CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Shakespeare and early modern Europe: A critical survey;Shakespeare and early modern Europe: A critical survey
Authors	Semple, Edel;Vyroubalová, Ema
Publication date	2018-02-12
Original Citation	Semple, E. and Vyroubalová, E. (2018) 'Shakespeare and early modern Europe: A critical survey', Shakespeare, 14(1), pp. 80-96. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2017.1421701
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	10.1080/17450918.2017.1421701
Rights	© 2018, the Authors. Published by Routledge - Taylor & Francis Group. All rights reserved. This is an Accepted Manuscript of an item published by Taylor & Francis in Shakespeare on 12 February 2018, available online: https://doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2017.1421701
Download date	2026-10-10 17:46:30
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/15564

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in the journal *Shakespeare* in 2018, available at: https://doi.org/[https://doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2017.1421701 .

Edel Semple & Ema Vyroubalová (2018) "Shakespeare and Early Modern Europe: A Critical Survey", *Shakespeare*, 14:1, 80-96, DOI: 10.1080/17450918.2017.1421701

"Shakespeare and Early Modern Europe: A Critical survey"

Edel Semple (University College Cork) and Ema Vyroubalová (Trinity College Dublin)

Abstract

This survey examines the history of criticism on Shakespeare and early modern Europe. With major socio-political European events in mind, the article reviews scholarship on this topic from the early twentieth-century to the present day. Particular emphasis is placed on studies of Shakespeare's own treatment of European characters and settings. The related topics of the changing meaning of "Europe" and of Shakespeare's European afterlives are also briefly discussed.

Keywords: European Shakespeare; Europe; nationality; European Union; Britain; borders

Introduction

Shakespeare and Europe have a long and complicated history. At this point in time Europe's identity is under intense scrutiny and its future as a political, economic, social, and cultural, entity is uncertain. While its physical geography, in the sense of the "shape of the continent, is easy to visualize, [Europe's] extent is more problematic to define" (Hadfield and Hammond, 6) and its boundaries are under pressure in a myriad of ways.[i] A search for "Europe" and "European" in the *OED* verifies the term's polyvalence. In its primary place name designation, "Europe" is "the name of the continent consisting of the western projection

of the Eurasian land mass lying north of the Mediterranean and Black Seas, north-west of the Caucasus and the Caspian Sea, and west of the Ural Mountains", recorded in English from the Old English period on and deriving from the Greco-Roman *Εὐρώπη* and *Eurōpa.* Since the 1950s, the noun can also refer allusively to "the European Union or its predecessors". "European" can mean "Of, relating to, or characteristic of Europe or its inhabitants" (sense 1a) but can more restrictedly connote this only for continental Europe (sense 1b). The remaining meanings include: "Occurring in, or extending over, Europe"; "Of or designating a person of European origin or descent living outside the boundaries of Europe; (hence) of or designating a white person, esp. in a country with a multiracial population"; and "designating a notional or prospective union or association of European countries. In later use usually: designating various intergovernmental, esp. economic, organizations of western (and later also eastern) Europe" (*OED*). Several of the crises presently unravelling in the world can be linked directly or indirectly to the protean and slippery nature of the entity called Europe: the ongoing humanitarian catastrophe in the Mediterranean and its reverberations throughout Europe and the Middle East; the tensions along the borders between the Baltic states and Russia; the averted Grexit and the impending Brexit, accompanied by different brands of Euroscepticism; the conflict between Russia and Ukraine; Turkey's volatile political situation and its bid to join the EU.[ii]

Despite these changes, challenges, and uncertainties in Europe's current political and economic landscapes, the works of Shakespeare generally seem to travel around Europe with relative ease. Low-cost airlines, the embodiments of the mobility of contemporary Europe's populace, do not come to mind as purveyors of experiences one would expect to involve the Bard. Yet in April 2014 the UK carrier Easyjet participated in the campaign that sought to make April 23rd a National Shakespeare Day in the British calendar by launching an Airbus decorated with a portrait of Shakespeare and organizing performances of some of the plays at

British airports as well as on its London-Verona flights. Shakespeare has also figured more seriously as an emblem of European culture's mobility and resilience during times of political turmoil in and between European nations. In Cold War Eastern Europe, Shakespearean theatre and literary criticism provided sites of resistance against the bloc's totalitarian regimes: Jan Kott's now classic volume *Shakespeare Our Contemporary* (1964) and Heiner Müller's influential adaptation *Hamletmachine* (1977) are perhaps the best examples of this phenomenon. More recently, in an interview on BBC Newsnight, Greece's former Finance Minister Yanis Varoufakis compared the Brexit negotiations to "a Shakespearean tragedy", noting "[i]t's like watching *King Lear*" and likening May, Juncker, and Merkel to Shakespeare's tragic misguided characters ("Yanis Varoufakis on Brexit"). Boris Johnson has meanwhile shelved his plans for writing a biography of Shakespeare due to the demands of his new post, which prompted the *Guardian*'s Andrew Dickson to observe bitingly that Shakespeare thus became "yet another casualty of Brexit" ("Brexit, pursued by a bear"). Shakespeare has long been co-opted and put to use across Europe's political arenas but he maintains a prominent position in European arts and academia too. Many European cities boast theatres and festivals dedicated to Shakespeare and his popularity amongst scholars, students, and enthusiasts in Europe is likewise borne out by the number of professional associations spread across the continent. A brief internet search lists groups such as the European Shakespeare Research Association (ESRA),[iii] the Société Française Shakespeare, the Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, the Swedish Shakespeare Society, the Polish Shakespeare Association, the Italian Association of Shakespearean and Early Modern Studies, and the Ukrainian Shakespeare Centre, to name but a few. In recent years, scholarly blogs, such as "Shakespeare in Ireland" and "Swisspeare", have developed to record, promote, and examine Shakespeare's legacy in individual nations.

While all of these examples illustrate the strength and topicality of the bond between Shakespeare and Europe, deciding how to delimit this well-established and intricate relationship for the purposes of our survey proved to be a challenge. Europe is a complex, evolving, and at times elusive category that bears the weight of the region's shifting political, demographic, economic, and cultural histories – this would have been equally true in Shakespeare's day as it is in our own. Shakespeare employs the word "Europe" exactly ten times (most frequently in the two *Henriads*), and he uses it very much like other English writers of the period do, to equate Europe with the "known world", or "Christendom", inclusive of England (Dobson, 2016).[iv] At the same time, an awareness of the divide between the continental landmass and the insular Britain can be located in many of the plays, perhaps most memorably in John of Gaunt's lamentation of the decline of "this scepter'd isle [...] this little world [...] this England" in *Richard II* (2.1.40-50). Regardless of whether we count Britain and other islands in and where we position the continent's eastern boundary, one can argue that Shakespeare's plays are fundamentally "European" in the sense that they constitute the outcome of an English playwright writing in English but using a wealth of mostly continental sources to craft play-texts all of which either directly take place on the continent or at least refer to it. As Stanley Wells reminds us, "[Shakespeare] was in essence a man of the European Renaissance rather than a parochialized islander" (4). Moreover, continental European artisans, as A. E. J. Honigmann has highlighted, participated in the production and early perpetuation of Shakespeare's work and reputation: from the Anglo-Dutch builder of the original Globe to the Dutch author of the engraved portrait in the First Folio (233-234). And the plays, of course, started travelling to the continent in Shakespeare's own lifetime and subsequently made themselves at home in many of the region's dramatic, literary, and philosophical traditions.

The appearance and growth of sustained academic engagement with the relationship between Shakespeare and Europe nonetheless coincides with the advent of European integration in much more recent history. The European Union's predecessor, the European Economic Community, was established in 1957 but the union in its current form began to take shape in the early 1990s, with the 12 member states of the EEC signing the Maastricht Treaty and forming the EU in 1993. Two major waves of accessions followed, in the mid-1990s and 2000s, bringing the current membership up to 28. The Union's expansion into its present form was, of course, facilitated by the collapse of communism in the late 1980s and early 1990s, with the concomitant opening of controlled borders and thawing of political and economic relations between the "East" and "West". Progress towards "ever closer union" among the member states has been part of the Union's tenets since the 1980s and the Eurozone (currently 19 of the states) and the free-travel Schengen area (currently 22 of the states) are among the most tangible manifestation of this goal. In literary and cultural studies, these developments of the past three decades have led to increased interest in relevant key concepts such as the nation, state, borders, and Europe, and their relationship to previously established subjects of study, including Shakespeare. It is clear then that the recent growth in Shakespeare and Europe as a scholarly focus can be linked directly to the visibility of and increasing access to Europe. Indeed, as Dirk Delabastita has argued, Shakespeare has predictably "become part of this partly conscious and partly unconscious process of Euronation building" (355).

Based on this state of affairs, our survey deals with studies from approximately the last 30 years, when Shakespeare and Europe came to the fore in literary criticism, but it also examines the few earlier interventions in this field to provide a sense of the subject's critical history. The study by no means aims to be exhaustive and is, by necessity, selective; nonetheless it seeks to identify the major trends and recurring issues in the subject area of

Shakespeare and Europe. Our discussions focus on what can be best described as Shakespeare and early modern Europe, meaning critical texts that examine Shakespeare's contemporary knowledge and imaginative use of nations/geographical areas in or characters from the geographical area broadly defined as "Europe". We need, however, to add two caveats. First, we look at both continental and insular regions of Europe that appear in Shakespeare's texts but with the notable exception of England. Second, the history of Shakespeare on Europe's screens and stages or European reception of his work is generally omitted. The decision to exclude England comes from a desire to work with texts which address Shakespeare's fashioning of locations and characters that, from an early modern perspective, would be simultaneously European and foreign in the cultural, linguistic, political, and/or religious senses. The exclusion of performance and reception histories was largely a pragmatic one as these topics would merit multiple survey articles in their own right and have also recently been addressed elsewhere.[v] We do discuss some scholarship that deals with performance history and reception of the plays, where this in some way elucidates the development of Shakespeare and Europe as a subject and/or the plays' original early modern context. While this chosen historical focus could come across as retrograde, we believe that looking back at Shakespeare's own engagement with Europe from the vantage point of our present historical moment and privileged location within the EU is inherently topical. As Dente and Soncini argue, "the diachronic primacy of Shakespeare's European cosmopolitanism [...] constitutes one of the root causes of, or at least a crucial enabling factor in, his planetary spread" (9).

Early criticism on Shakespeare and Europe

Prior to the late twentieth century, Shakespeare and/in Europe had rarely been the focus of scholarly attention. A notable early exception to this trend can be found in an 1898 issue of

The American Shakespeare Magazine, which included a report of a lecture on European Shakespeare productions delivered by Sidney (later Sir) Lee in London. In his lecture, Lee praised the high number of performances of Shakespeare and the range of his plays performed on the continent. For example, "[in] 1896 there were 910 performances of as many as twenty-three of Shakespeare's thirty-seven plays on the German stage." The thrust of this comparison is to underscore the sorry state of Shakespearean theatre in his native country. Worryingly, the author suggests, looking back over the nineteenth century "Shakespeare's popularity in England as an act-able dramatist had declined at almost the same rate of velocity as it had risen in Central Europe" ("The Shakespearean", 53). Shakespeare's language is now difficult for an English audience, but translated into the modern languages of continental Europe, the plays' dramatic power is evident and audiences are captivated. The report closes with a rallying call: in the "interest of dramatic art, of higher national education and of a great patriotic sentiment, state aid" is needed to subsidise a theatre and make Shakespeare as welcome and as understandable as he is on the continent ("The Shakespearean", 54). The United Kingdom's (failing) commitment to Shakespeare is again highlighted in the magazine in a piece on the touring of Frank Benson's Shakespeare Company in Ireland: "[it] is in cities like Dublin, Belfast and Cork that [Benson] finds the heartiest appreciation of Shakespeare." As the sole remaining bastion of Bardolatry in the British Isles, nineteenth-century Ireland seems to have more in common with continental Europe than with its nearest neighbour: "Ireland, according to this experienced provincial actor, will be the last quarter of the United Kingdom to be unfaithful to the memory of the greatest dramatist." ("Shakespeare", 54). Both of the *Magazine* articles thus exhibit a typical concern of early critics "to make sure Shakespeare was duly being treated with the respect befitting a monument of his stature" across the Channel, and once reassured, displayed "smug

satisfaction at Shakespeare's extraordinary record of successes abroad" (Delabastita and d'Hulst, 20).

In 1916, the Great War disrupted plans across Europe for commemorations of the Shakespeare tercentenary. However festschrifts like *William Shakespeare: Gedenkboek, 1616-1916* by Edward B. Koster and Israel Gollancz's *A Book of Homage to Shakespeare* ensured that, in print at least, the anniversary did not go unobserved. Gollancz's limited edition folio comprised over 160 contributions by scholars, poets, novelists, and eminent personages from across Europe, Asia, and North America. The collection contains responses to Shakespeare in 23 languages, including most of the major European languages but with German excluded, due to the war.[vi] In Koster's book Shakespeare achieved a kind of "supranational status in a Europe at war" (Hoenselaars and Calvo, 2007: 104) but in Gollancz's, as Kahn observes, "multicultural Shakespeares […] stage the contradictions of empire" (457). For some then, Shakespeare could productively cross borders and help forge a "universal intellectual fraternity" (Kahn, 478), but for others, Shakespeare problematically embodied a specific cultural and national identity.

While Cumberland Clark's *Shakespeare and National Character*, published in 1932, examines a large number of nationalities and ethnicities, it finds that ultimately all of Shakespeare's characters, like their author, "are English through and through" (13). At times, Clark appears anxious about the influence of the continent on Shakespeare but he judges that, for instance, while Shakespeare was rightly interested in Italy, "he did not sacrifice his English feelings, impulses, and traditions, and place his neck tamely beneath the Italian yoke" (103). It is apparent too that England's national poet "understood and sympathised with those traits common to all humanity, [and thus] it may be said that he knew the essentials of every national character" (14). Thus, for Clark although Shakespeare is flawed in being a man of his time (like his countrymen, he was prejudiced against the French (131)), his universal

genius more than compensates for such frailties. Recent decades have seen the demythologising of Shakespeare, and while his Englishness has remained a central concern, he is less likely to be presented as the embodiment of Englishness or an inward-looking British nationalism.[vii] In tandem with this development, Shakespeare's 'Europeanness' has assumed a more equal footing in critical discussions, as the titles of countless studies attest.[viii]

Oswald LeWinter's 1963 anthology *Shakespeare in Europe* provides a finely curated selection of Shakespearean criticism by continental writers from Voltaire, Goethe, and Schiller, through Pushkin, Hugo, Tolstoy, and Hegel to Ortega y Gasset, Croce, and, Barrault.[ix] LeWinter's editorial apparatus, which includes a substantial Introduction to the topic of Shakespeare in Europe as well as shorter introductions to the individual writers and their texts featured in the volume, focuses almost entirely on the afterlife of Shakespeare's texts in continental European thought, and in doing so pieces together an account of how and why Shakespeare's influence penetrated deeper in some European countries (e.g. Germany and Russia) than in others (e.g. France and Spain). The selections themselves often include thoughts on Shakespeare as a historical figure, although the writers tend to find Shakespeare's Englishness, rather than his early modern historicity, more relevant as a source of his otherness. This awareness of Shakespeare as a writer working from within a particular national tradition at a particular historical moment in turn demonstrates how Shakespeare's embeddedness in early modern English culture constituted an integral part of the plays' migration and reception outside of England.

Surveying a range of genres and authors, including Chaucer, Hakluyt, Moryson, Wilson, and Shakespeare, G. K. Hunter's 1964 article "Elizabethans and Foreigners" focuses on the "framework of assumptions" about foreigners from Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Americas circulating in early modern English literature (37).[x] Hunter proposes that "Europe retained a strong common culture well into the seventeenth century", however, the

"fragmentation of faiths" during the Reformation in time led to a "fragmentation of national cultures" (42). However, Hunter cautions against a simplistic view of the emerging racial ideologies. Rather than "a pattern of races […] capable of supplying moral discriminations rich and complex enough for literary use", what often emerged were caricatures, such as the stock-figure of the butter-loving, drunken Dutchman. In post-Reformation literature, English patriotism led to a negative view of non-natives: "in any work showing the foreigner living in England […] the 'stranger' could be shown to be a villain or a clown, but little else" (43). In the final half of the article, Hunter surveys dramatic depictions of Dutch, Flemish, French, Italian, Jewish, and Moorish characters. Italy, he notes, frequently operates as a stock "setting to focus the meaning of [a] play" and press home a cautionary moral exemplum (47). Yet, Hunter argues, European nations were not yet distinct enough to offer playwrights large-scale dramatic contrasts and so they turned to figures outside of Christianity (48). In his portrayal of such figures, Shakespeare relied on "the old framework of assumptions about Jews, Turks, and Moors", a theological model that presented the religious 'other' as villain (49). Hunter concludes ultimately that European settings and characters not only provided Shakespeare with the opportunity to include some local flavour, grounding his audiences, but also allowed him the means to explore "the image of the foreigner […] in a dimension which is at once terrestrial and spiritual" (52).

In the 1970s, *Shakespeare Quarterly* began to publish annual reports on Shakespeare in performance in specific nations, with Europe represented mostly by western European countries, including Finland, Norway, Sweden, Italy, France, and Spain. While these short review articles discuss recent performances of the plays in the respective countries, many of the authors, who are typically Shakespeare scholars, at the same time contend with the tension between the historicity of Shakespeare and the contemporisation of the plays in many productions or adaptations. Tauno Mastanoja in his appraisal of Finnish Shakespeare

productions for 1981-82, for instance, reports that the "season was disappointing, only four of Shakespeare's plays were staged, most of them adaptations on varying experimental levels, and all in the spirit of the now somewhat hackneyed phrase which reminds us that Shakespeare is our contemporary" (239). This tendency to some extent heralds the division of Shakespeare scholarship into studies of Shakespeare's works in their original early modern contexts and studies focusing on the works' afterlives and manifestations in subsequent eras, which became increasingly commonplace in the following decades.

The 1980s and 1990s saw the definitive emergence of Shakespeare and Europe as a subject of critical interest and several nation-centred studies appeared.[xi] Given Shakespeare's fondness for Italian locations, scholars have often focused on his use of Italian settings, appropriation of Italian sources, and knowledge of the language and culture. Rome proved to be of perennial interest with several monographs on the topic appearing throughout the twentieth century. Robert Miola's *Shakespeare's Rome* and Murray J. Levith's *Shakespeare's Italian Settings and Plays* build on the work of their predecessors, but endeavour to broaden the focus beyond the usual Anglo-Italian plays.[xii] Two issues are central in *Shakespeare's Rome*. Firstly, Miola argues for a progression in Shakespeare's Roman canon; from amateurish experiments – derivative or gruesome tales drawn from Roman sources and peopled by caricatures – to sophisticated, complex maturity, with *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra* as the superlative achievements. Nonetheless, Miola's analyses of *The Rape of Lucrece* and of *Titus Andronicus*, which had been dismissed entirely or neglected in earlier studies of Shakespeare's Rome (42-43), are compelling and he makes a strong case for their inclusion in the Roman canon. Notably, Miola's work on *Titus* provided a foundation for the rehabilitation of this play over the past three decades, facilitating developments such as Jonathan Bates' Arden edition of the play (1995; revised edition forthcoming 2018), John Kerrigan's study of the play in *Revenge Tragedy: Aeschylus to Armageddon* (1996), and

scholarship on its textual and attribution issues by MacDonald P. Jackson (1996 and 1997), Brian Boyd (2004), and Rory Loughnane (2016).[xiii] The second key issue in *Shakespeare's Rome* is that Miola acknowledges continuities and differences in Shakespeare's portrayal of the city – as central themes develop, advance, or recede – but proposes that there is a unity, a "network of images, ideas, gestures, and scenes", which stretches from *Lucrece* to *Cymbeline* (15-16). *Lucrece*, Shakespeare's first treatment of Rome, includes many of the features that are reworked in the plays: the poem examines the impact of the Roman ideals of honour, self-sacrifice, and glory; how "the city is the family writ large"; the motif of the city (as civilisation) opposed to and often besieged by the other (wilderness, the barbarian) (40). Miola argues finally that while Shakespeare's view of Rome was increasingly critical, in *Cymbeline* he offered a valediction to the city. The play celebrates Britain's coming-of-age, its ascendancy, but simultaneously endeavours to dispel the differences and institute a reconciliation between "the warring factions of the larger, extended Trojan family (233).

Levith's slim volume covers eight 'Italian' plays; the non-classical tragedies and comedies from across the Shakespearean canon and *The Tempest* (on the grounds that its protagonists are largely Milanese and Neapolitan). Levith sets out to explore what exactly Italian locations and characters offered to Shakespeare. He argues, for instance, that *Much Ado*'s Messina is chosen as it is an appropriate setting for witty characters and "to poke [fun] at the historical Don John of Austria" (82). 'Italian' themes are also central to Levith's analyses. For instance, in *Romeo and Juliet*, *Much Ado*, and *All's Well*, education is of recurring interest (69). In the latter play, Bertram's time "in Italy has shown him the way to maturity, virtue, and wisdom" and through him the English audience has learned to be wary of "Italy's fashionable temptations [which] can compromise the most basic virtues and teachings of home" (76). In places, Levith rehearses familiar ideas (many of Shakespeare's characters are recognisable as "Englishmen Italianated" (11); "Something is obviously wrong

with Iago's marriage" (36)) and some arguments are insufficiently nuanced or developed ("the Venetian background of *Othello* helps to suggest Iago's homosexuality" (38)). However, as one reviewer suggested, it is clear that "Levith is on to something" (Johnson-Haddad, 254). If Shakespeare's Italy formed something of a critical gap in the late 1980s (Levith, 3-4), then Levith, Miola, and others made steps to remedy this situation and proved the topic worthy of careful scholarly scrutiny.

From the 1990s to the twenty-first century

With the solidification and expansion of the EU in the 1990s, a "wave of […] European self-consciousness" laid the foundations for multiple publications, conferences, and research projects on Shakespeare in/and Europe (Hoenselaars and Calvo, 2007: 104). Multiculturalism, assimilation, and open-mindedness became part of popular discourse and scholars sought out evidence of these ideals in earlier literatures. One of the first books in this vein was A. J. Hoenselaars' *Images of Englishmen and Foreigners in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*.[xiv] Like Michele Marrapodi, mentioned below, Hoenselaars has contributed much to European Shakespeare through single-author studies and edited collections such as *Shakespeare's Italy: Functions of Italian Locations in Renaissance Drama*; *The Italian world of English Renaissance Drama*; *400 Years of Shakespeare in Europe*; *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation*. Noteworthy for the breadth of its focus and sensitivity of approach, as well as for being the first modern study of early modern English drama with a truly pan-European focus, *Images of Englishmen* examines European foreigners in England and the English in Europe as portrayed in a wide range of Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline dramatic texts, both canonical and lesser known. Central to Hoenselaars' volume is the idea that the depiction of foreigners progressed over time.[xv] Early Elizabethan drama tended to be jingoistic, staging the European as a figure

for mockery or fear. However, Hoenselaars identifies in the period a growing scepticism of simplistic binaries where "favorable traits are assigned to the ingroup and unfavorable traits to the outgroup" (23). From the 1590s onward, plays show "a sense of dissatisfaction rooted both in a historical as well as an intellectual awareness that the traditional images were valid only in part or had lost their plausibility altogether" (25). For instance, the temporary transformation of the French Doctor Caius in *Merry Wives* "from comic gull into comic agent, suggests an attempt to emancipate the foreigner and to present him in a more favorable light" (59). Caius' exit during the play's finale and his marginalisation in its newly-formed society, furthermore, imply "that [Shakespeare] used his foreigner in a more critical fashion" than some of his contemporaries (60). In Jacobean and Caroline drama then, English superiority is typically far less certain and European characters are not limited to the roles of villains or clowns. For example, the traditional roles of virtuous native and villainous foreigner are reversed in *Henry VIII*. Queen Katherine is devoid of stereotypical Spanish traits; rather, the clichéd vices of her compatriots are to be found in Cardinal Wolsey (134). Such an inversion, Hoenselaars argues, is a key dramatic strategy aimed at critiquing the natives and commending the foreigner. This development in early modern English drama is symptomatic of a "national identity crisis" (243). B. J. Sokol suggests that this is perhaps an overstatement of the situation, but concurs with Hoenselaars' general conclusion that the drama's negative portrayal of the English and favourable presentation of Europeans "may be a bid to promote tolerance and cohesion" (77).

In the rest of the essay, which addresses the state of scholarship on Shakespeare and Europe from the 2000s on, our subject matter is divided by individual geographical units in order to showcase the great range and diversity of the work recently produced in this area, as well as the ways in which scholars discussing the same countries, nationalities, or languages engage in conversation with one another. We have endeavoured to cover all the parts of

Europe outside of England that appear in the plays either as settings or as places of origin of major characters.[xvi] We begin with the two continental locales used most prolifically by Shakespeare – Italy and France – and then move on to Greece and Spain, which both occupy important positions in the early modern English cultural imaginary yet figure in Shakespeare's works more obliquely. We next cover three regional groupings – Eastern Europe, Germanic Western/Central Europe, and Celtic countries – based on linguistic, cultural, and political affinities, many of them dating back to Shakespeare's day and earlier. We conclude with a short discussion of texts which take a more pan-continental perspective on Shakespeare's treatment of Europe and discuss simultaneously the role of multiple European nationalities and/or regions in the plays.

Italy is by far the most frequently depicted region outside of England in Shakespeare's oeuvre, with 12 of the plays as well as *The Rape of Lucrece* set either entirely or partly in Italy (including Sicily). The Italian settings Shakespeare fashioned fall into two categories: those representing an early modern Italy meant to be seen as roughly contemporaneous with Shakespeare's England (e.g. the Messina of *Much Ado About Nothing,* the Verona of *Romeo and Juliet*, or the Venice of *Othello* and *The Merchant of Venice*) and those representing ancient Rome of different eras or their eclectic mix (e.g. the Second Triumvirate in *Antony and Cleopatra*, the end of the Monarchy and beginning of the Republic in *The Rape of Lucrece*, or the end of the Empire in *Titus Andronicus*). The twenty-first century has seen a renewal of interest in issues of periodisation and, particularly, the question of chronological and geographical delimitation of the so-called early modern or Renaissance period. Shakespeare's handling of temporal and topographical referents crucial to the concept of the early modern period has thus naturally continued to draw much interest from scholars.

Three recent monographs take on the challenge of discussing Shakespeare's Roman plays en masse: Warren L. Chernaik's *The myth of Rome in Shakespeare and his contemporaries*, Paul Innes' *Shakespeare's Roman Plays*, and Lisa Starkes-Estes' *Violence, Trauma and Virtus in Shakespeare's Roman Plays and Poems: Transforming Ovid*. Chernaik undertakes a comparative study of how major Elizabethan and Jacobean writers portrayed ancient Rome and its denizens in order to answer the question of what early modern Englishmen and Englishwomen would have imagined and understood under the rubric of an Ancient Roman. Chernaik's methodology is primarily a wide-ranging analysis of the textual sources that would have been available in England at the time, with a focus on how this body of texts was accessed and utilised by English writers. The book succeeds in showing that the individual early modern English writers developed their own signature Romes and that the notions of Romanness in the early modern English imaginary, which these literary representations both arose from and fed back into, form a richly composite and often contradictory picture. Chernaik accounts for all of Shakespeare's Roman plays as well as for *Lucrece* and compares Shakespeare's Roman settings and characters with those of other major playwrights, including Jonson, Massinger, and Chapman. Innes' book, by contrast, provides a more linearly orientated study of how Shakespeare's representations of Ancient Rome and Romans developed in the course of his career, by looking closely at each of the five Roman plays. The readings offered in the chapters focus on "the meanings of Rome as they are starting to be incorporated into the nascent British state contemporary with Shakespeare, and thus the emerging British Empire" (4). This Roman-British connection means that Innes opens and closes the study with *Cymbeline* and uses this play, often consigned by other scholars to the margins of the Shakespearean Roman canon, to shed a new light on how the Roman state and identity function and relate to their early modern English equivalents in the four more explicitly Roman plays. Starks-Estes' book likewise singles out

a particular subset of Shakespeare's Roman-themed works, as it revisits the topic of Shakespeare's use of Ovid, previously explored from different angles by scholars including Leonard Barkan, Jonathan Bate, Lynn Enterline, and Cynthia Marshall. Starkes-Estes' book is notable for its simultaneously broad-ranging and systematic approach to its Shakespearean-Ovidian focus, which devotes one chapter to each of Shakespeare's texts with a strong Ovidian influence. These include the four core Roman plays (*Titus Andronicus*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Julius Caesar*, *Coriolanus*) as well as the narrative poems *Rape of Lucrece* and *Venus and Adonis*; the Coda discusses *Cymbeline* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. With the exception of the comedy set in Athens, all of these works of course feature Roman settings and/or characters and in this sense the study demonstrates how centrally Ovid's legacy figures across the nearly full spectrum of Shakespeare's renditions of classical Rome. The three-pronged focus on violence, trauma, and virtus at the same time enables Starks-Estes to read what she terms Ovid's "metamorphic poetics" through the lens of modern theoretical approaches, in particular psychoanalysis and trauma studies (55). In its theoretical allegiances, the volume can be said to continue the work begun by Coppélia Kahn in *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women* almost twenty years earlier. Both Starks-Estes and Kahn write to reclaim the body of Shakespeare's Roman works for feminist scholarship as they locate and describe female power and agency in the outwardly masculinist gender politics of the plays and poems.

In *Identity, otherness and empire in Shakespeare's Rome*, edited by Maria Del Sapio Garbero, the contributors approach the topical tripartite focus from an impressive variety of theoretical and thematic angles, including gender and queer studies, psychoanalysis, deconstruction, and global studies. Through their respective critical pathways, the essays refine and apply the approaches more often used in literary studies of early modern multicultural, multilingual, or multinational settings to Shakespeare's ancient Rome. In the

process, the contributors collectively demonstrate that the Roman plays can sustain the full range of critical methodologies commonly deployed elsewhere in the Shakespearean canon and, in this sense, the collection represents perhaps the most interesting output in this subject area for the purposes of our survey.

Shakespeare's engagement with early modern Italy has likewise inspired a number of monographs and edited volumes over the past two decades. The evolution of this subject owes much to the dedication of Michele Marrapodi, who has authored or edited no fewer than 10 volumes on the subject of the relationship between Shakespeare and early modern Italy, several of them available both in English and Italian. The most recent and relevant of these to our European focus are *Shakespeare and the Italian Renaissance: appropriation, transformation, opposition*; *Italian culture in the drama of Shakespeare and his contemporaries: rewriting, remaking, refashioning*; and *Shakespeare, Italy, and Intertextuality*. The three edited collections offer an impressive range of arguments about Shakespeare's Italian locations and characters, including not only the traditionally 'Italian plays' but also *Hamlet* (who refers to himself at one point as "more an antique Roman than a Dane" (5.2.341) and *The Tempest* (which features Italian characters dislocated from Italy). Reviews of these collections sometimes mention that their considerable heterogeneity renders it difficult to identify arguments and conclusions that would hold across the individual essays let alone for each volume as a whole. We want to suggest, however, that their strength lies precisely in the range of approaches and viewpoints generated by the cosmopolitan and cross-generational casts of contributors and that the resulting wealth of readings mirrors the copia of Shakespeare's Italian worlds and their vast interpretive possibilities. All three collections belong to the "Anglo-Italian Renaissance Studies" series, launched in 2009 and edited for Routledge by Marrapodi. One other title from this series deserves to be mentioned here. Michael Redmond's *Shakespeare, Politics, and Italy: Intertextuality on the Jacobean Stage*

represents an important contribution to the study of Shakespeare's use of Italian contexts. Its subject is the influence of early modern Italian political theory and practice on Jacobean drama, and specifically the ways in which writings by Italian political thinkers, including Machiavelli and Castiglione, crucially shaped notions of nationhood, nationalism, power, and corruption in Jacobean England's drama.

With Shakespeare's Italy proving such a fruitful topic of scholarly investigation over the past forty years, it is not surprising that his treatment of a single Italian city alone has inspired two monographs and one essay collection over the past decade: *Shakespeare and Venice* by Graham Holderness; *A Fury in the Words: Love and Embarrassment in Shakespeare's Venice* by Harry Berger, Jr.; and *Visions of Venice in Shakespeare* edited by Laura Tosi and Shaul Bassi. Tosi and Bassi assume a wide-ranging and inclusive approach to their subject, comparable to the variety found in Marrapodi's volumes discussed above. The Introduction justifies potential contradictions among the collected essays by proposing that "Venice as city state appears to embody the Renaissance culture of paradox, in the way it both flaunts and contains opposite views without offering a solution based on commonly held opinions and/or orthodoxies" (6). The editors also identify "Shakespeare's historical context" as one half of the volume's two-pronged approach to Shakespeare's Venice (the other being its later adaptations) (6). The essay by Holderness on the status of various types of foreigners in Venice and how this complexity is reflected and refracted in *Othello* and *The Merchant of Venice* exemplifies this approach. Holderness' own monograph approaches Shakespeare's Venice as a vast cultural intertext. The majority of the book hypothesises and then explores the processes through which Shakespeare would have acquired and processed information about Venice, focusing especially on how details about the presence of non-Italian foreigners in the city state find their way into the two Venetian tragedies. Berger's monograph, by contrast treats Shakespeare's Venice as a rhetorically and affectively, rather than historically

and culturally, inflected space as it proposes that embarrassment provides the optimal lens for reading the interpersonal dynamics within *Othello* and *The Merchant of Venice*. This study by the veteran Shakespearean does provide many original insights into the internal workings of Shakespeare's Venetian microcosms, despite its ahistorical nature. Finally, there are many indications that the subject of Shakespeare and Italy/Ancient Rome continues to be topical, including several recent special issues of journals devoted to the area, for instance, volume 63 of *Shakespeare Survey*, edited by Peter Holland in 2016.

Although England lost its French lands in the fifteenth century and conceded its last territory, the Pale of Calais, in early 1558, France remained something of a preoccupation for Shakespeare and his contemporaries, as *Representing France and the French in Early Modern English Drama* attests. As its editor Jean-Christophe Mayer remarks, the volume sets out to "break down a number of barriers" (22); it brings together critics working on different aspects of the topic who employ a variety of approaches and methodologies to study a range of dramatists and genres. While this goal may be typical of many an edited collection, it seems a particular characteristic of studies of Shakespeare and Europe. As Shakespeare is imagined to be an outward-looking 'citizen of the world', these studies seek to be correspondingly pluralist and showcase the value of the trans-cultural/national/disciplinary in exploring Shakespeare's interest in, dialogue with, and dependency on Europe and its literatures.

In the editorial Introduction to *Representing France*, Jean-Christophe Mayer draws on the work of Richard Hillman to consider French otherness, asking "is there a specific '*difference* of France'?" and speculating that the "French, surely, cannot be reduced to the 'not-English.'" (25). The two nations shared "cultural ground" and so the French not as different or distant as some other European nationalities. However, the English attitude to the French was ultimately one of "fundamental ambivalence" with their continental neighbours

marked as stylish and cultured, but also as frivolous and fickle. (25). (This raises the question was there a hierarchy of otherness, with some Europeans more foreign than others?) Increasingly, early modern dramatists envisioned France as "synonymous with mutability" and represented it as a "tragic stage […] where France's political turmoil and wars of religion are described as a tragedy involving the whole nation" (26). In different ways, then, the English imagined France as a kind of "walking shadow, a poor player" on the European stage. The individual chapters in *Representing France* examine several Shakespearean dramas, including *All's Well*, *Love's Labour*, *1 Henry VI*, and *Henry V*. In his study of the latter play, Mayer argues that it is a "theatrical attempt to recover a lost English past and to regain a lost territory – France – through the imagination" (128). However, England was caught between a desire to "renew the dialogue with its closest neighbor" and the knowledge that this was wishful thinking (137). This paradox is played out in *Henry V* when the "plurivocality" of the soldiers and nobility from England, France, and the Celtic fringes, unsettles the meaning of the colonialist mission and "confronts [Shakespeare's] audiences with [a] sense of loss", arising from the fracturing of European Christian unity post-Reformation (129-130). This enduring sense of loss incites the English to probe the old wound, to fantasise a reunion, but "the hybrid language that is forged momentarily [in *Henry V*] to constitute the country's identity as a colonial nation contains the seeds of its future divisions" (137).

Like Rome, Greece was of enduring interest to Shakespeare. Athens and its environs are the setting for plays as far apart in tone, date, and popularity as *Dream*, *Timon*, and *Two Noble Kinsmen*, *Pericles* traverses much of the Greek peninsula, *The Comedy of Errors* takes place in Ephesus, and characters from Greek mythology are the focus of *Venus and Adonis* and *Troilus and Cressida*. Shakespeare's Hellenism has, however, suffered from critical neglect, a fact highlighted by Tanya Pollard in a recent essay, where she goes on to declare

that "[t]he moment is long overdue to rewrite the scholarly consensus on the place of Greece in Shakespeare's imagination, as well as that of Renaissance more broadly" (51).[xvii] Focusing on all of the 'Greek' texts, *Shakespeare and Greece*, edited by Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou, goes a long way towards redressing this scholarly lacuna. In their illuminating Introduction, the editors set out the prevailing and notably conflicting views of Greece. For Shakespeare and his contemporaries, Greece was, like France, simultaneously a model to imitate and to avoid. On the one hand, Greece was the foundation of Western civilisation, the wellspring of philosophy, political thought, tragedy, but on the other hand it was corrupt, "a fallen state, currently under Ottoman control, and therefore an exotic, dangerous, 'Other'". Not only an economic and geo-political concern, the status of early modern Greece "disrupted England's effort to achieve a *translatio imperii* by showing that the Christians had already turned Turk, that the binary opposition between Christian Europe and infidel Asia had been subverted" ("Introduction", n.p.). Ultimately, the editors contend, "Greece surfaces as a fluid, multifaceted mosaic that constitutes a formative *stratum* of, and crucible for, early modern literature". The opportunities presented by Greece's complicated status are the focus of several chapters including those by Liz Oakley-Brown, John Drakakis, and Nic Panagopoulos. Findlay's chapter, for example, argues that the depiction of Athens in *Midsummer* and *Two Noble Kinsmen* is "part of a self-conscious process of constructing English or British culture", a process that encouraged English audiences "to reflect on the composition of their own national identity, and how it might be reinvented at one remove from an Athenian prototype" (Ch.7, n.p.). Examined together, the plays reveal the changing perception of Greece in early modern England. While *Midsummer* has its doubts about Athenian society and its ruler Theseus, *Two Noble Kinsmen* presents a forceful critique of "the Athenian model of heroism as a source of tragedy" and it puts forward "a new point of origin or beginning" in an English "literary and cultural tradition headed by Chaucer" (Ch.7,

n.p.). Whereas critics like Clark and Levith (discussed above) viewed Shakespeare's Europeans as mere ciphers of the English, Drakakis is careful to note that the republican Athens of *Timon* is not Shakespeare's London in disguise. Rather, English concerns are transposed to the city and Greek history is used "to examine the past in order to locate the possibilities of [England's] future". In *Timon*'s tragic vision of an Athenian future of "domestic profligacy, and internecine warfare", Drakakis proposes, Shakespeare's audience would see "a vivid and cautionary image of [Jacobean Britain's] own emerging crises" (Ch.5, n.p.).

Spanish characters in Shakespeare are few and far between and have consequently received only limited and sporadic attention.[xviii] Scholarship has instead focused on the canon's reception and performance in Spain.[xix] The 2006 collection *Spanish Studies in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, edited by José Manuel González, aims to show "the maturity and richness of Shakespearean scholarship in Spain" (12) and it includes several chapters on Spanish responses to Shakespeare on the page and stage. More recently, articles by Clara Calvo and José Manuel González, from 2009 and 2012 respectively, also survey this topic, offering the reader insightful and engaging introductions to Shakespeare in Spanish translation, education, visual art, theatre, and film. Clearly, Shakespeare's Spanish afterlives is a fertile and developing field that offers much to scholars. Moreover, as both Calvo and González observe, it is notable that contemporary criticism strives to situate the reception of Shakespeare in Spain within the larger context of European Shakespeare. The fourth centennial of Shakespeare and Cervantes' deaths inspired conferences and publications comparing the two authors, both in their original historical contexts and in their subsequent afterlives.[xx] As González perceptively asserts, in the twenty-first century "appropriating and rewriting Shakespeare is not only an intra-cultural process but also an intercultural one, with

other European countries where Shakespeare has been translated, performed and discussed" (36).

Germany has had a long love affair with Shakespeare on both scholarly and theatrical fronts: in 1796 August Wilhelm Schlegel famously declared the playwright "ganz unser" (entirely ours) and *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* (published since 1865) is the oldest Shakespeare periodical still in circulation. Yet with the exception of the, admittedly intriguing, mention of Wittenberg in *Hamlet*, German locations and characters do not figure in Shakespeare's oeuvre. *Measure for Measure* takes place in Vienna but it is populated by characters bearing Italian names and, while the Viennese setting has often inspired cultural and historical specificity in modern productions, Vienna as depicted by Shakespeare could stand in for any large city in Catholic Europe. Although the original text(s) of *Hamlet* by contrast provides many more particulars about the play's setting, Denmark has figured relatively rarely in the vast body of *Hamlet* scholarship. Discussions of the play's Danish context have appeared mostly in discrete philologically oriented articles addressing the play's relationship to its sources. Lisa Hopkins' work represents a notable exception to this trend, with both her *Drama and the Succession to the Crown, 1561-1633* and *Renaissance Drama on the Edge* discussing *Hamlet*'s setting and its many geographical references. The conference "Shakespeare, the Next 400 Years", which took place at the Kronborg Castle in Helsingør in Denmark in 2014, featured a panel on "Shakespeare, Saxo and Elsinore", dedicated to the Danish setting and sources of *Hamlet*. The region that would have been known to Shakespeare as the Low Countries (comprising roughly the modern Belgium and the Netherlands) stands out as perhaps the most notable absence on the list of places where Shakespeare chose to locate his plays. The Low Countries were highly relevant to Shakespeare's England both politically (its Protestant portion as an ally and the Spanish-occupied one as a Catholic menace) and economically (as a major trading partner and access

point to the continent). Late Elizabethan London also hosted a large Dutch community and many of Shakespeare's fellow playwrights fashioned Dutch characters and settings. This dearth of Dutch characters in Shakespeare is just one of many aspects of the relationship between Shakespeare and this region discussed in "Shakespeare and the Low Countries", a special issue of *Shakespeare Yearbook* edited by Ton Hoenselaars and Holger Klein. Although the volume is primarily concerned with the reception and dissemination of Shakespeare's work and legacy in the region, a few of the essays discuss the relationship in its early modern context, most notably Peter McCluskey's "Sir Edmond Tilney, *Sir Thomas More*, and the Netherlandic immigrant community" and Andrew Fleck's "Fingers of the multitude: Shakespeare, Jonson, and the transformation of news from the low countries".

References to Eastern Europe in Shakespeare's plays are rare. The only nominally Eastern European locale featured directly by Shakespeare is the Bohemia (geographically roughly equivalent to the current Czech Republic and incorrectly endowed by both Shakespeare and his source with a sea-coast) in *The Winter's Tale.* As for Eastern European characters, the Russians in *Love's Labour's Lost* turn out to be fake and the jury is still out on whether Polonius is supposed to be Polish. Poland is mentioned as part of *Hamlet*'s military landscape but all we find is that it is, like the play's Denmark and Norway, cold and politically unstable. The marginal presence of Eastern Europe in Shakespeare's works has meant that there have been few book-length studies on the topic. Monica Matei-Chesnoiu nevertheless chose to make the marginality into a focal point of her study entitled *Early Modern Drama and the Eastern European Elsewhere: Representations of Liminal Locality in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. This volume constitutes the only exhaustive coverage of Shakespeare's Eastern European references and covers both the usual suspects, like *The Winter's Tale*, and less familiar territory, such as the locales found in present-day Romania, mentioned in *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*. The study's overarching trans-

historical perspective usefully highlights how Shakespeare and other early modern English writers were often aware of the long and rich history of what was to them a relatively remote region. As the examples show, this often included an awareness of Eastern Europe as a liminal zone in which Europeans frequently came into contact with people from the Middle East and Central Asia, most notably the Mongols in the thirteenth century and the Ottomans from the fourteenth century on.

In examining Ireland, Scotland, and Wales in Tudor and Stuart Shakespeare, along with Shakespeare's Celtic afterlives, Willy Maley and Rory Loughnane's *Celtic Shakespeare* is indebted to earlier texts such as *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, Politics, Culture*, *Shakespeare and Scotland*, *Archipelagic English* (2008), and *Shakespeare and Wales: From the Marches to the Assembly*. The volume breaks new ground through its multi-national focus, its "[emphasis on] cultural crossovers and crucibles of conflict" (12), and its strident assertion of the value of "cross-comparison between Scottish, Welsh, and Irish treatments in Shakespeare's writing" (21). The essays gainfully address a broad range of topics from Senecan traditions in *Macbeth*, to Spenserian politics in *Venus and Adonis*, to the old Welsh woman in *Henry VIII*. In his engaging Prologue, John Kerrigan asks "So how Celtic was Shakespeare?" (xli). As Kerrigan demonstrates, 'Celtic' was a complex and mercurial category in the period. Taking up the difficult task of definition, the editors' Introduction explores a range of texts and identifies two categories of thought on the Celtic; one defined "Celtic in terms of French difference" while the other endorsed "an idea of a shared heritage, notionally described as Celtic or Old British" (3). As the individual chapters demonstrate in different ways, reflecting on Celtic Shakespeare is important for two reasons. Firstly, it "reminds us how misleading it is to confine archipelagic accounts of [Shakespeare's] drama to the three kingdoms of England/Wales, Scotland and Ireland" (xxiv) and, secondly, it draws attention to "the distinctness of identities around the edges of Elizabethan England that were

not readily absorbable into James VI and I's 'Great Britain'" (xxv). Writing on the scene in *1 Henry IV* where the Welsh Lady sings, Kerrigan notes that this is a moment of "cultural and linguistic alterity" but, more importantly, it is "otherness by degrees, between English, Welsh translated into Anglo-Welsh, and Welsh, which draws us into the Celtic and nowhere cuts off human interconnectivity" (xxxviii). Unsurprisingly, interconnectivity is of recurring interest in recent studies of Shakespeare and Europe. Shakespeare's depictions of difference are examined, but the commonalities and shared histories of the English and the Europeans are also acknowledged and explored. Across the early modern period and its literature, there are "opposing tendencies of cosmopolitanism and xenophobia in […] English attitudes to foreigners both home and abroad" (Singh, 8). Contemporary criticism, like *Celtic Shakespeare*, shows the value of being mindful that England did not exist in isolation and there is no 'grand narrative' that charts a straightforward progression (acceptance, integration, assimilation etc.) or declinism (discrimination, oppression, fear etc.) in responses to the European other.

Conclusion

Writing in 2001, Keith Gregor proposed that the "changing circumstances of millen[n]ial Europe, together with Britain's own redefinition of its relation to the continent and indeed to its own unity, are sufficient indices of the probable genesis of yet more and radically undomesticated Shakespeares" (x [sic.]) As we have suggested throughout this article, the definitions of 'Europe' and 'Shakespeare' are mutable, shifting in response to societal changes and political circumstances. Consequently, European Shakespeare is a constantly evolving, rich field of study where much work is yet to be done.

The areas of translation, performance, and reception will certainly continue to grow, and new and interesting connections between Shakespeare and European authors (such as Cervantes), traditions (such as commedia dell'arte), and histories (such as those by Saxo Grammaticus and Plutarch) will undoubtedly emerge. Although much scholarship on Shakespeare and Europe has been nation-centred, and the popularity of this topic shows no sign of abating, it is noticeable that recent studies have turned their attention to pan-European issues such as language, immigration, and identity and alterity. Andrew Hadfield and Paul Hammond's *Shakespeare and Renaissance Europe* endeavours "to illuminate our understanding of the impact of Europe on Shakespeare's life as a writer", providing valuable context by exploring Shakespeare's knowledge of European literature, English contact with Europeans and their 'others', politics in early modern Europe, and the staging of its imagined and 'real' geographies (17). Although Shakespeare tends to engage with an idea of Europe, rather than precisely address its contemporary political and geographical realities, the volume convincingly elucidates his awareness of and indebtedness to the current affairs, history, and culture of Europe. Supranational themes are also addressed in texts such as Ruben Espinoza and David Ruiter's *Shakespeare and Immigration*, Ton Hoenselaars and Dirk Delabastita's *Multilingualism in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, Marianne Montgomery's *Europe's Languages on England's Stages, 1590–1620*, Marianne Novy's *Shakespeare and Outsiders*, and Jean E. Howard's *Theater of a City: the Places of London Comedy, 1598-1642*.[xxi] Howard's volume, with its subject of the so-called city or London comedy, may not at first sound like a title relevant to our interest in Shakespeare and Europe. Yet this wide-ranging study offers many novel insights into the European angles in several of Shakespeare's plays as well as into the theatre scene within which Shakespeare directly operated. Howard discusses not only the integration and alienation of European foreigners in Shakespeare's sole city comedy, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, but also in *Measure for*

Measure, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*. The focus of some pan-European Shakespeare works has also encompassed broad scholarly trends such as gender studies, critical history, and war studies. European women, for instance, are the subject of a forthcoming Special Issue of *Early Modern Literary Studies*, with essays on Danish, Dutch, French, Italian, Jewish, Saxon, Scottish, and Spanish women in the works of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. The edited collection *Shakespeare and European Politics* traverses the politics of the Reformation, the Age of Napoleon, two World Wars, European unification, and the September 11 attacks to explore diverse political appropriations and ideological uses of Shakespeare across Europe. As Ton Hoenselaars insists in the foreword, collectively the essays in this volume showcase that European Shakespeare is a rapidly expanding, "vital site of cultural exchange best brought into focus simultaneously from inside out and outside in" (Delabastita, De Vos, and Franssen, 11). Moreover, throughout the editors are encouragingly sensitive to the importance and intricacies of their subject. They refuse to use legerdemain to replace 'English' Shakespeare with 'European' Shakespeare, and call instead for a careful examination of "'English,' 'European,' 'universal,' and other national and international identities, myths, and constituencies […] with due acknowledgement of their often elusive complexity and their dynamic interdependence" (13-14). While the future of the EU is uncertain and the identity of 'Europe' is metamorphosing as we speak, these pan-European studies – diverse in their composition and critical analyses, attuned to the complexities of their topics, committed to reassessing old assumptions and opening up new fields of enquiry – give much hope for the future of European Shakespeare.

Works cited

"Europe, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, June 2017. Web. 19 July 2017.

"European Shakespeare: A Brief History." *European Shakespeare Research Association*, <https://www.um.es/shakespeare/esra/history.php>

"European, adj. and n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, June 2017. Web. 19 July 2017.

"Shakespeare in European Culture: A Bibliography." *Ton Hoenselaars*. <http://www.let.uu.nl/~ton.hoenselaars/personal/european%20bibliography.html>

"Shakespeare in Ireland." *The American Shakespeare Magazine*. 4. (Feb. 1898): 54.

"The Shakespearean Drama in Continental Europe (Report of a lecture of Mr. Sidney Lee at Toynbee Hall)." *The American Shakespeare Magazine*. 4. (Feb. 1898): 53-54.

"Yanis Varoufakis on Brexit: 'How can these smart people be so deluded' - BBC Newsnight." *YouTube*, May 3, 2017. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N3zjLfSlaPg&t=3s>

Berger, Harry Jr. *A Fury in the Words: Love and Embarrassment in Shakespeare's Venice*. Fordham, 2013.

Bourus, Terri and Gary Taylor, eds. *The Creation and Re-Creation of Cardenio: Performing Shakespeare, Transforming Cervantes*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Boyd, Brian. "Mutius: An Obstacle Removed in *Titus Andronicus*." *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 55. Iss. 219, 2004, pp. 196-209.

Burnett, Mark Thornton and Ramona Wray, eds. *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, Politics, Culture*. Macmillan, 1997.

Calvo, Clara. "Shakespeare in Spain. Current Research Trends." *Literature Compass*, vol. 6. Iss. 4, 2009, pp. 942-956.

Carnegie, David and Gary Taylor, eds. *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, & the Lost Play*. Oxford UP, 2012.

Chernaik, Warren L. *The myth of Rome in Shakespeare and his contemporaries*. Cambridge UP, 2011.

Clark, Cumberland. *Shakespeare and National Character: A Study of Shakespeare's Knowledge and Dramatic and Literary Use of the Distinctive Racial Characteristics of the Different Peoples of the World*. Haskell House Publ., 1932.

Delabastita, Dirk. "Anthologies, Translations, and European Identities." *Shakespeare and European Politics*. Eds. Dirk Delabastita, Jozef De Vos and Paul Franssen. U of Delaware Press, 2008.

Delabastita, Dirk, and Jozef De Vos and Paul Franssen, eds. *Shakespeare and European Politics*. U of Delaware Press, 2008.

Delabastita, Dirk and Lieven d'Hulst, eds. *European Shakespeares: Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age*. John Benjamins, 1993.

Del Sapio Garbero, Maria. *Identity, otherness and empire in Shakespeare's Rome*. Routledge, 2016.

Dente, Carla and Sara Soncini. *Shakespeare and Conflict: A European Perspective*. Palgrave, 2013.

Dickson, Andrew. "Brexit, pursued by a bear." *The Guardian*, 23 July 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/jul/23/boris-johnson-shakespeare-biography-brexit-riddle-of-genius>

Dobson, Michael and Stanley Wells, eds. *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*. Oxford UP, 2001.

Dobson, Michael. "What did Europe mean to Shakespeare?" *British Council*, 8 July 2016. <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/what-did-europe-mean-shakespeare>

Espinoza, Ruben and David Ruiter, eds. *Shakespeare and Immigration*. Routledge, 2014.
Findlay, Alison and Vassiliki Markidou, eds. *Shakespeare and Greece*. Arden Shakespeare, 2017.
Fleck, Andrew. "Fingers of the multitude: Shakespeare, Jonson, and the transformation of news from the low countries." "Shakespeare and the Low Countries." *Shakespeare Yearbook*. Eds. Ton Hoenselaars and Holger Klein, vol. 15, 2005, pp. 89-111.
Garcia, Melodie. "Don Adriano de Armado: a Spanish Character on the English Stage." *Actes des congrès de la Société française Shakespeare*, vol. 32, 2015, pp. 1-21.
"Germany." *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*. Oxford UP, 2015. *Oxford Reference*. 2015. <http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780198708735.001.0001/acref-9780198708735-e-1155>
Gollancz, Israel. *A Book of Homage to Shakespeare*. Oxford UP, 1916.
González, José Manuel. "Nothing like the Sun: Shakespeare in Spain Today." *Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance*, vol. 9, Iss. 24, 2012, pp. 34-52.
---, ed. *Spanish Studies in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. Associated University Presses, 2006.
Gregor, Keith. "Introduction: More European Shakespeares." *More European Shakespeares*. Eds. Keith Gregor and Ángel Luis Pujante. *Cuadernos de Filología Inglesa*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2001, pp. VII–XIII.
Hadfield, Andrew, and Paul Hammond, eds. *Shakespeare and Renaissance Europe*. Arden, 2004.
Hendricks, Margo. "Surveying 'race' in Shakespeare." Shakespeare and Race. Eds. Catherine M. S. Alexander and Stanley Wells. Cambridge UP, 2000.
Hoenselaars, A. J.. *Images of Englishmen and Foreigners in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. Associated University Presses, 1992.
Hoenselaars, A. J., ed. *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation*, Arden Shakespeare, 2004.
Hoenselaars, Ton and Clara Calvo. "European Shakespeare on Either Side of the Channel." *Shakespeare*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2007, pp. 102-107.
---. "European Shakespeare: From strength to strength." *Cahiers Élisabéthains*, vol. 70, no. 1, 2006, pp. 43-45.
Hoenselaars, Ton and Dirk Delabastita, eds. *Multilingualism in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. John Benjamins, 2015.
Hoenselaars, Ton and Holger Klein, eds. "Shakespeare and the Low Countries." *Shakespeare Yearbook*, vol. 15, 2005.
Holderness, Graham. *Shakespeare and Venice*. Ashgate, 2010.
Honigmann, E. A. J. "Shakespeare, Sir Thomas More and Asylum Seekers." *Shakespeare Survey*, vol. 57, 2004, pp. 226-35.
Hopkins, Lisa. *Renaissance Drama on the Edge: Border Crossings in the Tragedies and the Henriad*. Ashgate, 2014; reprinted by Routledge 2014.
---. *Drama and the Succession to the Crown, 1561-1633*. Ashgate, 2011; reprinted by Routledge 2011.
Howard, Jean E. *Theater of a City: the Places of London Comedy, 1598-1642*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2007.
Hunter, G. K. "Elizabethans and Foreigners." *Shakespeare Survey*, vol. 17, 1964, pp. 37-52.
Innes, Paul. *Shakespeare's Roman Plays*. Palgrave, 2015.
Jackson, Macdonald P. "Stage Directions and Speech Headings in Act 1 of *Titus Andronicus* Q (1594): Shakespeare or Peele?" *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. 49, 1996, pp. 134-48.

---. “Shakespeare’s Brothers and Peele’s Brethren: *Titus Andronicus* again.” *Notes and Queries*, vol. 242, 1997, pp. 494-5.
Johnson-Haddad, Miranda. “Reviewed Works: *Italian Drama in Shakespeare’s Time* by Louise George Clubb; *Shakespeare’s Italian Settings and Plays* by Murray J. Levith.” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 43, no. 2, 1992, pp. 253-257.
Kahn, Coppélia. *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women.* Routledge, 1997.
---. “Remembering Shakespeare Imperially: The 1916 Tercentenary.” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 52, no. 4, 2001, pp. 456-478.
Kermode, Lloyd Edward. *Aliens and Englishness in Elizabethan Drama*. Cambridge UP, 2009.
Kerrigan, John. *Revenge Tragedy: Aeschylus to Armageddon*. Clarendon Press, 1996.
Koster, Edward B. *William Shakespeare: Gedenkboek, 1616-1916*. Kottmann, 1916.
Levith, Murray J. *Shakespeare’s Italian Settings and Plays*. Macmillan, 1989.
Loughnane, Rory. “Re-editing Non-Shakespeare for the Modern Reader: The Murder of Mutius in *Titus Andronicus*.” *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 68, no. 284, 2017, pp. 268–295.
Loughnane, Rory and Willy Maley, eds. *Celtic Shakespeare: The Bard and the Borderers*. Ashgate, 2013.
McCluskey, Peter. “Sir Edmond Tilney, Sir Thomas More, and the Netherlandic immigrant community.” “Shakespeare and the Low Countries.” *Shakespeare Yearbook*. Eds. Ton Hoenselaars and Holger Klein, vol. 15, 2005, pp. 49-64.
Maley, Willy and Andrew Murphy, eds. *Shakespeare and Scotland*. MUP, 2005.
Maley, Willy and Philip Schwyzer, eds. *Shakespeare and Wales: From the Marches to the Assembly*. Routledge 2010.
Marrapodi, Michele, ed. *Italian culture in the drama of Shakespeare and his contemporaries: rewriting, remaking, refashioning*. Ashgate, 2007; reprinted by Routledge 2016.
---. *Shakespeare and the Italian Renaissance: appropriation, transformation, opposition*. Ashgate, 2014; reprinted by Routledge 2016.
---. *Shakespeare, Italy, and Intertextuality*. Palgrave, 2004.
Marrapodi, Michele and A. J. Hoenselaars, eds. *The Italian world of English Renaissance Drama*, U of Delaware P, 1998.
Marrapodi, Michele, A. J. Hoenselaars, Marcello Cappuzzo, L. Falzon Santucci, eds. *Shakespeare’s Italy: Functions of Italian Locations in Renaissance Drama*, Manchester UP, 1997.
Matei-Chesnoiu, Monica. *Early Modern Drama and the Eastern European Elsewhere: Representations of Liminal Locality in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. Farleigh Dickinson, 2009.
Mayer, Jean-Christophe, ed. *Representing France and the French in Early Modern English Drama*. Associated University Presses, 2008.
Miola, Robert. *Shakespeare’s Rome*. Cambridge UP, 1983.
Montgomery, Marianne. *Europe’s Languages on England’s Stages, 1590–1620*. Ashgate, 2012.
Mustanoja, Tauno. “Shakespeare in Finland.” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 2, 1983, pp. 239-240.
Novy, Marianne. *Shakespeare and Outsiders*. Oxford UP, 2013.
O’Neill, Stephen. “In fair [Europe], where we lay our scene.” *Romeo and Juliet in European Culture*. Eds. Juan F. Cerdá, Dirk Delabastita, and Keith Gregor. John Benjamins, 2017.

Pollard, Tanya. “Romancing the Greeks: *Cymbeline*’s Genres and Models.” *How To Do Things With Shakespeare: New Approaches, New Essays*. Ed. Laurie Maguire. Blackwell, 2008, pp. 34-53.
---. *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages*. Cambridge UP, 2017.
Pujante, Ángel Luis and Ton Hoenselaars, eds. *400 Years of Shakespeare in Europe*, U of Delaware Press, 2003.
Redmond, Michael. *Shakespeare, Politics, and Italy: Intertextuality on the Jacobean Stage*, Routledge, 2009.
Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works*. 2nd edition, Gen. Ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford UP, 2005.
Singh, Jyotsna G., ed. *A Companion to the Global Renaissance: English literature and culture in the era of expansion*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
Sokol, B. J. *Shakespeare and Tolerance*. Cambridge UP, 2008.
Starks-Estes, Lisa. *Violence, Trauma, and Virtus in Shakespeare's Roman Poems and Plays*: *Transforming Ovid*. Palgrave, 2014.
Taylor, Gary and Gabriel Egan, eds. *New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion*. Oxford UP, 2017.
Tosi, Laura and Shaul Bassi, eds. *Visions of Venice in Shakespeare*. Ashgate, 2011.
Wells, Stanley. “Shakespeare, Man of the European Renaissance.” *Renaissance Shakespeare: Shakespeare Renaissances: Proceedings of the Ninth World Shakespeare Congress*. Ed. Martin Procházka et al. Rowman and Littlefield, 2013, pp. 3-18.

---

[i] The shape and borders of Europe were also contested, debated, and imagined as under threat in the early modern period. Hadfield and Hammond observe that the boundaries between Europe and Russia and between Europe and the Ottoman Empire were particularly opaque (6-10). In a forthcoming book chapter, Stephen O’Neill discusses how digital cultures further complicate Europe’s boundaries and the notion of a “European Shakespeare” (2017).

[ii] See Delabastita for a considered discussion of the problems of defining Europe and its imagined, potential ‘others’ (356-359).

[iii] For more on the history and development of the European Shakespeare Research Association, see Hoenselaars and Calvo’s article in an earlier issue of this journal.

[iv] *The Tempest* is an exception. In Act 2, Sebastian sets up Europe in opposition to Africa, where Alonso has sent his only daughter (2.1.129-131). The other seven plays which employ the word “Europe” are *Cymbeline*, *Henry IV Part 1* and *Part 2* (on two occasions), *Henry V* (on two occasions), *Henry VI Part 1* and *Part 3*, and *The Winter’s Tale*.

[v] For an overview of the translation, reception, and performance of Shakespeare in individual nations or specific regions, see entries for e.g. “Germany”, “Scandinavia” etc. in *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*. For an annotated reading list on Shakespeare and Europe, see the website “Shakespeare in European Culture: A Bibliography.”

[vi] Gollancz’s book may have excluded an entry in the German language but, as we discuss below, Shakespeare was immensely popular in Germany from at least the late eighteenth century onward. Indeed, by the beginning of the twentieth century, Shakespeare had been adopted “as the ‘third German classic’ (alongside Goethe and Schiller)”, while “during the Third Reich”, Shakespeare’s tragedies were of interest with plays such as *The Merchant of Venice* “recommended for anti-semitic propaganda” (“Germany”).

[vii] This appears to be the case at least in literary scholarship, though not so elsewhere. See Dobson, 2016.

[viii] Shakespeare’s Englishness has occasionally been treated with scepticism. See Margaret Tudeau-Clayton and Willy Maley, eds. *This England, that Shakespeare: New Angles on Englishness and the Bard*. Ashgate, 2010.

[ix] Charles Moline Haines’ *Shakespeare in France: Criticism, Voltaire To Victor Hugo* (OUP, 1925) had appeared in 1925 as part of a monograph series edited by Israel Gollancz and focussed specifically on the engagement of French thinkers with Shakespeare in the 18th and 19th centuries. Haines' book overlaps significantly with the LeWinter’s anthology, although the former is more detailed due to its single-nation focus.

[x] For a recent discussion of the novel ideas in and datedness of Hunter's article, see Hendricks (2000).
[xi] Nationalism perhaps underlies some nation-centred studies of Shakespeare's European afterlives, as critics endeavoured to show their "native culture was quick enough to respond to Shakespeare's genius, and that in due course and despite many obstacles it developed a tradition of Shakespeare reception" to rival that of other nations (Delabastita, 347).
[xii] For instance, Paul Cantor's *Shakespeare's Rome: Republic and Empire* (1976) focuses on *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*.
[xiii] See also the essays on *Titus* in the *New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion* (2017).
[xiv] For some publications, A. J. Hoenselaars' first name is listed as Ton.
[xv] Kermode similarly argues for a similar progression, with earlier Elizabethan drama portraying contact with the 'other' as dangerous and unwelcome and later Elizabethan dramas typically showing such contact as desirable and necessary (4).
[xvi] Portugal, for instance, is mentioned only twice in Shakespeare's corpus and is thus omitted here.
[xvii] Pollard's recently published volume *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages* argues convincingly that early modern English drama was strongly influenced by Greek literature.
[xviii] However, *Henry VIII*'s Catherine of Aragon has featured prominently in some essay-length studies. A recent article by Melodie Garcia on *Love's Labour's Lost*'s Don de Armado is further evidence of the growing scholarly interest in Shakespeare's Spanish characters.
[xix] Large-scale projects of note in this area include *Shakespeare in Spain: An Annotated Bilingual Bibliography* (2014) and "Shakespeare in Spain: within the framework of his European Reception".
[xx] These conferences included "Shakespeare, Cervantes, and the Golden Age of Drama" at the University of Leiden, "Spain and England in the Age of Cervantes and Shakespeare" at the University of Pennsylvania, "Worlds of Shakespeare and Cervantes" at the University of Buffalo, "Cervantes and Shakespeare: A Transnational Conversation" at the Newberry Library, "Cervantes+Shakespeare 1616-2016" in Valladolid, and "Symposium on Shakespeare and Cervantes" at Exeter College Oxford. Numerous publications resulting from these events are in preparation. Shakespeare's *Cardenio* and its connections to Cervantes have also come in for renewed scholarly scrutiny in recent years. For more, see Carnegie and Taylor (2012) and Bourus and Taylor (2013).
[xxi] The authors wish to thank and acknowledge the publishers for review copies of the following books: *Shakespeare and European Politics* edited by Delabastita et al. and Howard's *Theater of a City*.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in the journal *Shakespeare* in 2018, available at: https://doi.org/[https://doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2017.1421701 .

Edel Semple & Ema Vyroubalová (2018) "Shakespeare and Early Modern Europe: A Critical Survey", *Shakespeare*, 14:1, 80-96, DOI: 10.1080/17450918.2017.1421701