

## REVIEW ESSAY

### *Hamilton's Ghosts*

*Hamilton: An American Musical*. Thomas Kail, director; Sander Jacobs, Jill Furman, Jeffrey Seller, and the Public Theater, producers; Lin-Manuel Miranda, writer, book, music, and lyrics; Ron Chernow, historical consultant. Richard Rodgers Theatre, New York City, performance date, August 6, 2015.

*Hamilton: The Revolution*. By Lin-Manuel Miranda and Jeremy McCarter. New York: Grand Central Publishing, 2016. ISBN-13: 978-1455539741. Hardcover. Pp. 288. \$45.00.

*Hamilton: An American Musical* (CD). By Lin-Manuel Miranda. Orchestrations by Alex Lacamoire. Produced by Alex Lacamoire, Bill Sherman, Lin-Manuel Miranda, and Ahmir Thompson and Tarik Trotter for the Roots. 2015. Lyrics enclosed. Atlantic Records 551093-2.

At the end of the first act of Lin-Manuel Miranda's *Hamilton*, a ghost makes an appearance. Immediately following the heart-warming duet "Dear Theodosia," Alexander Hamilton's wife, Eliza, approaches him with a letter. Before she speaks, a blue light illuminates the spectral presence of Hamilton's close friend John Laurens next to them. "I may not live to see our glory / But I will gladly join the flight," the ghost of Laurens sings as Eliza tells Alexander that it is not Laurens but his friend's father who has written (131). Alexander is stunned to learn that Laurens was killed in battle in South Carolina. The father reminds him that Laurens had dreamed of emancipating slaves to form an all-black military regiment, but, sadly, those plans will die with him. Laurens sings one more time in a rousing martial echo of one of Miranda's favorite musicals, *Les Misérables*: "Tomorrow there'll be more of us!" Alexander looks shaken but replies only, "I have so much work to do" (131). The blue light fades out on Laurens, and Aaron Burr reenters to finish the second act with a rousing account of Hamilton's authorship of the Federalist Papers.

The ghost of John Laurens, like all ghosts, voids, and silence, raises intriguing questions. For the character of Laurens is not only literally a ghost at this moment, but is something of a spectral presence throughout the first act. Played by Anthony Ramos, the youngest cast member, Laurens never quite has a show-stopper moment like those of his comrades the Marquis de Lafayette and Hercules Mulligan, both of whom affected commanding stage presences, delivered the cleverest lines, and received the most applause at the curtain call of the show I attended.<sup>1</sup> His death at the end of the first act feels curiously undeveloped. Especially given the contrast between the death of Laurens and the impactful

second-act death of his doppelgänger, Philip Hamilton, that lack of development seems to be not a result of Ramos's performance but a fault of the text created by Miranda and his collaborators. We're seemingly meant to feel strongly about the death of John Laurens, but the staged reality fails to quite achieve this. Why this small imperfection in such an extraordinary work of art? The underdevelopment of Laurens is something of a hermeneutic window into what makes *Hamilton* tick, and I propose that we follow his Dickensian ghost through some basic questions about *Hamilton*: What does this musical do, what does it tell us about the past, and what will it do about the future?

One aspect of Laurens's low-impact death is that it is the only scene of the musical that does not appear on the wildly popular 2015 original cast recording. In his annotations on the libretto, published in *Hamilton: The Revolution*, Miranda explains simply that it was excised for being "more of a scene than a song. I wanted to save a surprise for those who see the show. And you, reading this" (131). This reveals our first insight into *Hamilton*: as with any performance, but especially in musical theater, there is not a stable text for analysis at the heart of the show. This is not merely a Barthesian argument but the simple fact that any show will go through multiple revisions prior to (and often after) a premiere on Broadway and will then further fragment into dozens of dueling artifacts: cast recordings, films, songbooks, and many more. Thus the basic semiotic relationship created by author, text, and spectator is even more complicated than it might be for a novel, for example. The massive popularity of *Hamilton* has heightened such issues, with tickets to the actual show being famously difficult to acquire. The cast recording, on the other hand, released October 17, 2015, debuted in the *Billboard* 200, the highest chart rank of a musical since the release of the recording of *Camelot* in 1961.<sup>2</sup> Now the entire world is left with a situation where everyone seemingly has an opinion on *Hamilton*, but only a tiny fraction of its fans have actually seen it. *Hamilton* has most especially become a metonym for a certain kind of liberal identity politics characterized most of all by aspirational optimism tinged with nationalist fervor, and it is no surprise that it has become a touchstone for everything from the 2016 presidential campaign to the birthday party of a four-year-old I recently attended, at which the toddlers all danced knowingly to "My Shot."<sup>3</sup>

Understandably, scholars of musical theater have been eager to engage with the phenomenon, even if they haven't seen the show live. More than a year after the musical's opening night on Broadway, we have a rich but convoluted supply of resources: the cast recording, short clips of individual numbers drawn from awards ceremonies and televised profiles, the published libretto with annotations by Miranda and essays profiling the creative team by Jeremy McCarter (hereafter referred to as *The Revolution*), a PBS documentary on the work's gestation directed by Miranda's college classmate Alex Horowitz, a published songbook, and the occasional bootleg video recording of the show's previews. Although a performance by the original cast was filmed shortly before the end of their run, there are currently no plans to release it.

Of these many texts, *The Revolution* anthology will be of particular use for scholars. The printed libretto it contains can also be found in the booklet accompanying the CD release of the cast recording and in many online sources. The essays and annotations, however, are invaluable, serving to consolidate a great deal

of information that previously needed to be gleaned from interviews, profiles, and especially Miranda's well-known Twitter feed. Many of the annotations are, in fact, observations that appeared initially on Twitter and are now formalized in print. To take John Laurens as our example, Miranda has long mused and joked on Twitter about the possibility that Hamilton was bisexual and that he and Laurens were lovers. At one point he quoted a particularly intimate bit of correspondence between the two with the hashtag "#awwyeah."<sup>4</sup> In its printed version in *The Revolution*, this observation becomes more formally, "Hamilton's letters to Laurens are every bit as flirtatious as his letters to the opposite sex" (131).

In her study of the marketing behind his first musical, *In the Heights*, Elizabeth Craft notes how in online spaces such as YouTube and Twitter Miranda is able to fluidly mix promotion and political commentary in a fast-paced discursive space.<sup>5</sup> She is speaking in the context of marketing, but we might say the same for the historical record. The Miranda-McCarter volume—affectionately nicknamed "Hamiltome" by its fans—serves to concretize the messy conglomeration of texts that surrounded the musical's initial development and early productions. We'll need to be careful, however, not to lose that initial historical record, especially as *Hamilton* achieves canonical status. One useful tool in this regard can be found on the website Genius.com, which reproduced and annotated the lyrics.<sup>6</sup> Miranda and his team collaborated with the site to provide some of the annotations, but a large fan community has worked hard to document a multiplicity of exegetical information associated with individual moments in the show, frequently citing specific Tweets and interviews.

The cast recording itself performs a similar stabilizing function, and as noted, in the absence of a film release it will serve as the object of analysis for most fans and scholars. Rather than the usual quick-and-dirty treatment received by most Broadway original cast albums these days, great care and attention were lavished on *Hamilton's*, with production assistance from Questlove and Black Thought of the Roots, a generous budget and timeline, and a release on Atlantic Records. The initial cast recording was followed by a "remix" of the songs entitled *The Hamilton Mixtape*, with a star-studded cast of singers and rappers doing covers of the tunes. Miranda has often said that he initially conceived of *Hamilton* as an audio-only mixtape, and indeed, especially with its availability on streaming services, the vast majority of *Hamilton's* audience has experienced the musical merely as a set of songs. This was my own experience; by the time I was able to see the actual Broadway production, the cast recording had been out for eight months, and I had it nearly memorized. I sensed that most of the audience that night similarly knew the music inside and out, an odd sensation for a new musical.

Two brief observations will illustrate the divide between staged musical and recording. The first is that in person, the musical was far funnier. In retrospect, the jokes were all present on the recording, but the looser nature of the live performance and the determined mugging of the performers made for a surprisingly amusing experience. The atmosphere was similar to that of Miranda's Freestyle Love Supreme rap-comedy troupe: a bunch of young men teasing each other and working hard for the laughs. The second observation is how crucial the choreography is for the musical. Andy Blankenbuehler's work sits front and

center right next to Miranda's text, and just as that text is spit rapid-fire, dense, and full of provocation, so too do the dancers churn in constant motion, hands always spinning through obscure gestures. The plain stage, designed by David Korins to evoke the dark wooden-beamed space of a colonial tavern, features two revolving circles set within one another, often moving in opposite directions. In the duel scenes, the two protagonists stalk each other on opposite sides of the larger circle, whizzing by one another before pausing to aim across the way, a crowd of dancers in between. In the famous final duel, Burr fires only for a record scratch to announce a momentary pause in time. A dancer pinches the imaginary bullet in midair, slowly walking it across the circles toward Hamilton. The gesture provides a considerable amount of coherence, which is lost in the audio-only experience of the cast recording. That said, given the centrality of the recording to mass cultural experience of *Hamilton*, I think it is fair for scholars to engage with the musical only through its recording; we merely need to note the variety of experiences available.

Tracing the complex fluidity of *Hamilton*'s many texts is important not only because of its current reception but also because its innovations seem poised to change the future of Broadway. Which innovations? As has been noted by most reviewers, the story is actually quite traditional and sentimental, complete with a finale in which the characters pedantically instruct us in the work's moral in the manner of *Don Giovanni*. The historical subject matter is no great innovation, with such precedents as *1776* (1969) and *Bloody Bloody Andrew Jackson* (2008). The racial dynamics of the casting are not unheard-of, even if Miranda and his team exercised particular care in casting people of color in all major roles save that of King George and his defender, Samuel Seabury. No, the innovation that seems most likely to emerge from *Hamilton* is Miranda's fluid synthesis of hip-hop idioms into the traditional Broadway vernacular.

On this front, the achievement of Miranda and his team is indeed remarkable. Miranda's own voice as a rapper is by all accounts rooted in what Questlove has called the "Rawkus Records hip-hop era" of the mid- to late 1990s.<sup>7</sup> Luckily for musicologists, this is precisely the era that has received the most scholarly attention, and so we have a nice complement of analytical language to bring to bear on the musical. The most useful context is the study of "flow," encapsulated by Tricia Rose in her seminal work *Black Noise*: "In hip hop, visual, physical, musical, and lyrical lines are set in motion, broken abruptly with sharp angular breaks, yet they sustain motion and energy through fluidity and flow."<sup>8</sup> Rappers, she writes further, "stutter and alternatively race through passages, always moving within the beat or in response to it, often using the music as a partner in rhyme."<sup>9</sup>

While the musical alludes to many different artists, most influential for Miranda is the work of the late Christopher Lee Rios, who performed under the name Big Pun. Big Pun practiced what Adam Krims called "speech-effusive delivery" of his lines. By this Krims meant a style that is closer to the rhythms of everyday speech and therefore often creates unpredictable polyrhythms, which, in turn "trace their elaborate patterns against the more regular (albeit often themselves complex) rhythms of the musical tracks."<sup>10</sup> As an organizing device to ground this unpredictability, rappers in the style tend to squeeze a great deal of rhyming syllables onto a single line. In the annotated libretto, Miranda flags "one of the

Big Pun—est lines in the show,” the climax of the show’s signature number, “My Shot”:

I know the action in the street is excitin’  
 But Jesus, between all the bleedin’ ’n fightin’  
 I’ve been readin’ ’n writin’  
 We need to handle our financial situation.  
 Are we a nation of states? What’s the state of our nation?  
 I’m past patiently waitin’,  
 I’m passionately smashin’ every expectation.  
 Every action’s an act of creation!  
 I’m laughin’ in the face of casualties and sorrow,  
 For the first time, I’m thinkin’ past tomorrow. (*The Revolution*, 29)

The moment here is one of rupture in both the musical and political senses described by Rose. The song illustrates Hamilton’s growing radicalization, one of the moments Kendra James has described as “the urgency to force change.”<sup>11</sup> At the beginning of this particular verse, Hamilton sings alone to the side of the stage, isolated from the crowd by a spotlight. Accompanied by a muffled snare drum tapping out a martial rhythm, he has an introspective moment: “I imagine death so much it feels like a memory,” a line that will frequently come back to haunt him. As he realizes that his own personal journey is part of a larger movement, Hamilton returns to center stage, mounting a box while the dancers circle around. As he begins rapping the lines quoted above, the music begins slowly to stir in an accelerando as the rhymes become increasingly intricate. Finally, as he reaches “I’m past patiently waitin’” the strictly metered snare drum drops out to be replaced by a series of syncopated orchestra hits, just as the lyrics reach dizzying heights of unpredictable rhythm anchored by nonstop rhymes.

As musicologists begin the project of more fully analyzing the music of *Hamilton*, it will be important not to let the dimensions of such analysis become too abstract. Flow is a social value in addition to a musical one, and to divorce the music from its performativity would be a mistake. Stephen Sondheim, for example, is fond of comparing *Hamilton* to the opening number of *The Music Man*: “It doesn’t have the attitude of rap and nobody thinks of it as rap, but the technique is rap.”<sup>12</sup> Sondheim isn’t wrong, per se, and but the separation of technique from attitude is risky business.

On the other hand, there is reason to believe that the Declaration of Independence was originally rapped. Jay Fliegelman, in his classic 1993 study *Declaring Independence: Jefferson, Natural Language, and the Culture of Performance*, argued that a series of carefully notated accent marks found on Jefferson’s rough draft of the Declaration indicated a document that was intended to be performed.<sup>13</sup> I call this “rapping” facetiously, of course, but to put *Hamilton*’s musical achievements in the ahistorical context of theatrical oration has some utility. As Fliegelman demonstrates, Jefferson’s vision of public speaking was defined against several different others: Tories, Native Americans, and Africans. The first of these is dramatized in *Hamilton*, with the “British” roles not only played by white actors but also given radically different musical languages that do not include rapping: in “Farmer Refuted,” Hamilton envelops Samuel Seabury in a blizzard of wordplay

that leaves his Tory antagonist speechless, and King George is famously played as a somewhat Hedwig-esque British rocker.

Native Americans play no significant role in *Hamilton*, although the sharp ears of historian Rachel Herrmann noticed that the Schuyler family landholdings—“let’s go upstate . . . to a place I know,” Eliza and Angelica sing—were the result of elder Philip Schuyler’s acquisition of Native American lands.<sup>14</sup> The question of African slavery, however, is one of the most prominent ones in *Hamilton*, if sometimes indirectly approached. On the one hand, slavery is mentioned in the show’s opening number, with Jefferson contextualizing Hamilton’s early work in a trading company as “slaves were being slaughtered and carted away across the waves.” Slavery also provides a memorable moment in the first cabinet rap battle, in which Hamilton makes the classic northern mercantile argument against slavery, that it provides an unfair source of free labor to southern plantation owners: “Yeah, keep ranting. We know who’s really doing the planting” (*The Revolution*, 161).

On the other hand, these glimpses of slavery are just that: merely glimpses. Originally, a third cabinet battle was to have addressed the subject more directly. Its lyrics are included in *The Revolution*, and we learn that the plan was to dramatize a petition from Philadelphian Quakers to abolish slavery. Jefferson and Hamilton debate, with the latter making an impassioned plea that slavery is “a stain on our soul and democracy / A land of the free? No it’s not. It’s hypocrisy / to subjugate, dehumanize a race, call ‘em property” (*The Revolution*, 213).<sup>15</sup> The battle was dropped from the final version of the musical mostly because of time constraints but also because Miranda acknowledged that Hamilton was not a clear-cut abolitionist, and so it was better to avoid delving into the subject in any substantive way. We encounter here another manifestation of the ghost of John Laurens. Of the main characters, only Laurens could legitimately claim an abolitionist position in the modern sense, and his commitment to the cause is dutifully trotted out on a few occasions, including upon his death. It makes little impact, however, and instead the subject of slavery is surprisingly downplayed. *Hamilton* has come in for a fair amount of criticism for this choice. The headline of Ishmael Reed’s polemic sums up this position nicely: “Black Actors Dress Up Like Slave Traders.”<sup>16</sup> In a more sustained critique, Lyra Monteiro notes the frequent absence of historical black bodies: “The line ‘No one else was in the room where it happened’ completely erases the slaves who would have been in that room serving dinner. This pattern of erasing the presence of black bodies continues throughout the play, as the role of people of color in the Revolution itself is silenced.”<sup>17</sup>

It is indeed the case that *Hamilton*’s treatment of slavery exists not so much in the text itself but in its performance. The goal of *Hamilton* was to comment performatively upon the Duboisian color line by having people of color rap the words of the founders. When Daveed Diggs, a child of Jewish and African American parents, opens the first cabinet battle singing lines of the Declaration of Independence, the actor’s identity is placed into dialectical tension with the real Thomas Jefferson, notorious slave owner. His dexterous, clever rapping jars with the real Jefferson’s opinion that black people never spoke “above the level of plain narration.”<sup>18</sup> As Joseph Roach wrote, in his gloss on Fliegelman’s work, “Under the close scrutiny of circum-Atlantic memory, no material event, spoken or written, can remain ‘pure,’ despite Jefferson’s special pleading for the revival

of Anglo-Saxon as the primal tongue of essential law and liberty."<sup>19</sup> Ironically, as Monteiro points out, this juxtaposition of white historical subject and black performing body requires not only that the contemporary performer be black but that the historical subject *must* be white, a reification of the whiteness of early American society not based in historical truth.

Is the political and historical commentary, as performed in this manner, adequate? The question of *Hamilton's* performance of history is the most crucial one scholars of the musical are facing. This is not to say that the accuracy or authenticity of the historical portrayal is of particular importance to musicologists.<sup>20</sup> It is rather that performances of the founding moment of the United States are stages in which contemporary nationalist ideology is formed, and as such we need to be especially critical. *Hamilton* needs to be viewed not just in the context of historical theater but in that of many other performances as well: sites of tourism in Boston, Philadelphia, and Colonial Williamsburg; the specter of constitutional originalism; the rise of the Tea Party movement and many more.

All of these performances must juggle the dynamic between "facts" and ideology; as Richard Handler and Eric Gable put it in their ethnography of Colonial Williamsburg, it's a juxtaposition of what they term "constructivist" theories of history making with "mimetic" ones, that is, the conflicting desire to present "just the facts" of a historical moment, with the knowledge that the known facts rarely illuminate historical reality accurately.<sup>21</sup> In a similar vein Diana Taylor has long argued for a distinction between the "archive" and the "repertoire," those facts passed down by the written record versus those remembered through oral tradition and performance.<sup>22</sup>

All of this maps nicely onto Elissa Harbert's more specific observation that most musical performances representing early American life share three objectives: to relay history, to comment upon the present, and to connect emotionally with the audience.<sup>23</sup> The last of Harbert's points should not be neglected; many critiques of *Hamilton* focus too much on the text of the musical unmediated by the experience of the audience. My only departure from Monteiro's critique, for example, is on her skepticism that *Hamilton* breaks out of the typically white Broadway audience to reach more people of color. Reception studies always involve a degree of speculation, but Elizabeth Craft's research on *In the Heights* showed convincingly that the musical did indeed diversify Broadway audiences.<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, there are too many stories of *Hamilton's* impact on people of color to dismiss their experiences so easily.

It is beyond the scope of this essay to consider these historiographic theories more fully, but I believe that to be the most interesting direction for future study of *Hamilton*: assessing the musical's performance of the past, its commentary on the present, and its capacity as a piece of musical theater to engage with audiences in a fluid, open-ended manner. As one such example, however, I'd like to return for a third time to the ghost of John Laurens. His absence speaks to another vein of thought about *Hamilton* first raised by Hilton Als in his review of the original production at the Public Theater, prior to its move to Broadway. In an essay titled "Bromance at the Revolution," Als registered the limited role of women in the musical: "Indeed, part of what makes people feel so jumpy and excited during 'Hamilton' is its unbridled masculinity. . . . Miranda's men aren't doing the usual 'gay' work of the musical, which is to say singing about

their feelings (at least, not at first); they're guys in a circle jerk, and the lube is ambition, chicks, and power."<sup>25</sup> Dismissive of the "commonplace love story" between Eliza and Alexander, Als argues that in fact it is the bromance of Burr and Hamilton's "treasured competition and camaraderie" that provides the musical's emotional center.<sup>26</sup> He's not wrong, but I would point out that there is a more obvious queer love story that could have easily played a more prominent role in the musical: John Laurens. However, as with Laurens the abolitionist, Laurens the possible lover is given short shrift. Miranda might joke on Twitter about the erotic possibilities of the two men, but those possibilities do not exist onstage in any recognizable form.

This is not to say that the musical is homophobic any more than it is proslavery. Miranda himself has certainly been a supporter of numerous gay rights initiatives, and as Sam Baltimore has pointed out, it's not difficult to read *In the Heights* with a queer lens.<sup>27</sup> *Hamilton* as a text, however, is resolutely heterosexual. I don't actually agree with Als that the women of *Hamilton* are prop-like and "dull." The Schuyler sisters are substantial roles, with Eliza and Angelica in particular given thoughtful agency over their lives and the historical narrative. It should be noted, however, that women barely rap in *Hamilton*. Angelica has important rap verses in "Schuyler Sisters" and "Satisfied" but otherwise sings. Eliza sings entirely, with the exception of providing the beat for little Philip Schuyler's rapping in "Take a Break," a gesture played for laughs. Peggy Schuyler / Maria Reynolds has only one major number, her sultry sung duet with Hamilton, "Say No to This." There is a sense, in *Hamilton*, of separate worlds of love and ritual: men mostly rap, women mostly sing. The major exception is King George, whose feminine gestures are coded as gay and also played for laughs. How this reads for audiences is an open-ended question, but Als suspects it played a role in the musical's crossover popularity, and I suspect he is right.

I have no general quarrel with heterosexuality, but its larger-than-life presence on the Broadway stage should not be seen as a neutral choice, either as historical judgment, political statement, or source of connection with the audience. The homosociality of early American politics is fascinating terrain, and it is a disappointment that *Hamilton* often reduces that dynamic to modern heterosexuality. I am reminded here of a wonderful essay by the cultural historian Henry Abelove on the trajectory of F. O. Matthiessen, a pioneering scholar of American studies who committed suicide in the early days of McCarthyism. Matthiessen's most important work, *American Renaissance* (1941), studied the culture of democracy in the mid-nineteenth-century United States. Abelove argues that the implicit theme of the book is a series of questions left unasked: "What was the erotic meaning of that democracy, the erotic dynamic, the ties, affections, affiliations, that bound together those white men, supposititiously equal, supposititiously brothers, who were the privileged subjects of the old republic?"<sup>28</sup> The white men in question here were Thoreau, Melville, Whitman, and so on, but I think similar questions could have been asked of Hamilton, Laurens, and the others. Abelove argues that American studies after Matthiessen has avoided answering those questions ever since. *Hamilton*, for all of its provocations, similarly feints to the side, with only the brief glimpse of a ghost in reply.

Philip Gentry  
University of Delaware

## NOTES

1. I attended the Saturday evening performance of *Hamilton* on June 25, 2016, just before the end of the original cast's run.
2. Keith Caulfield, "'Hamilton's' Historic Chart Debut: By the Numbers," *Billboard*, October 7, 2015, <http://www.billboard.com/articles/columns/chart-beat/6722015/hamilton-cast-album-billboard-200> (accessed January 29, 2017).
3. I discuss *Hamilton's* identity politics more fully in Philip Gentry, *What Will I Be: American Music and Cold War Identity* (Oxford University Press, forthcoming).
4. Lin-Manuel Miranda, Twitter Post, April 15, 2015, 6:51 a.m., [https://twitter.com/Lin\\_Manuel/status/588338776373596160](https://twitter.com/Lin_Manuel/status/588338776373596160)(accessed January 29, 2017).
5. Elizabeth Titrington Craft, "'Is This What It Takes Just to Make It to Broadway?!': Marketing *In the Heights* in the Twenty-First Century," *Studies in Musical Theater* 5, no. 1 (2011): 46–49.
6. Available at <http://genius.com/albums/Lin-manuel-miranda/Hamilton-original-broadway-cast-recording> (accessed January 29, 2017).
7. Jody Rosen, "The American Revolutionary," *New York Times*, July 8, 2015, <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/07/08/t-magazine/hamilton-lin-manuel-miranda-roots-sondheim.html> (accessed January 29, 2017).
8. Tricia Rose, *Black Noise: Rap Music and Black Culture in Contemporary America*, 1st ed. (Hanover, NH: Wesleyan, 1994), 38.
9. *Ibid.*, 39.
10. Adam Krims, *Rap Music and the Poetics of Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 51.
11. Kendra James, "Race, Immigration, and Hamilton: The Relevance of Lin-Manuel Miranda's New Musical," *Toast*, October 1, 2015, <http://the-toast.net/2015/10/01/race-immigration-and-hamilton/> (accessed January 29, 2017).
12. Rosen, "The American Revolutionary."
13. Jay Fliegelman, *Declaring Independence: Jefferson, Natural Language & the Culture of Performance* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993).
14. Rachel Herrmann, "'Daddy' Schuyler, Hamilton, and the Dakota Access Pipeline," *The Junto*, November 1, 2016, <https://earlyamericanists.com/2016/11/01/daddy-schuyler-hamilton-and-the-dakota-access-pipeline/> (accessed January 29, 2017).
15. A demo version of the song is available on *The Hamilton Mixtape*.
16. Ishmael Reed, "'Hamilton: The Musical': Black Actors Dress Up Like Slave Traders . . . and It's Not Halloween," *Counterpunch*, August 21, 2015, <http://www.counterpunch.org/2015/08/21/hamilton-the-musical-black-actors-dress-up-like-slave-tradersand-its-not-halloween/> (accessed January 29, 2017).
17. Lyra D. Monteiro, "Race-Conscious Casting and the Erasure of the Black Past in Lin-Manuel Miranda's *Hamilton*," *Public Historian* 38, no. 1 (February 1, 2016): 94.
18. Fliegelman, *Declaring Independence*, 193.
19. Joseph Roach, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 12.
20. For perspectives on *Hamilton* from historians, I recommend *The Junto*, a group blog of early Americanists: <https://earlyamericanists.com/tag/hamilton-an-american-musical/> (accessed January 29, 2017).
21. Eric Gable and Richard Handler, "Deep Dirt: Messing Up the Past at Colonial Williamsburg," *Social Analysis*, no. 34 (1993): 3–16; their arguments are fleshed out further in *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997).
22. Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003).

23. Elissa Harbert, "Remembering the Revolution: Music in Stage and Screen Representations of Early America during the Bicentennial Years" (Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 2013), 13.

24. Craft, "'Is This What It Takes,'" 64. Anecdotally, the audience at a production of *In the Heights* I attended early in the show's Broadway run was noticeably younger and less white than most shows I have experienced.

25. Hilton Als, "Bromance at the Revolution," *New Yorker*, March 9, 2015, <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/03/09/boys-in-the-band> (accessed January 29, 2017). I'm grateful to Joel Nichols for reminding me of this review.

26. Ibid.

27. Sam Baltimore, Twitter post, March 14, 2016, 7:07 a.m., <https://twitter.com/celloshots/status/709380446627323904> (accessed January 29, 2017).

28. Henry Abelow, "American Studies, Queer Studies," in *Deep Gossip* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 62–63.