Recently, the University of Lisbon’s performance database was temporarily out of action while I was preparing a chapter on Portuguese performances of Shakespeare. My panic during this time made me realize just how dependent I had become on that database but also made me newly appreciative of the technology of the book, as it doesn’t run the same risk of disappearing from one moment to the next. The editors of this annotated bibliography have been involved in establishing and maintaining the University of Murcia’s excellent database on Shakespeare’s presence in Spain within a European framework (https://www.um.es/shakespeare/) but have also recognized the importance of publications in book form. This most recent volume, which won the Association of Spanish University Presses’ Best Inter-University Co-edition award, follows on from the earlier work by Pujante and Laura Campillo 2007 Shakespeare em Espãna. Textos 1764-1916, developing the research in the previous volume and extending it up to the year 2000.

In the preliminary note, the editors affirm that ‘the presence of Shakespeare in various European cultures is still to be thoroughly documented up to the end of the twentieth century, and not only for internal national purposes, but in order to open up this body of knowledge to the international community’ (X). In this sense, the decision to publish the volume in both Spanish and English caters to the need to consolidate the dynamic field of Shakespeare studies in Spain and to contribute to the equally vibrant field of European Shakespeares in which both authors have played a significant role. The six hundred chronologically-ordered annotated summaries published here and the one thousand entries in the unannotated bibliography at the end of the book will therefore enable both national and international scholars to appreciate the richness of work on Shakespeare in Spain in a variety of different fields of study.

The editors’ criteria for selection of the works are made clear in the introduction. On the one hand, they have not limited the entries to critical and academic work on Shakespeare and have opened the volume up to ‘notes, remarks and commentaries of varied nature and length written by journalists,
actors, politicians or private persons, since they reveal particular tastes and attitudes, and allow for a more comprehensive appraisal of Shakespeare in Spain’ (XII). This enables the inclusion, for instance, of the large number of discussions of Shakespeare’s life and work which have been aimed at a more general audience. The criteria of comprehensiveness is also evident in the inclusion of entries on the poetry as well as the plays, the hospitable decision to open up the volume to international academics whose articles have been translated into Spanish, and entries on Galician and Catalan translations of Shakespeare which have played a key role in establishing the intellectual distinctiveness of these cultures. On the other hand, especially with regard to work in the area of linguistics and translation, the authors have chosen only to include works which have Shakespeare as their main focus and to exclude works which deal only briefly with Shakespeare. This acknowledgment of the need for selectivity also helps to counter what could be one of the main problems in a book project such as this, in other words, a tendency towards homogenization which does not distinguish between seminal and minor works on Shakespeare. The volume certainly gives an idea of which texts have been more important in the history of Shakespeare in Spain; either by noting this in the summary of the work itself (as Pujante does with his entries on Alfonso Par’s 1935 and 1936 volumes on Shakespeare, for instance) or more implicitly through the number of entries which refer to a particular work. An example here would be Moratin’s 1798 translation of Hamlet, caught between its respect for neo-classical rules and an instinctive admiration for Shakespeare, and which is referred to in several entries throughout the volume. Indeed the dialogical nature of work on Shakespeare in Spain, where authors comment on each other’s work, is brought out particularly well in the volume.

Another potential challenge prompted by the decision to arrange the entries chronologically is the possibility that the volume might construct a narrative of inevitable progress towards the quantitative and qualitative consecration of Spanish studies in Shakespeare in the 1990’s, which also coincides with the greater consolidation of academic Shakespeare studies in Spanish universities. The editors certainly include more entries from the 1980’s and 1990’s in the volume than from previous periods. As they point out, there
were as many publications on Shakespeare during the 1990's in Spain as in all the decades of the twentieth century leading up to 1960. However, there is also a sense of this gradual progression involving movements backwards, forwards and even sideways. One example of the latter might be the way in which neo-classical and Romantic readings of Shakespeare co-exist in the early nineteenth century until the Romantic reading gradually becomes predominant. The sense of development within the volume is also sensitive to curious paradoxes such as the fact that detractors of Shakespeare often knew his work better than his defenders and that neo-classicists, although more hostile to Shakespeare’s “errors”, were politically liberal while the pre-romantics who venerated Shakespeare were often more conservative.

Throughout the volume, the editors aim not only to describe the contents of a particular work but also to indicate the critical perspective adopted by the author of that work. There are frequent critical labels such as neo-classicist, Marxist, new historicist or feminist which help the reader distinguish between critical perspectives, but the reader might want slightly more assistance in this task from time to time. The volume is also useful in signaling new developments within attitudes to and writing on Shakespeare. The increase in the latter part of the nineteenth century in authors who not only know the name of Shakespeare but also knew the works is one such development. Similarly, the increase in the number of women writing about Shakespeare in the twentieth century becomes particularly noticeable after their minimal presence beforehand. The late 1980’s are a particularly interesting period in this respect, with a reversal in the previous anti-theatrical prejudice of many earlier commentators as performance studies began to be taken seriously within the academy and the new prominence of studies of Shakespeare on film and on adaptations of Shakespeare.

A comparative perspective, where Shakespeare and his works were compared first with those of Lope de Vega and Calderón de la Barca and later with Cervantes will also interest readers of this volume. Within this perspective, there are several entries which deal with themes such as jealousy, honour or family in both Spanish and Shakespearean drama, that posit possible Spanish sources for Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*, *Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *Hamlet* or examine the constructions of stereotypes of Spain and the Spanish in
Shakespeare. The larger than life character of Don Armado in *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, for example, receives critical attention in several entries.

Yet perhaps the most interesting feature of the volume is its discussion of the establishment and modification of a Shakespeare canon in Spain. The Shakespeare that was most prominent remained the Shakespeare of the tragedies, particularly *Hamlet, Romeo and Juliet, Othello* and *Macbeth*. Nevertheless, the volume illustrates how greater knowledge of and critical commentary on a wider number of plays also led to subtle shifts in the canon. The editors argue, for instance, that the twentieth-century saw a new diversity in the Shakespearean canon in Spain as a result of the increase in criticism on the plays, giving new attention to plays like *Troilus and Cressida, Richard II, Henry IV* and later *The Tempest*. There are also some peculiarly Spanish twists to canon formation. The interest in *Henry VIII*, for instance, was due to interest in the representation of Katherine of Aragon and the Shakespearean representation of Henry’s queen is sometimes compared to the representation of Katherine and Anne Boleyn in plays by Spanish dramatists. Within the volume there are several attempts by authors to establish the characteristics of Spanish Shakespeares at particular moments in time which are signaled by the editors. For Hormigón in 1987, for instance, the main characteristics of Shakespeare in Spain were the abundance of translations, lack of stage productions and repetition of a highly restricted canon of plays while in 1993, amid several attempts to take stock of the growing amount of critical material on Shakespeare, Patricia Shaw noted that the main areas of critical interest in Spanish Shakespeares had been in sources, textual politics, editing, stylistics, particular characters, theatrical aspects of the text, Spanish translations and Shakespeare’s presence in Spain. The editors themselves describe the Spanish Shakespeare canon eminently pragmatically in the following terms: ‘[t]he Spanish Shakespeare canon is what it is: rather less varied than that of Britain or the United States but perhaps not so different from other European countries’ (XLII). As someone working on the presence of Shakespeare in Portugal, this is certainly a conclusion I could endorse from the material.

A volume such as this is of immense value for both Spanish and international scholars and the decision to publish the work in Spanish and
English is thus an astute and a significant one. In a sense, it illustrates the coming of age of studies of Shakespeare in Spain and their necessary integration within a wider international framework. As a reference work for students of the Spanish Shakespeare canon, it enables a historical perspective on the field and indicates key texts within that field, while the annotation guides them in terms of what to find in each of these works. The volume is also part of an ongoing project to document Shakespeare in Spain which stands on its own or can be read in conjunction with other related works. As such, the editors are to be congratulated on a carefully researched but eminently accessible volume which is clearly situated within a particular space and time, but that also points beyond it towards Spanish Shakespeares’ rich and multiple pasts.

Francesca Rayner