such a declaration of faith" (176). These patterns of interpreting Shakespeare and the American tradition in formation were aided by a tendency to "ignore Shakespeare's national origin and to regard him as a naturalized American"—a phenomenon that begins early and continues to the present time (39).

The book begins with an intriguing question never before interrogated: why was Shakespeare absent for so long from the stage and on the bookshelves of early America? Chapter 1 demonstrates a range of factors that contributed to this absence, including the lack of "institutional backing for performances" in Puritanism (14) and the settlers' nostalgic attempts to "preserve the cultural dynamics" of seventeenth-century England where playhouses were closed (13).

Chapters 2 through 5 offer case studies of the myriad ways in which Americans sought to own Shakespeare, and how Shakespeare helped to forge new identities. Focusing on a series of accounts by such figures as John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, the American ambassadors to London and Paris, respectively, chapter 2 shows that Americans were "not averse to claiming Shakespeare as their own" as Shakespeare's figure became "useful as a means of expressing . . . one's national identity in America, either as British . . . or as American" (36–37). Chapter 3 considers how Shakespeare's figure participated in the formation of personal identities in P. T. Barnum's attempt to commodify Shakespeare, a "dif-

ficult figure, belonging to the English, but desired by Americans" (48). According to Teague, Barnum's failed project to purchase Shakespeare's birthplace is "a performance of national and social identity, as well as a metaperformance in which Barnum calls attention to himself as the master showman" (51). The Astor Place Riot in 1849 is the subject of chapter 4, in which the history of the rivalry between Edwin Forrest and William Charles Macready marks a moment when Shakespeare's figure becomes "class-bound" (63). Chapter 5 turns to the "American Brutus" John Wilkes Booth's use of *Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth*, and *Hamlet* in his writings about the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

Chapters 6 through 10 consider the more familiar history of musical comedy and burlesque, including the pragmatic and symbolic values of beards on the musical stage in relation to gender or racial identities: Eddie Foy's 1908 *Mr. Hamlet of Broadway* ("the first Shakespearean musical comedy" [101]), Rodgers and Hart's *Boys from Syracuse* (1938), Gilbert Seldes and Erik Charell's *Swingin' the Dream* (1939), and more recent musicals such as *Kiss Me, Kate*; *West Side Story*; *Return to the Forbidden Planet*; and *The Lion King*. Some were success stories, others more controversial; for instance, *Swingin' the Dream*—a jazz musical based on *A Midsummer Night's Dream*—straddles the racial divide. Teague suggests that it could be viewed as either "a tricked-up minstrel show [or a] subversive challenge to racism," depending on whether Shakespeare is regarded as part of African American tradition or white America's racism (132).

As a study that will find a general readership, the book is well served by its remarkable economy, appendix of production information, and summary of American events before 1750 with Spanish, French, and English perspectives (12). Chapter titles such as "Treasure, Stratagems, and Spoils" and "How Many Ages Hence . . ." are smart, but nonspecialist readers may appreciate a clearer sense of direction.

The concluding chapter provides illuminating metacriticism of the narratives about Shakespeare in America, including the author's own position and assumptions. Teague's "narrative of heritage" offers students and scholars of Shakespeare and theatre fresh perspectives on both the "dreams of transformation" of Shakespeare and America (175) and the studies of them.

ALEXANDER C. Y. HUANG
The Pennsylvania State University

SHAKESPEARE FILMS IN THE MAKING: VISION, PRODUCTION AND RECEPTION.

By Russell Jackson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007; pp. xii + 280. \$101.00 cloth.

All movies made of Shakespeare's plays carry a distinctive burden of expectation. From the moment pre-production begins they are critiqued in greater detail than others, and upon release they join their own category of cultural objects: the oeuvre of "Shakespeare films." Russell Jackson applies his usual meticulous research skills and impeccable critical eye to the process of making such a film, rather than to the product. This is largely a cultural history; there is some finely executed cinematographic analysis, but the emphasis is mainly on historical detail and what it tells us about the cultural systems in place at the time of the film's production. Jackson stays true to the "vision" mentioned in his subtitle by detailing just whose vision shaped a particular film. Production is also given substantial attention, particularly how process influenced product. Reception is dealt with in a more perfunctory way by connecting it back to the notable social characteristics of the era. The author provides detailed examination of the many steps that occur once a decision is made to make a Shakespeare movie, with all the cultural cachet and baggage that goes along with such an enterprise. Jackson digs into questions such as who makes the decisions, how is power distributed, and what are the goals of the power players involved. He does so by selecting a restricted list of five films, all except one of which remain high-profile examples.

Beginning with Max Reinhardt's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1935), Jackson energetically investigates the visionary aspect of filmmaking. Reinhardt was consumed by the idea of putting art and magic on celluloid, and Jackson shows a superior understanding of the impact of this kind of driving force on a project. Proceeding in the second chapter to Laurence Olivier's *Henry V* (1944), the author offers a much more sophisticated analysis of the conditions giving rise to the movie than the usual summary of it as "propaganda." An overview of many other films from the period provides cultural, social, and political context. Jackson ably marries a critique of Olivier's film itself to a thorough consideration of the influences on and the impact of the artistic choices made in a time of war (though he cannot be excused for the blunder of referring to Errol Flynn as a New Zealander—he was Australian).

The last three chapters are classified under the unifying heading "Visions of Renaissance Italy" to provide a frame for examining three versions of *Romeo and Juliet*: George Cukor's of 1936 for MGM,