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The literature on Shakespeare in Spain has a relatively long and fruitful tradition. As far back as 1874, a German article on *Hamlet* in Spain by Caroline Michaëlis was issued in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*. In 1883, Daniel López published a nine-page documented survey with the title “Shakespeare en España”, covering up to Villalta’s 1838 translation of *Macbeth*, in *La Ilustración Española y Americana*. In 1916, the tercentenary of the death of Shakespeare and Cervantes stimulated publications on the subject. Julià Martínez included an appendix on “Shakespeare en España” in his fictionalized biography *Shakespeare y su tiempo* (1916), but he produced a more ambitious monograph for the award given by the Real Academia Española to reciprocate the commemoration of Cervantes in Britain (Pujante 2007: xlv). Julià’s work, published in 1918, focused on translations and on Shakespeare’s influence on Spanish literature. A book by Ruppert y Ujaravi with the same title followed in 1920; and in the 1930s, Alfonso Par, perhaps the most dedicated of the Spanish Shakespeareans, surpassed these preceding works with his bibliographical compilation (1930), his monumental two-volume study of Shakespeare in Spanish (and Catalan) literature (1935), and his two-volume catalogue of theatre productions up to 1900 in Madrid and Barcelona (1936 and 1940).

The topic continued to be of interest in articles and monographs after the Civil War (Entrambasaguas 1939; Thomas 1949; FitzGerald 1951), and as English Studies was consolidated as a university degree in Spain, it was taken on by academics (Pujals 1985; Serrano 1987). In 1993, J. M. González published *Shakespeare en España: crítica, traducciones y representaciones* containing (besides
Among the contributions to reception studies of Shakespeare in Spain summarized above, Pujante and Campillo’s *Shakespeare en España: Textos 1764-1916* is unique in being an ample and well-assorted annotated anthology of 114 pieces of criticism on the Bard by Spanish (or Spain-related) writers within the indicated period. The bulk of the compilation is preceded by a preliminary note (xv-xviii), and a 37-page “Introducción” (signed by Ángel-Luis Pujante, also author of the footnotes and translations), and is followed by an appendix (423-485), a chronology of Shakespeare’s works (487-441), a bibliography (493-506), and an index (507-519). Whereas Alfonso Par’s 1935 precedent provided readers with a rather critical history from Par’s particular viewpoint, Pujante and Campillo’s compilation, by offering transcriptions of the texts themselves, accompanied by footnotes and by succinct but informative introductions, allows readers to mould their own view of the development of Spanish criticism on Shakespeare along the evolution of literary tastes in Spain. Only occasionally, and sometimes confusingly and inaccurately, did Par provide quotations from his primary material, and his critical voice prevailed throughout. In the present anthology, only footnotes and short introductions contain a critical view, as when Pujante criticizes Joan
Maragall’s idealist view of Fortinbrass (364, footnote 42). The book will quickly strike the Shakespearean scholar as a Spanish counterpart of Brian Vicker’s *Shakespeare: The Critical Heritage*.1 In this respect, Pujante and Campillo’s title may be a little misleading since “textos” also suggests translations, theatre adaptations or literary offshoots whereas the anthology limits itself to critical appraisals. Of course, this is clarified in the preliminary “Advertencia”, which after giving due credit to Julià, Ruppert and Par, justifies the decisions on the selected material.

As for the chronological span of 1764-1916, I found it a wise decision to cover this period from the earliest recorded criticism to just before the time extended monographs on the topic of Shakespeare in Spain began to be published (Pujante and Campillo 2007: xv). In all, the book is over 500 pages long with some material necessarily left out. As for this selection, the anthology stands out for its breadth and for the rightness of its choices. Not only does it include works for their historical relevance, but also minor pieces that have a documentary value of their own. As well as critical articles or essays the collection brings together all kinds of texts that contain a piece of criticism, such as notes, observations and comments by writers (Benito Pérez Galdós, Joan Maragall), journalists (José de Armas), actors (Ernesto Rossi) and politicians (Antonio Cánovas del Castillo). The selection shows that the editors’ conception of “en España” is neither restricted to Spanish nationals (they include the above-mentioned Cuban journalist José de Armas and Italian actor Rossi)2 nor to Spanish-speaking texts (Blanco White’s writings in English are included, as are Italian writings by Spanish Jesuits and Catalan writings such as those by Alfonso Par and Eugeni D’Ors). The latter are anthologized in Spanish translations.

Pujante and Campillo have not only limited themselves to providing full or more extended quotations of those critics Par, Juliá
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1 A similar anthology, but compiling prefaces and notes of translators into Catalan, preceded by an introductory study on the reception of Shakespeare in Europe and on a historical survey of Shakespeare and Catalan translators, is Didac Pujol’s *Traduir Shakespeare: les reflexions dels traductors catalans* (2007).

2 Strictly speaking, translations of non-Spanish works, such as those by Victor Hugo (1887) and Turgenev (1894), also constituted significant contributions to the dissemination and reception of Shakespeare in Spain.
and Ruppert recorded (e.g. Francisco Xavier Lampillas or Narciso Campillo y Correo) but have contributed with authors and pieces not even mentioned by their predecessors (such as José Joaquín de Escartín or Ricardo Blanco Asenjo with his articles “Hamlet y Segismundo” and “Cervantes y Shakespeare (23 de abril de 1616)”), which denotes very welcomed fresh research. As in any anthology, the specialist may miss a piece (for instance, G. Romo’s praise for Shakespeare in a comparison with Corneille published in Memorial Literario (1804), the leading journal of criticism at that time; see Menéndez y Pelayo (1974: 1348)), but this will not impair the readers’ image of Shakespeare in Spain through its critical heritage. If one misses the article “Reflexiones sobre el teatro inglés” by Joseph Calderón de la Barca, then editor of the journal, at least this author and the journal are represented in a pithier essay comparing Lope and Shakespeare (33-34; Calderón 1796). Although Pujante and Campillo explain their exclusion of Eduardo Benot’s “impersonal and acritical” introduction to the collected translations by Guillermo Macpherson (xvi), I particularly regret this omission since his originality has at least as much documentary value as the Voltaire-parroted comments by earlier critics. As some of the pieces are too long (such as Moratín’s edition of Hamlet, Blanco White’s writings, Guillermo Macpherson’s prologues or Aurelio Pereira’s Shakespeare y Calderón), the editors’ necessary cutting is well-chosen, some of the sections focusing on related issues (such as views of Othello, contrast with Spanish Golden Age authors) so that readers can compare different attitudes from various authors.

In the collection of texts, presented in chronological order, one can appreciate a conscientious effort to produce accurate editions (barring the modernization of spelling, the few samples I have compared have proved to be error-free except in minor “typos” that, hopefully, will be corrected in the announced online version), and to annotate the texts explaining references and correcting mistakes (such as when Calderón de la Barca states that Shakespeare was buried at Westminster (33)). The editors have even located and checked the originals of the quotations made by the anthologized authors. One can imagine that even a brief introduction on the author’s background or a small footnote clarifying a reference must
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3 Available in Google Books with limited preview. See also “Online Publications” at <http://www.um.es/shakespeare/eng/>.
have needed painstaking hours of research. The footnotes and introductions are aimed at both a specialist and non-specialist readership, and are also interrelated, giving not only cohesion but also providing readers with a helpful overview. The editors’ punctiliousness is also observed in an appendix offering the original texts in Italian, English and Catalan. All this denotes a remarkable work of editorship.

Ángel-Luis Pujante’s “Introducción” graces the book with a well-informed and instructive survey of Shakespearean criticism in Spain, offering explanations for the way Shakespeare was introduced and received (and not only by critics but also referring to translations and performances), contrasting the situation in Spain with that in other European countries and signalling the distinctive features of the Spanish reception of Shakespeare, especially the comparison between Shakespeare and Spanish classical authors, from Lope and Calderón to Cervantes. After the texts and their appendix, the volume includes an eye-friendly table containing a chronology of Shakespeare’s works, with dates basically taken from the chronology proposed by Taylor (1987), with titles both in English and translated into Spanish (some with alternative translations), and with a genre adscription.4 Another welcome feature is the index allowing readers to easily spot commentaries on a specific Shakespeare play or by a given author.

All this makes Shakespeare en España: Textos 1764-1916 not only an example of the excellent research carried out by the Murcia Shakespeareans, in this case Ángel-Luis Pujante and Laura Campillo, but also an invaluable service and a “must” for those studying the presence of Shakespeare in Spain. For Spanish criticism on the Bard, Par will no longer be the main reference and the interest of his work will mainly lie in his personal appraisals of the Shakespearean critics. And many a visit to, or loan from, the Biblioteca Nacional, or the Biblioteca de Catalunya, or the library of the Institut del Teatre, or the Biblioteca Histórica Municipal de Madrid will be saved. Pujante and Campillo deserve a big “thank you”.

4 Oddly enough, the adscription ventures to classify the lost play Cardenio as a tragicomedy, on a par with not only The Tempest and other late comedies but also with Measure for Measure, Troilus and Cressida and All’s Well.
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