

Amanda Bailey contends that *Measure for Measure* resists comedic closure's assumptions of restitution and works through the logic by which encounters are unknowable, diffuse, and productive. Kent Cartwright's study of place and being considers location in the plays as both crucial and opaque in a study of mapmaking, the imaginative potential of Italy, and regulative and protean worlds that make Italy both threatening and productive. Geraldo U. de Sousa begins his chapter with James Baldwin's political struggle with Shakespeare, a frame that forces us to confront the urgency of readings of race in Shakespeare and early modern literature more widely. The essay works out from there to study caricature, language, whiteness, and a presentist consideration of what *The Merchant of Venice* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* mean in a world of walls, borders, and bans.

Steve Mentz's ecocritical reading puts pressure on encounters between green and blue worlds, posthuman and postnatural conditions in *As You Like It*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. David Orvis's analysis of *Much Ado about Nothing* reveals it, and comedy more widely, as queer in its construction and procedure. As I read it, I wished I had this chapter available to me while working on the play. Lina Perkins Wilder and Erika Lin bring us into the playhouse and performance, where props and cognitive encounters with the senses create place and mood. And Joan Diaz argues both that Shakespeare's use of Ovid in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *The Taming of the Shrew* critiques early modern education by making boys misreaders of women and shows his own cogent deployment of women's stories.

This is a partial and unfair overview of many excellent essays. If I were to offer a critique, however, I would urge authors, even when space is limited, to think about their sources. What makes an argument dated or timely? Whom are we citing? What kinds of arguments are we citing on a given topic? I was grateful for many citations offered that I did not know. But at least as often I felt citations ignored more current and urgent studies. If we are thinking about encounters as a politically and hermeneutically important concept, then the sources we encounter and deploy are equally political and important to the task of reading Shakespeare.

Cristina León Alfar, *Hunter College, CUNY*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2020.102

"Hamlet" and Emotions. Paul Megna, Bríd Phillips, and R. S. White, eds. Palgrave Shakespeare Studies. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019. xxvi + 348 pp. \$119.99.

"Hamlet (the man) is dominated by an emotion which is inexpressible, because it is in excess of the facts as they appear." This is T. S. Eliot in 1920, explaining both his theory

of the “objective correlative,” which would make its way into countless high school English lessons, and his conviction that Shakespeare’s most celebrated play was “most certainly an artistic failure,” which would not (“Hamlet and His Problems,” in *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism* [1997]: 84–86). *Hamlet*, Eliot believed, was a play fatally limited by its inability to account for the feelings of its protagonist: in order to comprehend it in full, he contends, “We should have to understand things Shakespeare did not” (87). Eliot’s bravado in this famous essay is astonishing, but he was right in at least one of his points: the emotional register in *Hamlet* is so vast, and at times stretches so far beyond anything that can simply be understood as plot, that ultimately it defies any singular explanation or overarching logic. It is, therefore, fitting that this new collection on the topic of *Hamlet* and the emotions does not seek to put forward a single, streamlined argument, but rather to embrace the affective diversity of “Shakespeare’s moodiest play” (4), exploring it as variously as possible through its many histories, languages, and afterlives.

The book begins with a prologue from R. S. White, which highlights the varieties of feeling interwoven into the tragedy and the “emotional aura” they produce (xiv), and then follows with a brief introduction from Bríd Phillips and Paul Megna, which outlines the structure of the volume and its commitment to a “variegated,” “not unified” approach (4). The first main section, which focuses on sources, influences, and intertexts, contains essays by Indira Ghose, Michael D. Barbezat, Catherine Belsey, Richard Meek, and Jane Rickard. Here, ancient philosophies of tragedy, religious lore, Elizabethan ghost stories, early modern revenge tragedy, and Ben Jonson’s *Sejanus* are read alongside Shakespeare’s play, with the authors illuminating several of the ways in which the playwright was shaped by the cultures of storytelling and knowledge making that permeated sixteenth- and seventeenth-century life. From this section comes an appreciation of *Hamlet* as deeply embedded within the conventions, beliefs, and practices of its time, even as it stands apart in the extent of its creative and intellectual achievement.

Parts 2 and 3 focus principally on the language and drama of the play itself, with modes of expression, sensation, thinking, and character making coming to the fore. Essays from Dympna Callaghan, Naya Tsentourou, and Bríd Phillips explore the presentation of tears, breath, and sight, while contributions from Jeffrey R. Wilson, Lisa Hopkins, and Bradley J. Irish probe the relationship between Horatio and reason, Claudius and empathy, and dread and freedom. If part 2 concentrates primarily on what the play has to say about emotional behaviors and sensations, and subsequently how it enacts them, part 3 explores how these moments of expression come together to create affectively complex characters that have influenced subsequent thinking about emotional experience beyond Shakespeare’s play.

Many of the essays in these middle sections occasionally look to modern performance to extend points of analysis, but the play’s ample afterlife becomes the central focus of the final section. Here, essays from Kathryn Prince, Stephen Chinna,

Megna, and White consider *Hamlet's* theatrical, literary, and philosophical legacies by looking at a tourist-friendly production of the play at Helsingor Castle in Denmark; three deconstructed, postmodern adaptations staged with student actors over the past twenty years; the play's existential commitments, as understood by Kierkegaard, Sartre, Camus, and Stoppard; and two twenty-first-century novels inspired by the tragedy. From this rich and strikingly varied collection of creative offshoots comes the realization that *Hamlet* truly is a "poem unlimited," though in a rather different way than either Polonius or Harold Bloom originally meant it.

Taken as a whole, Megna, Phillips, and White's volume illuminates Shakespeare's play from a number of angles, offering a wealth of penetrating insights and rewarding both systematic and more intermittent readers. Though the editors admirably resist the temptation to over-engineer a singular argument, what does emerge very clearly is a sense of how diverse the forms of emotional experience explored in the play are, and how variously they have affected Shakespeare's readers over more than four centuries, Eliot included.

Erin Sullivan, *University of Birmingham*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2020.103

Shakespeare and the Afterlife. John S. Garrison.

Oxford Shakespeare Topics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. xvi + 156 pp. \$23.95.

Garrison's *Shakespeare and the Afterlife* is a recent addition to the Oxford Shakespeare Topics series and explores the many figurations and representations of the dead and the afterlife in Shakespeare's plays. In his introduction, Garrison informs us that "this book will reveal that we find the subject [of heaven and hell] across both the plays and the poems" and his aim is to show that notions of the afterlife were "very much on the minds of Shakespeare's characters and poetic speakers" (3). Garrison examines attitudes and ideas about death and the afterlife and how they connect with early modern culture and Shakespeare's plays.

The book consists of a preface, a list of illustrations, notes, an introduction, five chapters, endnotes, suggestions for further reading, and an index. Much of the information Garrison offers comes from already well-traveled territory—questions about purgatory in *Hamlet* have been thoroughly covered in other texts, for example, and there are quite a few books and articles about Shakespearean resurrections that do not make an appearance in the index. However, Garrison does break new ground in some very innovative ways. His discussions of the Porter from *Macbeth* as a key signifier for the play as a "cautionary tale" (24) and of Shakespeare's "reputation-as-afterlife" conceit resulting in negative outcomes are fascinating. I also appreciated those moments when Garrison