essays here are uniformly brave in their ambition to escape from traditional thinking about these issues, but they are also meticulous in their procedures and scrupulous about making these clear. There are illustrations showing "Zeta scatterplots" and "Delta scores," visual realizations of complex data sets that may baffle some readers (and no doubt help persuade some others), but the volume usefully ends with a section, "The Canon and Chronology of Shakespeare's Work," by Gary Taylor and Rory Loughnane, that neatly summarizes the evidence for the inclusion or exclusion of "work" by Shakespeare that appears in the *New Oxford Shakespeare*. But the principle of selection of the essays themselves in the *Companion* isn't always obvious. (Why, for example, are there five essays about *All's Well* but only one about the collaborations of *Henry VI, Part Three*?) Still, it is valuable to see their procedures in action, and Gabriel Egan's essay, "A History of Shakespearean Authorship Attribution," is a remarkably clear account of this often confusing (and confused) area of Shakespeare scholarship and editorial practice.

The New Oxford Shakespeare is unlikely to prove any more definitive in its assumptions about the "all" that we call Shakespeare than the now not-so-new *Oxford Shakespeare*, or the newest *Norton Shakespeare*, or the soon to be completed third edition of the Arden Shakespeare's expanded canon (including fully edited texts of *Edward III*, *Sir Thomas More*, and *Double Falsehood*). The next generation's complete Shakespeares will have more Shakespeare—or maybe less. But the *New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion* will become for many of their editors the place from which their own thinking about attribution will begin.

David Scott Kastan, *Yale University*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.237

The Sonnets: The State of Play. Hannah Crawforth, Elizabeth Scott-Baumann, and Clare Whitehead, eds.
Arden Shakespeare: The State of Play. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2017. xviii + 288 pp. $102.

This invigorating collection of twelve original essays is dedicated to the memory of a great Shakespearean, Russ McDonald. It is an appropriate tribute. As a group, the essays exemplify many of the critical approaches to which these poems have proven hospitable, all the while attending to the distinctive formal features of a sonnet, and of a sonnet sequence.

The volume begins with a helpful introduction by the editors, explaining the volume's tripartite organization (essays dedicated to the Sonnets and their past, the Sonnets and their moment, and the Sonnets in our moment). In the first essay, "Promising Eternity in the 1609 Quarto," Cathy Shrank explores how Shakespeare

in the Sonnets uses poetry as a form for challenging its commemorative properties. Lynne Magusson speculates about what happens if we imagine Shakespeare as the mysterious "Mr. W. H.," the figure that Thorpe's enigmatic dedication addresses. Although somewhat unconvincing in its premise, the essay provides some fascinating material on Thorpe's career and its relevance to the volume. Kristine Johanson's essay situates Sonnet 59 amid poetical renderings of Ecclesiastes by Henry Lok. The essay offers a fascinating account of a sonnet that uses biblical language to reject commonplace biblical ideas. The comparison with Lok, moreover, highlights the deliberate secularity of Shakespeare's sequence. In the final essay in the first section, John Roe explores Shakespeare's debt to Petrarchan sonnets, focusing on the phenomena of unfulfilled imperatives, particularly as they are deployed in a suggestive account of the injured intimacies of Sonnet 120.

The second section begins with Colin Burrow's engrossing essay, "Shakespeare's Sonnets as Event." Burrow analyzes the poems as individual aesthetic events that refuse to be tied to a single narrative, however much their order may tempt readers to read the poems as events in the story of a real relationship. Ann Thompson's essay, "A Lingering Farewell," reads closely the valedictory gestures of Sonnet 87 against Shakespeare's dramatic writings. Focusing on recurrent legal and financial metaphors, and emphasizing the poem's predominantly feminine rhymes, Thompson shows how Shakespeare wrestles formally with the trauma of separation. In a particularly engaging contribution, J. K. Barret looks at a range of sonnets dealing with the theme of "injurious time." Barret explores in detail the relationship between material ruin and emotional loss, and offers a fascinating account of the way that time is embedded in the very form of the sonnet. Shankar Raman reads the Sonnets amid the early modern emergence of modern mathematics. While the essay perhaps tells us more about early modern mathematics than about Shakespeare's poetry, it does propose ways that the Sonnets address numerically related issues of singularity and exemplarity.

The collection really comes alive in the third section, on the "Afterlives of the Sonnets." Matthew Harrison analyzes the fascinating history of the near obsession with rearranging the collection to generate some kind of coherence. This striking essay reveals afresh the "vibrant relationality" that animates the collection (193). Jonathan Post explores the afterlives of the Sonnets in contemporary works by Alice Fulton, Don Paterson, and others. Attentive to early modern and contemporary poetics, Post provides a fascinating account of the processes by which contemporary poets have metabolized Shakespeare's Sonnets into their own deeply original works. Relatedly, Reiko Oya explores the influence of Shakespeare's collection on Ted Hughes, focusing on Hughes's frequently strained effort to remake Shakespeare in his own image.

The final essay of this section, and the collection, is a valuable piece by Daniel Moss that provides a creative yet pragmatic way to excite today's students about these poems. The collection concludes with an afterword from Heather Dubrow, which looks at the

https://doi.org/10.1017/rqx.2019.238 Published online by Cambridge University Press

present state of play in the field and puts an apt punctuation mark on an important addition to the study of Shakespeare's Sonnets.

Michael Schoenfeldt, *University of Michigan*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.238

Renaissance Psychologies: Spenser and Shakespeare. Robert Lanier Reid. The Manchester Spenser. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017. xiv + 352 pp. £80.

Renaissance Psychologies is an ambitious and impressive work of scholarship that will command attention from specialists in early modern (or Renaissance and Reformation) literature and culture. Reid places the major works of Spenser and Shakespeare in an intellectual context that ranges from classical and medieval culture to modernism (Shakespeare's "epiphanies" are instructively compared with their counterparts in Joyce and, to a lesser extent, Proust and Faulkner), and his documentation marshals an equally breathtaking range of scholarly literature. The book is unmistakably the crowning achievement of a lifetime's careful research in European philosophy, theology, psychology, and literature.

The book's seven chapters are organized into two sections, "Anatomy of Human Nature" and "Holistic Design," both of which proceed through systematic contrasts between the two authors. Beginning with their treatments of self-love, part 1 develops its sustained polarity between the hierarchies of Spenser's Christianized Platonism and the "experiential thinking" of Shakespearean drama through the categories of passion (humoral psychology), intellect, and soul or spirit. Part 2 describes basic patterns and structures that establish a synoptic view of each author's works: there are, for example, three "modes of temptation" that govern the structure and progress of each, organizing Redcrosse's descent and recovery, Macbeth's downward spiral, Lear's journey into madness, and so forth. The argument proceeds largely by classifying, listing, labeling, and diagramming, although these categorizing labors periodically open out into sustained and illuminating stretches of commentary, whether on characters like Britomart, Falstaff, Juliet's Nurse, or Lear, or on whole plays (especially *The Tempest*) and allegorical episodes (Mutability, Alma's castle). The strategy of treating the two authors as representative of opposite intellectual and aesthetic tendencies can, of course, be reductive —in my view it produces a much more satisfying account of Shakespeare, a dynamic and thoroughly ambivalent artist, than of Spenser, conservative and static in comparison —but Reid's intellectual honesty and analytic tenacity most often overcome this limitation by engaging directly with competing views and by thinking critical issues through with a full sense of their complexity, rather than resting content with broad generalizations.