Tempest respectively. Both these tragicomedies offer the most overwhelmingly utopian visions through an emphasis on art's ability to "present imaginary, alternative modes of life" (152), and in some cases overturn initial political jealousies and abuses.

Grady is explicit about his belief that Shakespeare's increasingly utopian perspective can and should be a source of hope for us today. At various points, he catalogues the worrisome political circumstances that girded the book's composition—the 2016 election of Donald Trump, the COVID-19 pandemic, racist police brutality, the 2021 storming of the US Capitol, increasing economic inequality, global warming—and he ultimately asserts that Shakespeare's "trajectory of hope" should be a "provocation for [Shakespeare's] readers and auditors to apply similar values to [their] own lives and politics" (99). While this imperative to hope can at times feel overly abstract, Grady does make more helpful, tangible nods to Shakespeare's concern about capitalist commodification and political disenchantment in his chapter on *The Tempest*.

Grady's selection of plays is schematic, but effectively so. His articulation of an aesthetic-utopian emergence offers a potent means for conceptualizing the unwieldy and lesser-attended late plays he does not focus on, especially *Pericles* and *Cymbeline*. The book is also peppered with references to the early plays, and these references help to flesh out both the intricacy and comprehensiveness of Grady's vision. Overall, the book leaves us with a useful means to conceive of Shakespeare's career and the works within it, as well as a reminder of the broad inspirational potential that Shakespeare's works possess.

<div style="text-align: right">

Jonathan Shelley, *St. John Fisher University*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2023.638

</div>

The Invention of Shakespeare, and Other Essays. Stephen Orgel.
University Park: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2022. 193 pp. $39.95.

This collection brings together essays written over the last thirty years that question the editorial compulsion to elucidate, emend, or explain (what editors themselves perceive to be) the problems, opacities, and inconsistencies of Shakespeare's works. Reading the essays together, however, it becomes clear that Orgel's issue is not simply with the impulse toward elucidation, but with the shifting cultural forces driving that impulse: what were the circumstances that caused not only editors but also readers, performers, and audiences to identify certain things and not others as problems, and as the type of problems that called for solutions?

In the collection's titular essay, Orgel reads eighteenth-century forgeries and legends (that Shakespeare played the Ghost in *Hamlet*; that *Hamlet* and *Richard II* were performed on a merchant ship anchored off the coast of Sierra Leone in 1608) alongside "another kind of forgery relating to Shakespeare, which is entirely accepted and passes

unnoticed as simply part of the editorial process: the practice of emendation and eluci-dation" (20). As he elaborates in "The Poetics of Incomprehensibility" through an examination of textual opacities in *The Winter's Tale*, editorial yielding to the tempta-tions of sense over (apparent) nonsense has tended to obscure the extent to which obscurity itself might be part of a text's meaning: "Shakespeare's age," he reminds us, "found incomprehensibility a positive virtue" (62).

Similarly, in "The Desire and Pursuit of the Whole," Orgel contrasts the editorial drive toward completeness (both on the level of individual works and that of the Shakespearean canon) with the marked and often self-conscious incompleteness exhib-ited by the plays and poems themselves. Orgel pursues Shakespearean incompleteness further in "No Sense of an Ending" and "Lascivious Grace: Seductive Evil in Jonson and Shakespeare," reading the famous "missing" couplet at the end of Sonnet 126 and Iago's notorious silence at the end of *Othello* as related emblematic instances of "dramatic vin-dictiveness, . . . where the poet, the witty deviser of conceits, schemes, and devices, really is in control" (44). These are moments where to elucidate would be precisely to miss the point.

Although much of the collection focuses on "Shakespearean inconsistencies" that were "noticeable only to editors (and thus first noticeable in the nineteenth century)" (86), the essays also consider aspects of the plays that would have seemed much more problematic or surprising to early audiences than to modern readers and spectators, whose generic expectations are probably not disappointed in quite the same way by the forestalled marriages at the ends of *Twelfth Night* and *Love's Labor's Lost*, for exam-ple, and who are unlikely to emerge from a performance of *King Lear* with the feeling that their sense of British history had been violated by the death of that play's protagonist.

Indeed, as Orgel elaborates in "Revising *King Lear*," for all the scholarly attention that has been lavished on the textual cruxes and problems that emerge from the discrep-ancies between the Quarto and Folio versions of *Lear*, modern readers are apt to miss some of the (from an early modern perspective) more interestingly problematic ele-ments of the play—elements that are directly engaged in another revision that today receives far less attention: Nahum Tate's 1681 rewriting, which ends notoriously (but in a way that Shakespeare's own audiences would have expected) with Lear's and Cordelia's survival. If Tate's *Lear* is "interesting as a critical reading of Shakespeare, confronting genuine problems in the play" that have escaped the grasp of editorial elucidation, the last two essays in the collection look to more recent perfor-mance history as an alternative site for encountering Shakespearean indeterminacies ignored, suppressed, or explained away by the editorial tradition (125).

Much as a retrospective collection like this might reflect the canonical status of Orgel himself as one of the preeminent Shakespeare scholars of our time, Orgel's own com-mitment to the idea that "the book is not the play" (a mantra repeated several times throughout the essays)—and that "there is never a 'final' version"—holds true for

this book as well (2). Like the manifold "false starts, second thoughts, and changes of mind" that he deftly excavates from the Shakespearean text and that he reminds us are "characteristics of any work in progress" (2), the "occasional inconsistencies, repetitions, and things" he admits to having "changed [his] mind about" over the course of the thirty years of scholarship represented here trace the development of a line of thinking that has come to seem so familiar that it is easy to forget that it is no more inevitable (or perhaps even internally consistent) than the Shakespearean text itself (5).

However, if it is true that "the one thing we really do know about Shakespeare's original text is that it was hard to read" (2), the same cannot be said of these essays, which are decidedly readable (and rereadable), in spite—or because—of the sly caveat concluding his introduction: that he has "not undertaken any major revisions" (5).

Thomas Ward, *United States Naval Academy*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2023.624

The Secret Architecture of Shakespeare's Sonnets. Steven Monte.
Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2021. viii + 340 pp. $110.

This study argues that *Shakespeare's Sonnets* (1609) "contains intricate hidden organisation, and that Shakespeare was far more engaged with other poets and with pursuing a career as a poet than is generally assumed" (1). Monte accepts as Shakespeare's the 1609 order of 154 sonnets followed by "A Lover's Complaint." The volume's "architecture," he claims, has been "hidden" at least since the early decades of the seventeenth century when readers were no longer familiar with the conventions of Elizabethan sonnet sequences (1). The main structure "consists of seventeen groups of poems whose first group contains seventeen sonnets, and whose subsequent groups decrease in size incrementally from sixteen sonnets to one poem. . . . The structure is pyramidal because the poem groups . . . form a pyramid with tapering layers. The design reinforces the conceit of poetry as a monument, and it highlights relations between poems" (2).

As Monte acknowledges, the pyramidal design was first proposed by Alastair Fowler in *Triumphal Forms: Structural Patterns in Elizabethan Poetry* (1970) and later modified by a handful of scholars; the disagreements have to do with reaching the magic number 153 (the total of poems in seventeen tapered steps) since there are 154 sonnets plus "A Lover's Complaint." Monte also makes "correction[s]" to Fowler's hypothesis (43), the most important being the inclusion of "A Lover's Complaint" as the final pyramid step. He advances his thesis about structure by drawing on studies by Thomas P. Roche, Katherine Duncan-Jones, and René Graziani, who have recognized number symbolism throughout *Shakespeare's Sonnets.*

To his credit, Monte anticipates the skepticism of many readers about a pyramid design; he also helps his case by placing Shakespeare within the milieu of the 1590s,