

to be a theoretical study, it does both provide in some senses a theoretical historical framework for any work that might be done on London pageant and drama in the future, and constitute a starting point – as informed as it can be at present – for an understanding of London’s civic longer term dramatic traditions. It attempts to set out something of the continuing story of public performance in London up to the mid-sixteenth century, ingeniously filling in gaps in knowledge through informed speculation and comparison with analogous situations and practices elsewhere. It is a book that needed to be written.

Darryl Grantley

Courtney Lehmann. *Shakespeare Remains: Theater to Film, Early Modern to Postmodern*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2002. Pp xii, 267.

The wit, intelligence, and scholarship of this study are reflected in its title. *Remains* functions here as a verb, as well as the noun employed by Heminge and Condell to describe their late colleague’s plays in the first folio. Lehmann argues that something of Shakespeare remains and endures despite the problematization of authorship wrought by late twentieth-century theory and despite the transformations wrought upon the playtexts not only in individual film adaptations but also by film as a framework for understanding art, culture, and entertainment. Demonstrating deep conversance with literary theory along with film theory, Lehmann challenges recent critiques of the idea of the Author in the Early Modern period; she anticipates, to some degree, some of Lukas Erne’s arguments in *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (2003). But then, Shakespeare himself, ‘what is in the text, more than the text’, anticipates and provokes later cultural developments and even cinematic techniques.

Chapter one considers Shakespeare as an ‘Unauthor’, uncharacteristically beholden to a single source for *Romeo and Juliet*. Placing the playwright amid shifting definitions of authorship and invention, Lehmann finds a parallel between Romeo’s attempts to break free from the Petrarchan discourse that defines him and Shakespeare’s attempts to ‘Author’ himself while demonstrably revising Arthur Brooke’s poem *The Tragical History of Romeus and Juliet*. The play’s language shares in thematizing the problem through its constant

references to books, from Juliet's judgment that Romeo kisses 'by the book' to Mercutio's sneer that Tybalt unduly relies on printed guides to fencing, such as Saviolo's.

Chapter two explores Shakespeare's foreshadowing of the 'Auteur-Function' in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Some recent scholarship has depicted the historical Shakespeare as choosing an 'author's theatre' over a 'players' theatre'; Lehmann proposes the use of the term *auteur* to acknowledge his – and his works' – participation in both models. Auteur theory, in some of its applications, focuses on the points of intersection, cooperative and combative, between the film maker and the system (or 'apparatus') in which she or he operates. Shakespeare's *Dream*, Lehmann argues, illustrates both this creative tension and the tension between models and purveyors of stagecraft that would soon explode into full blown war between the theatres in late Elizabethan London. To perform such an 'exposition of sleep', as Bottom says, Lehmann reads the play as a prophetic dream predicated upon the collision between the players' theatre embodied by bully Bottom and the author's theatre that Oberon endeavours to script. Along the way, she insightfully comments on parallels between Titania's fascination with Bottom and Queen Elizabeth's delight in Richard Tarlton; she also finds in the Mechanicals' improvisations on Pyramus and Thisbe (and revisions of *Romeo and Juliet*) a synthesis between the two notions of theatre that succeeds comedically but cannot hold for long.

Chapter three proposes that *Hamlet* defines the preconditions and longings for a medium such as the cinema: the title character not only hints at cinematographic practice in his efforts to achieve 'that which passes show' (that is, transcends what might be *played*, as on a stage), but also gives early expression to what Lehmann terms, borrowing from Lyotard and Jameson, 'the desire called cinema'. Hamlet's approach to reality employs juxtaposition, suture and montage; in his search for truth, he is less a *noir* detective than a *noir* director. No wonder, then, that so many film versions assert Hamlet's capacity for vision despite the moral uncertainty of a corrupt Denmark: both Olivier's and Branagh's princes 'see' the murder of Old Hamlet; the Hamlet figure in Kurosawa's *The Bad Sleep Well* orchestrates visual gestures aimed at uncovering a conspiracy; in Almereyda's update, Hamlet is always and already a director. In this, Lehmann suggests, Hamlet is indeed his father's son, since it is the apparition that sets the play's events into motion, later intervening to keep Hamlet on script. Playfully quoting from the play, Lehmann identifies the Ghost with the person traditionally thought to have first portrayed him: 'I [.] Will', Ur-Auteur and -Author.

In chapter four, 'Strictly Shakespeare?', Lehmann turns her attention to Baz Luhrmann's film of *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet*. Her analysis of the film's giddy, canny play of postmodern surfaces reveals some intriguing antecedents, some expressly invoked and others less obvious. Lehmann traces the connections between Luhrmann's earlier film, *Strictly Ballroom* (hence the chapter's title), this film, and Shakespeare's own *Romeo and Juliet*; she also persuasively exposes the visual echoes of Arthur Brooke's imagery in *Romeus and Juliet* that appear as Luhrmann translates and then overgoes (to use Gabriel Harvey's term) Shakespeare's language into cinematic terms. Luhrmann is at his most – and most troublingly – Shakespearean, then, as he replicates Shakespeare's struggles against his primary source and toward self-authorship, leaving his distinctive (Baz)mark on the story.

Chapter five begins by casting Kenneth Branagh in a dual role: he is a practitioner of Late Auteurism; he is also, not coincidentally, deeply implicated in the problems of mediating between popular culture, especially its in mass-market and globalized aspects, and national culture. As auteur, however, Branagh, a native of Belfast, is less concerned with adapting Shakespeare than he is in revising himself as the premier exponent of England's national poet. The chapter concentrates on Branagh's acting, as well as his directorial choices in what must be called postcolonial self-fashioning: as director, Branagh can engineer the displacement of Derek Jacobi – erstwhile Hamlet and star of television's *I, Claudius*, now Shakespeare's (that is, Branagh's) Claudius – as actor. Similarly, in chapter six, Lehmann shows how Branagh chooses Will Shakespeare, symbol of English culture, over 'King Billy' – William of Orange as emblem of Anglo-Irish identity – in his cinematic version of *Henry V*. The film's treatment of the Irish Captain, Macmorris, at the siege of Harfleur reflects the director's earnest, desperate efforts to distance himself from his past; the relationship between Harry and a 'good' colonial, the Welsh Fluellen, is given extraordinary emphasis. At the same time, Ulsterian motifs are regularly audible: Lehmann astutely notes how Branagh delivers the phrase 'noble lustre in your eyes' in full brogue to Harry's common soldiers.

Chapter seven comes full circle by returning to Shakespeare himself, as he is portrayed in the film *Shakespeare in Love*. From the anxious Un-Author evident in the playwright's own *Romeo and Juliet*, we come to the Ur-Author, who is the only begetter of his first triumph: there is no hint of Arthur Brooke's poem in this film's account of creative events. But this Shakespeare can only be the 'only begetter' by objectification of another: in this case, the Lady Viola. Applying concepts advanced by Slavoj Žižek, Lehmann shows that, where Viola is concerned, enjoyment as a consumer is as important to Will Shake-

speare as opportunities through capital are to his noble rival, Lord Wessex. Showing how the dramatist delightedly consumes the Lady before converting her into product to be enjoyed by audiences, Lehmann deftly destroys the film's claims to value love above all else; it is the consumption of goods (literal and figurative) that leads ultimately to Shakespeare's critical and economic success, to his strenuously negotiated redefinition as sharer in the company and, later, as gentleman.

Despite its impressive range, the study is, at times, overly constrained by its focus on what is 'more than the text': I would have appreciated Lehmann's take on the persistence of Shakespeare-speak in several of the films that she discusses. Luhrmann's *Romeo + Juliet* and Almereyda's *Hamlet* achieve some of their most grandly disorienting effects by their use of Shakespearean language; much of the humour in *Shakespeare in Love* derives from its sparkling pastiche of Shakespearean quotes. Lehmann quotes one such example – 'It needed no wife come from Stratford to tell you that' – without commenting on the resonances of its original context (Horatio's response to Hamlet's initial report on his encounter with the Ghost) or on the implications for Shakespeare's future career (since, in the world of the film, *Hamlet* has yet to be written). If Shakespeare indeed remains, it is because he is constituted by an assembled corpus of 'words, words, words', as well as extrapolated from it.

Similarly, the emphasis on 'anticipation' is so strong that some backward glances are neglected, even when they could enrich the argument: surely *Dream* recalls guild plays and children's companies (such as those for whom Lyly wrote) from the past; Branagh's campaign of redefinition is indebted not only to actors such as Jacobi but also to directors like Olivier and Welles. Further, distinctions between film and video as media are usually overlooked. Lehmann does not expand on the significance of how television broadcasts frame Luhrmann's *R+J* or how Almereyda's *Hamlet-as-director* works with digital images.

Such omissions, however, derive from one of the book's overriding strengths: its splendid continuity of argument, which keeps a range of critical perspectives, cultural practices, and creative materials well in hand. This is first and foremost a study of Shakespeare, which makes it all the more valuable as a study of Shakespeare and film. Lehmann maintains a clear-eyed view of production realities, past and present, and displays a ready command of media and cultural history and criticism. *Shakespeare Remains* both restlessly and thoughtfully moves forward, going beyond the processes of reconceptualization that have been the benefit and bane of recent theory. In the chapter on Luhrmann, she issues a hopeful call for critics to embrace author as adapter,

rather than doomed creator, and to accept postmodern pastiche as a potential (and potent) alternative to blank parody. In the book overall, she demonstrates the considerable value of such an approach.

Stephen M. Buhler

Tristan Marshall. *Theatre and Empire: Great Britain on the London Stage under James VI and I*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000. Pp x, 211.

Bruce Galloway, the historian, once dismissed as 'naïve' the notion that James [I] was 'spellbound by a vision of "Britannia Rediviva"'. James 'refused offers of Empire', said Galloway, and besides, he declared, in the period 'theatre was one thing, politics, quite another'.<sup>1</sup> In *Theatre and Empire*, Tristan Marshall seeks to refute this claim and others like it. James I, he argues, set out to engineer the creation of a specifically 'British' national identity and to promote an imperial 'Britain' at home and abroad. This 'evocation of "Britishness" is' – or should be – 'at the heart of our understanding of [his] reign' (1). Much of Marshall's book is given over to canvassing the texts, most of them plays, in which this 'identity' was variously seized upon, reworked, and disseminated by James' subjects throughout his reign. The larger historical claims of *Theatre and Empire* are convincing, it seems to me. This is a worthwhile book for the questions it raises (albeit glancingly) about the relations between the theatre and royal authority and ideology in the early Jacobean period. But its specific demonstrations of those claims, and its readings, are, if not unconvincing, then sometimes unfocussed or underdeveloped, leaving much about those relations unexplained and many of those questions unexamined.

Marshall's rejoinder to Galloway at the end of the first chapter suggests both the larger stakes of his argument and his sometimes disjointed approach to it. James, counters Marshall, was enthusiastic about the 'Ulster plantation as a British project'. And who's to say that the 'idea of Britain as a political entity remained the prerogative of the crown alone'? "'Britain" meant many things', he suggests, one thing to common lawyers, perhaps, and another to playwrights such as Shakespeare, who used it as a 'point of topical relevance by which to entertain' (40). Marshall's overall point here is a good one: 'Britain' should not be thought of in narrowly 'political' terms. The failure of James' plans to install