A Strange-disposed Time: *Julius Caesar* and Fascism

Elisa Fortunato
University of Bari (Italy)

Censorship is a practice undertaken by a given society at a given moment in time. It materializes either through repressive cultural, aesthetic and linguistic measures or through economic pressure.[1] In my paper, I will discuss a less blatant form of control, that peculiar phenomenon of self-censorship which took place in Italy during the first decade of Fascist domination, before the promulgation of racial laws (1938), when censorship became overt and coercive. In particular, I analyze the reception through translations of the full text of *Julius Caesar* by William Shakespeare, which, interestingly, was translated several times during the regime, but put on stage only once, in 1935.

Two important facts made this play easily "translatable": Caesar embodied the myth of Roman spirit, and Shakespeare's work was a classic and "universally recognized as such" (as we read in a circular from the Minister of Popular Culture, Dino Alfieri, to the prefects).[2] On the other hand, the dangerous question about power portrayed in the play, which materializes when Caesar's corpse, covered with blood, is shown on the stage, is likely to have acted as a powerful

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 17, 95-107
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

reminder to the audience of the possibility of rebellion. It is precisely for this reason that I believe the play was not produced on stage until 1935.

During the Fascist regime, translations became a political issue and were framed in terms of a trade war. The common political discourse made reference to the import and export of intellectual products and to a "trade balance," which needed to be redressed in favor of Italian intellectual production. In general, the regime was "disturbed by the idea of Italy being an excessively *receptive* culture,"[3] with an exaggerated enthusiasm for all things coming from abroad and with translations being a threatening sign of this very weakness. Available data show that Italy published more translations than any other country in the world at the time, and that between 1933 and 1934 translations from English tripled.[4] Despite these concerns, however, the regime was unwilling to stop the translation industry because it could have triggered the exclusion of Italy from the international debate and from a growing business.

The Italian Fascist dictatorship, therefore, had an ambiguous attitude towards translations. According to the famous magazine of the publishers' association (*Il Giornale della libreria*), the three pillars of the Italian autarchy were "to give value and power to books and magazines, to exclude things carefully in defence of the national interest, and to absorb all activities, including those coming from abroad, which could contribute to the creation of a modern society"[5] Translating novels became one means to "absorb" and "include" the *other* into Italian culture, a way to "cannibalize" it (using Bassnett's term).[6]

Broadly speaking, it is possible to divide the period from 1929 to 1943 into two phases: an initial phase when, although with some disapproval vis-à-vis the influx of foreign literature, the regime neither cared enough about nor was organized enough to attempt to inhibit the increasing influx; and a second phase, from 1935 onwards, when the

Press Office became the Ministry for Press and Propaganda, and censorship and repression of freedom became more and more common practice, a phase which culminated in 1938 with the introduction of the Fascist Racial Laws. Yet, as Nancy Eisenberg notes, Shakespeare's work proliferated: "Between 1924 and 1925 at least thirteen new translations of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* appeared in print throughout the Italian peninsula, and at least forty editions, including new translations and reprints published during Mussolini's twenty-year rule, have survived."[7]

The fact that Shakespeare's work might find a place in Italian Fascism's program of cultural propaganda is not in itself remarkable, being part of the jingoistic use of the Bard during the regime. Eisenberg continues: "Youngsters with their impressionable minds fired up by all the glorified facts about the Regime's radiant legacy would read Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* and, according to plan, come to adore the legendary Roman hero and through him their current day ruler."[8] Shakespeare's play was read as a way to glorify Roman qualities, voluntarily forgetting the dangerous questions about power and conspiracy that the play contains. This superficial reading explains why, although *Julius Caesar* translations increased precisely during Fascism, the play was performed only once during this period (in 1935 by Tamberlani).

The act of translating is by definition an act of manipulation,[9] while on stage, the "props" are not concealable (i.e., Julius Caesar's corpse). Scholars find a deep and complex relationship between theatre and cultural memory. In her introduction to *Shakespeare and the Second World War,* Irena R. Makaryk explains, "Theatre, as a simulacrum of the cultural and historical process itself, seeking to depict the full range of human actions within their physical context, has always provided society with the most tangible records of its attempts to understand its own operations. It is the repository of cultural memory, but, like the memory of each individual, it is also subject to continual adjustment and

modification as the memory is recalled in new circumstances and contexts."[10] From this point of view, the history of the accuracy and adequacy of the translations of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* released during Fascism could therefore be quite revealing as they help us understand that an apparently contradictory system of surveillance and punishment was in place under the Fascist Regime.

During the two decades of the Regime, Mussolini used the "'Caesarean model' of leadership as the background for his political project of establishing a 'Modern Roman Empire' and of becoming himself a 'Modern Caesar.'"[11] Mussolini formally came to power with the march to Rome, which took place from October 22 to 29, 1922. It was thought to mirror, even in its itinerary, Julius Caesar's crossing the Rubicon in 49 BC. Mussolini looked at ancient Rome with its *romanitas* and its powerful armies as models of strength, discipline, and skill. As a consequence of this "appropriation," the study of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* was included in the middle school curriculum as part of the study of Roman history.[12] Furthermore, *Julius Caesar* "was considered one of Shakespeare's most accessible plays with its seemingly stylistic simplicity, and its lack, in comparison to other Shakespeare's plays, of lasciviousness and obscenity. . . . But more important in the context at hand were *Julius Caesar*'s roots in great Latin texts and its recreation of a chapter in the life of the greatest of Roman heroes."[13]

The web of institutes of censorship failed to understand the true meaning of the play, getting lost in the complexity of the characters' relationships among themselves and of each character with History. In this play, every character, from Brutus to Cassius, from Caesar to Antony, is torn between public and personal motives. A pervasive sense of divergence lies between the image every character, obliged by the force of circumstances, presents to the world and the reality of what he is in fact (this is true in particular for the male characters). Caesar and Brutus are the most troubled

and intense male characters, both of them crushed by the mechanism of History, which determines their historical role and which they cannot stop or change. For example, Caesar's physical vulnerability inversely mirrors, in most of the Italian translators' notes and critical introductions of those years, his moral grandeur.[14] As a consequence, the words of Cassius in act 1, scene 2, when he begins manipulating Brutus with his negative account of Caesar, were not perceived as a way of belittling Caesar's image,[15] but rather as Cassius's invention to accomplish his malignant plan.

> I know that virtue to be in you, Brutus, (90)
> As well as I do know your outward favour.
> Well, honour is the subject of my story.
> I cannot tell what you and other men
> Think of this life; but for my single self
> I had as lief not be as live to be (95)
> In awe of a such a thing as I myself.
> I was born free as Caesar, so were you;
> We both have fed as well, and we can both
> Endure the winter's cold as well as he.
> For once, upon a raw and gusty day, (100)
> The troubled Tiber chafing with her shores,
> Caesar said to me, "Dar'st thou, Cassius, now
> Leap in with me into this angry flood
> And swim to yonder point?" Upon the word,
> Accoutered as I was, I plunged in (105)
> And bade him follow; so indeed he did.
> The torrent roared, and we did buffet it
> With lusty sinews, throwing it aside,
> And stemming it with hearts of controversy.
> But ere we could arrive the point proposed, (110)
> Caesar cried, 'Help me, Cassius, or I sink!'
> I, as Aeneas, our great ancestor,
> Did from the flames of Troy upon his shoulder
> The old Anchises bear, so from the waves of Tiber
> Did I the tired Caesar: and this man (115)
> Is now become a god, and Cassius is
> A wretched creature, and must bend his body

If Caesar carelessly but nod on him.
He had a fever when he was in Spain,
And when the fit was on him I did mark (120)
How he did shake. 'Tis true, this god did shake:
His coward lips did from their color fly,
And that same eye, whose bend doth awe the world,
Did lose his lustre: I did hear him groan:
Ay, and that tongue of his that bade the Romans (125)
Mark him, and write his speeches in their books,
"Alas," it cried, "give me some drink, Titinus,"
As a sick girl. Ye gods, it doth amaze me
A man of such a feeble temper should
So get the start of the majestic world (130)
And bear the palm alone." (1.2. 90-131)[16]

It is particularly interesting to underline how Avancini and Piccoli, who both translated Julius Caesar in 1925, failed to render the high poetical language of Shakespeare, giving the Italian reader two plain, unemotional translations of this passage. What is even more interesting is that they both felt the urge to add several explanatory notes. Avancini, for example, glosses lines 97-99 with this explanation: "There is in Cassius, beyond his love for freedom, a sinister and deep envy toward Caesar."[17] Similarly, Piccoli provides an explanation for lines 110-15, revealing that "this race between Cassius and Caesar is an invention of the poet, for the historians record how Caesar had saved his own life and his *Commentari*, by swimming in the port of Alexandria."[18]

Moreover, in all the critical introductions to the translations issued in these years of Fascism, the tyrannicide is called *murder* or *assassination* and Caesar is a hero, not a tyrant, while Brutus is an assassin, not a patriot. The translators are all voluntarily blind to the text's complexities and to the world it creates, a world where all who rule are weak or ill. The image of illness and the theme of disease run continuously through the play: Caesar suffers from the "falling sickness," "fever," "deafness"; his wife Calphurnia is "sterile"; Cassius suffers from "shortsightedness," Casca and

Caius Ligarius from "ague"; Brutus cannot sleep at night, and his wife Portia fears he is ill; Portia herself is running a high fever from the wound she has inflicted on herself.

As Cicero remarked to Casca, "Indeed it is a strange-disposed time. / But men may construe things after their fashion / Clean from the purpose of the things themselves" (1.3.33-35). In the *strange-disposed time* of Fascism, the readers of *Julius Caesar* were guided through the text in order to appreciate "the ruling force of Caesar.[19] Muccioli, in the introduction to his translation published in 1924, goes one step further, explaining that the true hero of the play is "Caesar's spirit which powerfully dominates the entire drama" and highlights the way in which Caesar "saved" and "consolidated" the empire. The translator continues by recognizing the weaknesses and frailty in Shakespeare's Caesar, but carefully confutes all of them: "The Poet shows a man fully/totally different from the true/actual Caesar."[20] Muccioli levels the character's complexity and in doing so gives the Italian reader a flat character, who lacks interior dilemma and inner world.

Within the 130 lines he speaks, the speech of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar is always elevated, even when he talks to his wife. He is authoritative, imposing and speaks in aphorisms;[21] "in a play given almost wholly to oratory and persuasion, the titular hero does not persuade."[22] He depicts himself as "constant as the northern star, / Of whose true-fixed and resting quality / There is no fellow in the firmament" (3.1.60-62); but his constancy does not survive his wife's pleading that he not go to the Senate house, nor Decius's counter-plea (2.2). Act 2, scene 2, in which Caesar is persuaded, against his deepest will, to go to the Capitol is indeed revealing. As Calpurnia, shaken by premonitions which the elements confirm, presses him to stay at home, he clings obstinately to his determination, repeating the sentence, "Caesar shall go forth" three times (2.2.10, 28, and 48); but then, after less than eight lines, he acquiesces ("Mark

Antony shall say I am not well" [2.2.55]). Even if he adds the excuse that it is the frailty of others that has imposed this change of plan ("And for thy humour I will stay at home" [2.2.56]), he reveals himself to be less "constant"than he intends to be. The arrival of Decius, who will change the interpretation of Calpurnia's ill-fated premonitions—turning them propitious—is even more revealing of Caesar's inner war, torn as he is between his ambition to be crowned and his inner uncertainty.

Brutus's rhetoric is also a key aspect of the text. Brutus is the counterpart of Caesar as Shakespeare gives him the same, or even more, depth and calibre. His language mirrors his inner dilemma, which is even more excruciating than Caesar's. All the translations released during the Fascist Regime largely failed to render his being "with himself at war" (1.2.46). His inner world in conflict with itself, he fights the *shadow* shown in Cassius's lines, "And it is very much lamented, Brutus, / That you have no such mirrors as will turn / Your hidden worthiness into your eye, / That you might see your shadow" (1.2.55-58). The *shadow* Cassius creates here means *reflection*, according to a subsidiary and not infrequent use cited in the *Oxford English Dictionary:* "Shadow . . . 5. A reflected image." Cassius is not projecting Brutus's inner world out, but is rather creating a new Brutus, as if he were Brutus's mirror returning him a new image of himself. Muccioli, Cesareo, Piccoli and Ricci translated *shadow* with the Italian *ombra*,[23] thus losing the mirror metaphor, and Angeli and Avancini chose the Italian *imagine*, which also does not render Shakespeare's metaphor. They all soften the role Cassius plays in the conspiracy, and in doing so, increase Brutus's.

In act 2, scene 1, Brutus has come to a decision and speaks his famous twenty lines:

> It must be by his death: and for my part (10)
> I know no personal cause to spurn at him
> But for the general. He would be crowned:
> How that might change his nature, there's the question.

It is the bright day that brings forth the adder,
And that craves wary walking. Crown him—that, (15)
And then I grant we put a sting in him
That at his will he may do danger with.
Th'abuse of greatness is when it disjoins
Remorse from power; and to speak truth of Caesar
I have not known when his affections swayed (20)
More than his reason. But 'tis a common proof
That lowliness is young ambition's ladder
Whereto the climber upward turns his face;
But when he once attains the upmost round
He then unto the ladder turns his back, (25)
Looks in the clouds, scorning the base degrees
By which he did ascend. So Caesar may.
Then, lest he may, prevent. And since the quarrel
Will bear no color for the thing he is,
Fashion it thus: that what he is, augmented, (30)
Would run to these and these extremities.
And therefore think him as a serpent's egg
Which hatched, would as his kind grow mischievieous,
And kill him in the shell. (2.1.10-34)

Here, Muccioli misrepresents many words. For example, he translates *remorse* with the Italian *rimorso* (Italian *rimorso* is "moral anguish arising from repentance for past misdeeds"), and not the more accurate *compassione* or *coscienza*.[24] In so doing he misses the high quality Brutus is recognizing in Caesar of being deeply aware of the suffering of another accompanied by the wish to relieve it. As a consequence, he is belittling the intensity of Brutus's resolution. Moreover, Muccioli translates *turn his face* with the Italian *muta sembianze,* but Brutus is not saying that Caesar will become someone else; rather he is saying to himself and to the audience that Caesar *may* change his attitude, and *then, lest he may, prevent.*

It is also interesting to underline that Muccioli lacks completely the performability and speakability of the text as his translation seems to have been written only to be read.

Moreover, he adds several notes highlighting the lack of cause supporting Brutus's decision.[25] Piccoli, Ricci, and Avancini, on the other hand, produce plain and quite accurate translations, even if the latter uses the notes to repeatedly stress Caesar's leadership qualities.[26] Cesareo and Angeli translate *sting* respectively with *arma* and *dardo* (respectively: *weapon* and *arrow*), losing the adder's metaphor which is crucial in Brutus's words. Brutus cannot resolve to kill Caesar without creating an image, without thinking about the adder instead of Caesar himself, he needs this metaphor to act; for this reason, Cesareo chooses not to translate the modal verb, "So Caesar *may*." In Shakespeare, Brutus's language shows his inner dilemma, which does not fade out with this soliloquy, but will bring him, through the "interim," to the final breakdown, which will culminate in his committing suicide. His *shadow* will destroy him.

In the construction of the myth of the Duce, it seems that Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* was seen as a useful "tool," but only as a written text, not on stage. Issuing plain, often blunt, translations combined with critical introductions which bend the complexity of *Julius Caesar* to an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target culture, the Italian readers would have certainly seen themselves as the direct heirs of ancient Rome and Mussolini as their Caesar.[27]

In 1935 Nando Tamberlani directed the one and only *Julius Caesar* staged during the Regime. The "stage" was not a theatre, but the Basilica of Maxentius; the "mis-en-scene was no pictorial reconstruction of ancient Rome, but the very ruins that survived from the ancient city, and were now newly revealed and restored."[28] The ideological plan was to create a juxtaposition between the fascist Italy and the Roman empire (the play was staged just before the Italo-Ethiopian war) and, in so doing, neutralize the subversive and "dangerous" subjects of the play.

In conclusion, by analyzing *Julius Caesar*'s translations during the fascist regime I have tried to bridge the gap between

linguistic analysis and the study of paratextual elements and cultural history. Ideology emerges as an implicit component of the translation process, residing at the root of self-censorship. *Julius Caesar*'s translation can be therefore seen, in tune with the latest theoretical debate, not only as a historical object but also as an approach to interpret historical subject (in our case study it could cast light on Italian cultural history and may provide fascinating insight into fascist policy).[29]

Notes

1. Francesca Billiani, "Censorship and Translation: An Introduction," in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Context and Diverse Media,* ed. Francesca Billiani (London: Routledge, 2007), 2.

2. *"I. A datare dal 1o aprile c.c. soltanto questo ministero potrà autorizzare la diffusione in Italia delle traduzioni straniere; II. Gli Editori possono inviare a questo Ministero direttamente o a mezzo della Prefettura, nella lingua originale, i libri che intendono tradurre in italiano; III. Questo Ministero farà conoscere all'Editore—tramite la Prefettura competente—il suo giudizio nel termine più breve; . . . V. Sono esclusi dalla preventiva approvazione i trattati puramente scientifici (medicina-ingegneria-matematica-astronomia-botanica-zoologia) e i classici universalmente riconosciuti";* translation: "I. Dating from 1 April of this year only this Ministry may authorize the diffusion of foreign translations in Italy; II. Publishers may send those titles they intend to translate into Italian in the original language directly to this Ministry or through the Prefecture; III. The Minister will notify the Publisher—through the appropriate Prefecture—of its decision with the shortest possible delay; . . . V. Purely scientific treaties (in medicine, engineering, mathematics, astronomy, botany and zoology) and classics universally recognized as such are exempt from such prior approval"; here and elsewhere, unless otherwise specified, all translations from Italian are mine. See Giorgio Fabre, "Fascism, Censorship and Translation," in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Context and Diverse Media,* ed. Francesca Billiani (London and New York: Routledge, 2007), 27-28.

3. Christopher Rundle, *Publishing Translations in Fascist Italy* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2010), 5.

4. Christopher Rundle, "Translations as a Threat to Fascism," in *Translation and Opposition,* eds. Dimitri Rogers and Margaret Rogers (Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2011). See also Guido Bonsaver, *Censorship and Literature in Fascist Italy* (Toronto: University of Toronto

Press, 2007); David Forgacs, *Mass Culture and Italian Society from Fascism to the Cold War* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008); Giorgio Fabre, "Fascism, Censorship and Translation," in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Context and Diverse Media*, ed. Francesca Billiani (London: Routledge, 2007), 27-59.

5. "Il Giornale della Libreria," 1932. http://emeroteca.braidense.it/eva/indice_volumi. PageSel=1, (accessed 08/01/2015).

6. Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, ed., *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice,* (London: Routledge, 1999).

7. Nancy Isenberg, "'Caesar's Word against the World': Caesarism and the Discourses of Empire," in *Shakespeare and the Second World War: Memory, Culture, Identity,* ed. Irene R. Makaryk and Marissa McHugh (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 85. In my paper I analyze the six most interesting translations from a linguistic point of view and for their notes and critical introductions. In chronological order: Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* versione e testo a fronte di Aldo Ricci (Firenze: Sansoni, 1924); Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. G. A. Cesareo (Messina-Roma: Principato, 1924); Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* in *Teatro di Guglielmo Shakespeare,* trans. Diego Angeli, (Milano: Treves, 1924); Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. Avancinio Avancini (Milano: Vallardi Editore, 1925); Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. Raffaello Piccoli (Firenze: Vallecchi Editore, 1925); Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare* in *Opere Complete di Guglielmo Shakespeare* trans. Alessandro Muccioli (Firenze: "La Nuova Italia" Editrice, 1925).

8. Nancy Isenberg, "Caesar's Word gainst the World," 86.

9. See Susan Bassnett's *Translation Studies* (London: Routledge, 2013), *The Translator as Writer* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2008), and, with André LeFevre, *Constructing Cultures* (Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 1998). See also André Lefevere's *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (London: Routledge, 2016) and *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context* (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1992), as well as Lawrence Venuti's *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation,* (London: Routledge, 2008).

10. Irena R. Makaryk, "Introduction: Theatre, War, Memory and Culture," in *Shakespeare and the Second World War: Memory, Culture, Identity,* ed. Irena R. Makaryk and Marissa McHugh (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 3.

11. Nancy Isenberg, "Caesar's Word against the World," 83.

12. See Maria Wyke, "Sawdust Caesar: Mussolini, Julius Caesar, and the Drama of Dictatorship," in *Uses and Abuses of Antiquity,* ed. Michael D. Biddiss and Maria Wyke (Oxford: Peter Lang, 1999), 176-79.

13. Nancy Isenberg, "Caesar's Word against the World," 86.

14. See for example the interesting introduction by Ricci to his translation, in Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. Aldo Ricci (Firenze: Sansoni, 1924).

15. The peculiar Shakespearean way of humanizing the historical figure of Caesar, the "northern star," on which all the Fascist critics agree.

16. All quotations from *Julius Caesar* are taken from William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar,* ed. David Daniell, The Arden Shakespeare, Third Series (London: Bloomsbury, 2015).

17. "In Cassio, oltre all'amore per la libertà, c'è un bieco e profondo sentimento d'invidia verso Cesare" in Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. Avancinio Avancini (Milano: Vallardi Editore, 1925), 56.

18. "Questa gara tra Cesare e Cassio è invenzione del poeta: gli storici antichi narrano come Cesare salvasse sé e i suoi *Commentari* a nuoto nel porto d'Alessandria, onde si deduce la sua perizia di nuotatore" in Gugliemo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. Raffaello Piccoli (Firenze: Vallecchi Editore, 1925), 32.

19. "Le creazioni di Shakespeare sono tutte in funzione dell'ispirazione originaria, la potenza dominatrice del genio di Cesare. Perché in questa singolare tragedia, se Cesare muore in principio dell'atto terzo, e prima non apparisce che in una breve scena del primo e in un'altra, un po' più lunga, del secondo atto, pure la sua figura gitta la propria ombra vasta da un capo all'altro della tragedia: egli è presente sempre, anche più quando è assente: non si parla che di lui, non si combatte che per lui, si vince o si muore per lui, i suoi stessi nemici sono costretti, pur dopo averlo trafitto, a confessare ch'egli è sempre vivo, ch'egli è augusto ed eterno come l'anima stessa di Roma," in "Notizia Preliminare," in Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. G. A. Cesareo (Messina-Roma: Principato, 1924), 4. Translation: "Shakespeare's characters are all devoted to his first flair: the ruling power of Caesar's genius. In this peculiar tragedy, even if Caesar dies at the beginning of the third act . . . his figure permeates the whole play: he is always there even when he is out of the scene . . . He is august and immortal as Rome itself."

20. Alessandro Muccioli, introduction to Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare* in *Opere Complete di Guglielmo Shakespeare* trans. Alessandro Muccioli (Firenze: "La Nuova Italia" Editrice, 1925).

21. For example, "Cowards die many times before their deaths; / The valiant never taste of death but once. / Of all the wonders that I yet have heard, / It seems to me most strange that men should fear, / Seeing that death, a necessary end, / Will come when it will come" (2.2.32-37).

22. David Daniell, introduction to William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, The Arden Shakespeare, Third Series (London: Bloomsbury, 2015). 47-48.

23. *Ombre* signifies the darkness caused by interception of light, a tract of partial darkness produced by a body intercepting the direct rays of the sun or other luminary.

24. *Oxford English Dictionary:* "Remorse: Compassion with an older sense of conscience."

25. For example, "Non solo Bruto non aveva alcuna particolare ragione d'odio verso Cesare, ma, al contrario, aveva ragione di gratitudine, avendogli Cesare risparmiata la vita dopo Farsaglia; inoltre lo nominò prima pretore nella Gallia Cisalpina, l'anno 46 a.c., e poi in Roma, l'anno 44," in Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare, in Opere complete di Shakespeare,* trans. Alessandro Muccioli (Firenze: "La Nuova Italia" Editrice, 1925), 56-57.

26. See Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare. Tragedia in cinque atti,* trans. Avancinio Avancini (Milano: Vallardi Editore, 1925), 71-71.

27. See Nancy Isenberg, "Caesar's Word against the World," 88.

28. Graham Holderness, "Julius Caesar: Shakespeare and the Ruins of Rome," in *Shakespeare and the Visual Arts: The Italian Influence,* ed. Michele Marrapodi (London: Routledge, 2017), 343.

29. See Jeremy Munday, "Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns," *The Translator* 20, no.1 (2014): 64-80; see also Christopher Rundle, "Theories and Methodologies of Translation History: The Value of an Interdisciplinary Approach," *The Translator,* 20, no. 1 (2014): 2-8.