

Introduction

they have seemed to be together, thought absent; shook hands, as over
a vast; and embraced as it were from the ends of opposed winds.

(*The Winter's Tale*, 1.1.28–31)

Intertraffique

Published in London in 1598, John Florio's monumental Italian-English *Dictionarie* made available, as its title professed, *A Worlde of Wordes*, opening up a new linguistic topography for Italophilic English readers. Shakespeare may well have dipped into this lexicographic aid when mining his Italian sources – elsewhere he drew upon Florio's parallel-text language-learning manuals, especially Florio's *Firste Fruites* (1578). This local, lexical illustration of a border-crossing is mirrored by another dictionary published in London, the two-volume *Dictionary of the English and Italian Languages* (1760) compiled by the Italian literary critic and translator Giuseppe Baretta (gratifyingly anglicized to “Joseph Baretta”), who had spent ten years in England, befriending Samuel Johnson in the process. Baretta's bilingual dictionary was used by Alessandro Verri, who completed his translations of *Othello* and *Hamlet* into Italian in 1777, the same year that Baretta published his *Discours sur Shakespeare et sur monsieur de Voltaire*, which sought, in part through occasional nods to Johnson's 1765 *Preface to Shakespeare*, to recuperate Shakespeare's works and defend his literary standing from Voltaire's critique.

These two dictionaries offer useful staging-posts in the history of transnational exchange between Shakespeare and Italian literary culture, not least since they were both composed by linguists whose national identities and cultural affiliations were fluid, spanning the Anglo-Italian divide. Florio, the English-born son of an Italian Protestant refugee, spent much of his formative childhood in an Italian canton of Switzerland: the lines subscribed to his portrait in his expanded dictionary of 1611, *Queen Anna's New World of Words* – “*Italus ore, Anglus pectore*” [Italian in his native tongue, English at heart] – attest his in-between, go-between status. Baretta spent a second period in England, from 1766 till his death in 1789, declaring himself to be “an Englishman forever”.

Their dictionaries are emblematic of what lies at the heart of this volume of essays, a diachronic study of exchange between languages and literary cultures. Like these works of lexicography, the chapters gathered here attest the centrality of translation in cultural exchange; the foundational importance of what Bakhtin called, variously, the interaction, “interorientation”, or “interanimation” of languages that catalyses the appearance of neologisms and loanwords (Bakhtin 1968: 470); and the role played by intermediaries (lexicographers, commentators, scholars, critics) in the interlingual transactions between nations and cultures. This volume ventures a two-way *translatio studii* – not simply a translation between languages, but also a transfer of knowledge and cultural prestige – and the longue durée of transnational exchange between Shakespeare and Italy could even be likened to a process of “double translation”, as theorized in Roger Ascham's posthumously-published *Scholemaster*. For Ascham, one-way translation restricts the cultural benefit to “but simple and single commoditie”, compared to the “whole proffett” and “commodities of double translation” (Ascham 1570: sigs. L1^v–L3^r). Historically, of course, given the shifting hegemony of Italian and English literature over the early modern period, the direction of cultural transfer in the first instance is from Italy to Shakespeare, who derives material and inspiration from Italian sources; from the eighteenth century onwards, Shakespeare becomes a source in turn to Italian writers, translators, and actors. Yet these obvious chronological shifts notwithstanding, this book contends that at each point of any cultural transfer, there is evidence of a two-way exchange belied by the restrictive terminology of “source” and “influence”: like the lemma and

definitions in a bilingual dictionary or the two texts constituting a double translation, source and translation are simultaneously present, available for continual collation by the reader. This volume insistently blurs the distinctions between “original” in the sense of returning to a pre-existing origin (*OED* “original, adj.”, 1.a) and “original” in the sense of inaugurating new origins (*OED*, 6.a). A similar rejection of unidirectional influence underlies the theory of intertextuality, a forerunner to which – if only in its cognate etymology – is articulated by Florio himself, who defines “Intertessere” as an interlacing of works: “*to interweave [...] or enterlace with other works*” (Florio 1598: sig. Q4^v). Interlaced works of literature invite an “analogical” mode of reading favoured by Elizabethans, actively relating a text to its co-present analogues and parallels (Miola 2006: 4).

The purpose of this book is to examine the relationships between Shakespeare and Italian literary, dramatic, and intellectual culture by asking a series of questions centred on the keywords “transnational” and “exchange”: is there a currency of cultural exchange, and how should its transactions be valued? Does the term “exchange” sugar-coat what is merely a one-way transaction, a hostile takeover, an appropriation, or is there evidence of a genuine two-way transfer, in which something is traded, lent, borrowed, transformed, returned with interest? Is there an anxiety of exchange, as there might be with influence? Are “transnational” encounters possible in Shakespeare’s time before the idea of the nation-state has fully materialized? Do transnational exchanges shade into looser, cultural exchanges? In endeavouring to answer these questions, this volume ventures an evolving, shifting paradigm of exchange, one that changes over time, and one that is reconfigured depending on what gets carried over in the exchange – whether Shakespeare’s language itself; particular works within his oeuvre; his models of generic hybridity; the more intangible idea of an irregular, transgressive genius; his cultural cachet, or something closer to what Pierre Bourdieu calls, in revealingly economic terms, “cultural capital”. The exchanges may be multilateral rather than strictly bilateral – textual and cultural merchandise is often translated through a number of intermediaries, leading to a kind of *contaminatio* of source texts with other literary touchstones, or to an unexpected blending of genres.

Since the coefficients of cultural transaction change over time, this book has been arranged into three sections that are both chronological and thematic. Underpinning the methodological range of the individual chapters – encompassing literary criticism, political history, repertory study, translation theory, and reception studies – is an organizing principle: namely, “exchange” between Shakespeare and Italy in the sense of both a reciprocal transaction (a mercantile trade, an exchange *between* equivalents) and a displacement (a substitution, an exchange of one thing *for* another). Where the former subordinates difference to similitude, the latter addresses resistance in the transaction – the untranslatability of a word or an idea, the replacement of one term by another. The duality is neatly embodied in the name that Lucentio adopts in his guise as a private tutor in *The Taming of the Shrew*, “Cambio”, glossed by Florio as both “*an exchange*” and “*a change*” (Florio 1598: sig. E4^r).

Metaphors for translation often liken the activity to a linguistic exchange, whereby the translator acts as a go-between brokering a trade between two languages, cultures, or eras. These image clusters can be traced at least as far back as the early modern period itself. Metaphors of exchange available to Shakespeare and his contemporaries typically take their inspiration from economics, commerce, transport, traffic – fittingly, perhaps, for a theatrical medium whose dramaturgical freight can be quantified as “two hours’ traffic”, a term synonymous with mercantile trade (*OED* “traffic, n.”, 1.a) but encompassing more figurative meanings of “intercourse, communication” too (*OED*, 3). Early modern English commentaries, Brenda Hosington remarks, frequently theorize the translating process in terms of “merchandise, treasure, wealth, monetary value and coin”: such metaphors for translation as a commercial exchange typically “contain some notion of mutuality and reciprocity, of receiving

and giving, ideally in equivalent measure”, if, in practice, complete parity is harder to achieve (Hosington 2015: 27, 30). Cultural transfer on this nascently-capitalist economic model is subject to patterns of debt and credit, the asymmetry of arbitrage, discrepancies between a commodity’s essential worth and its symbolic, relationally-defined value, and the possibilities of loss and gain. Sir John Cheke, in a letter appended to Thomas Hoby’s translation of Castiglione’s *Il Cortegiano*, expresses anxiety at the translator’s introduction of foreign words: the English tongue, “euer borowing and neuer payeng”, would be “fain to keep her house as bankrupt” (Hoby 1561: sig. Zz5^r). Countering Cheke’s gloomy vexations about one-way indebtedness and the devaluation that results from linguistic quantitative easing, George Chapman described giving “pasport” to unfamiliar or neologistic loan-words in translating *The Iliad*: “if my countrey language were an vsurer [...] hee would thanke mee for enriching him” (Chapman 1598: sig. B2^r), the native linguistic stock increasing in value from his imports and coinages.

These conceits of cultural exchange as a commercial transaction are given their most succinct articulation by the poet and historian Samuel Daniel, Florio’s close friend and (possibly) brother-in-law. Daniel’s poem “To my deere friend M. *Iohn Florio*”, prefacing Florio’s translation of Montaigne’s essays, compares translation and cultural transfer to a “transpassage” (Daniel’s coinage) into an English “lodging” which naturalizes Montaigne. Daniel maintains that a “happie Pen” circumvents national or cultural isolation by joining an all-inclusive “communitie” which

*neither Ocean, Desarts, Rockes nor Sands
Can keepe from th’intertraffique of the minde,
But that it vents her treasure in all lands,
And doth a most secure commercement finde.*

(Florio 1603: sig. ¶1^v)

Daniel’s “intertraffique” (a second coinage) idealizes the exchanges of words and ideas as a kind of reciprocal, equitable trade – a risk-free transaction that “vents” (vends, sells) its “treasure”, leading to a guaranteed trade or “commercement” that precludes loss of value. “Intertraffique” dissolves suggestions of hierarchy and asymmetry inherent in the language of “influence”, “imitation”, “source language” and “target language”, “original” and “copy”, “precursor” and “epigone”, which imply a vertical syntax of ancestry, descent, servility, and belatedness. Admittedly, these terms *do* underwrite some of Shakespeare’s portraits of cultural *imitatio*: in *Richard II* (1595), York indicts Richard’s court for its assimilation of “[I]ascivious metres” and “[r]eport of fashions in proud Italy”,

Whose manners still our tardy-apish nation
Limps after in base imitation

(2.1.19–23)

articulating fears about English susceptibility to the impress of Italian culture, the emergence of the Italianate Englishman, and an “apelike” will-to-copy, as bewailed by William Rankins’ obloquy *The English Ape, The Italian Imitation, the Footesteppes of France* (1588). Rankins’ lexicon permeates *King John* too, when the zealously patriotic Philip the Bastard voices calls to ward off the “apish and unmannerly approach” of the French (5.2.135). By contrast, the idea of “intertraffique” connotes a more equitable, continuous exchange or collaborative dialectic, and finds an equivalent in Shakespeare’s terminology of “interchange”. In the emblematic “heraldry” of Lucrece’s face, the “sov’reignty” of beauty and virtue is “so great | That oft they interchange each other’s seat” (*Lucrece*, ll. 64–70). And Camillo’s lines from *The Winter’s*

Tale, the epigraph to this Introduction, invoke a similarly even-handed exchange, here in the form of an Erasmian epistolary ideal of mutual conversation between absent friends, substituting heraldry with cartography, as the image of “the ends of the opposed winds” summons up the diametrically-opposed points of a compass or map. Partly set, of course, in Italy and partly in another, counterpointed realm, Shakespeare’s play, from this opening scene onwards, revolves around a series of textual, paper exchanges – what, a few lines earlier, Camillo calls “encounters ... attorneyed with interchange of gifts, letters, loving embassies” (1.1.26–28), and what the shape-shifting ballad-seller Autolycus will gesture towards on his first appearance, declaring “My traffic is sheets” (4.3.23) – a textual (if also, in Autolycus’ case, sexual) intertraffic.

“What ish my nation?”

This is the question that Macmorris memorably poses in *Henry V* (3.2.123), among the most international of Shakespeare’s plays, staging representations of English, French, Scots, Irish, and Welsh, a series of roles all enacted in the earliest performances of the play by, of course, English actors. It has become a commonplace that, in Shakespeare, the “physical borders of England are clear, but its conceptual borders are not” (Lethbridge 1999: 318), and that the writings and theatre of early modern England are rife with “proliferating images of hybridities and cross-overs” (Loomba 2002: 19). For these reasons and others, the very idea of the “nation” is a contested one in this period, its contours not yet ossified into the modern nation-state. As Alexander Samson observes, the nation has had a “notably short, modern history, despite its foundational gesture being a claim to mythic origin”, a political entity that has enjoyed arguably only a “brief predominance from the mid-nineteenth century to the twentieth” (Samson 2015: 243). In early modern currency, the term and concept of “nation” were sufficiently capacious to accommodate the sense of “race” or “people” (Henke 2008: 3), a “nation” designating those of a common nativity (*natio*). As such, a nation, as a relatively coherent group of people, could exist in a new geographic territory, as with the small community of English students – the *natio Anglica* or “English nation” – at Padua’s university of law, a “microcosm” of that “sense of national cohesiveness which has long been said to have emerged from confessional strife in the sixteenth century” (Woolfson 1998: 33). Beyond this foundational sense of “nation” as a people, Claire McEachern argues that the term “hovers near” a more recognisable definition of a “principle of political self-determination belonging to a people linked (if in nothing else) by a common government”. In a sense, every nation at every time is “proto-national”, still in the process of definition – “there is no nation that is *not* a proto-nation”. This inherent, systemic fragility notwithstanding, English nationhood could be called “a sixteenth-century phenomenon”. Even before its more stable nineteenth-century reification, the “nation” in the sixteenth century exists as a “performative ideal of social unity founded in the ideological affiliation of crown, church, and land” (McEachern 1996: 1, 19, 5).

Even as nations strove for firmer definition (territorial and semantic), no nation was truly complete in itself. As Helen Hackett has argued, building on Stuart Elden’s work (2013), while the early modern period was undoubtedly a “time of nation-formation”, gauged in part by the “rise of vernacular literatures, and new assertions of national identities and cultures”, these nations “defined themselves not only by difference from one another, but also through dialogue” (Hackett 2015: 4). A cosmopolitan, outward-looking purview, an antitype to patriotic insularity, is suggested by Sir Philip Sidney in a posthumously-printed letter of travel advice to Robert Dudley: “For hard sure it is to know England, without you know it by comparing it with some other Countrey; no more than a man can know the swiftnesse of his horse without seeing him well matched” (Sidney 1633: sig. G1^r). Understanding a nation requires, or at least invites, understanding other nations, through a kind of intercultural, transnational collation. National identity is never quite autonomous, but dialogically forged in relation to other national

or regional identities. That assumption seems to underlie George Chapman's prefatory address "To the vnderstander" of his translation of part of *The Iliad*. Conscripting an incipient terminology of nationhood, still emergent but also sufficiently well-defined to admit its antitype, Chapman alleges that

as Italian & French Poems to our studious linguistes, win much of their discourtryed affection, as well because the vnderstanding of forreigne tongues is sweete to their apprehension, as that the matter & inuention is pleasing, so my farre fetcht, and as it were beyond sea manner of writing [...] should be much more gracious to their choice conceiptes, then a discourse that fals naked before them, and hath nothing but what mixeth it selfe with ordinarie table talke.

(Chapman 1598: sig. B2^r)

Defending his polylingual translation, and lexical difference more generally – not only the defamiliarizing, "farre fetcht", "beyond sea" otherness of his idiom, but also the alterity of Italian and French poems read in their original, "forreigne tongues" – Chapman leaves us with a delightful ambiguity in his neologism "discourtryed". It remains unclear how a poem or the experience of reading it could be said to be "discourtryed", and who or what is uprooted from their native origins – whether the reader is momentarily deracinated in the act of reading a text in a different language, or whether the text itself becomes discourtryed when read by a foreign audience, in its original tongue or in translation. Either way, interlingual transactions negate or elide national boundaries.

A still more tangible manifestation of early modern cosmopolitanism or transnationalism, of discourtrying the country, takes the form of an idealized textual "communitie" (in Daniel's terms) – a pan-European republic of letters. The architecture of this virtual commonwealth had its foundations in an international book trade that served as a network of literary and intellectual transmission, and a Europe-wide print market that "traversed national and linguistic boundaries" as if they were, Thomas Betteridge argues, "simply there to be crossed and erased". This humanist model of a "pan-European textual community, without borders" (Betteridge 2007: 1) endured well into the eighteenth century, as articulated by Paolo Rolli, the Italian translator and librettist resident in England for nearly thirty years in the early eighteenth century. An apologist for Shakespeare's style against Voltaire's censures (Rolli 1742: 11–12), and the hand behind the first translation of any passage from Shakespeare ("To be or not to be...") to be printed in Italian ("Essere o no, la gran questione è questa...", Rolli 1739: 97–99), Rolli contended, on the one hand, that national identity was necessarily hemmed in by one's language and parochial purview: "I always thought that the Country of an Author was to be discovered by his Language, or what he related of his Age, Country or himself". Yet on the other he envisaged a cosmopolitan community of literati who transcended local borders: "There is a Degree of Perfection and Taste, which when Authors and Criticks are arriv'd at, make them all of one Nation, call'd the *Commonwealth of Letters*" (Rolli 1728: 12).

The idea of nationhood is doubly loaded in this volume. The "nation" was a porous category not only for Shakespeare and his contemporaries, but it remained for much of the history of the Italian peninsula a theoretical ideal rather than a political actuality. Paradoxically, Italy's "theatrical and literary prestige" in early modern Europe was "inversely proportional to its relatively weak political position [...] as it was carved up by foreign powers" (Henke 2008: 4), and its political, regional fragmentation continued in a variety of forms well into the nineteenth century. Italy as a coherent nation-state emerges only after the rumblings of political unification, orchestrated in part by Garibaldi, in 1861. Prior to unification, Italy had been dismissed by Metternich as no more than a "geographical expression", an agglomeration

of unstable regions and states – the Austrian-controlled North, the Papal States of central Italy, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies in the South. Political parochialism was mirrored linguistically: despite efforts, by the Cinquecento humanist Pietro Bembo, to establish the Florentine of the *tre corone* (Dante, Boccaccio, Petrarch) as an Italian literary standard, after unification only about 10% of the population was fluent in this language (Castellani 1982), since local dialects still dominated (Lepschy and Lepschy 1988). This political and linguistic disunity had implications for Italian theatre too: the lack of a common tongue lent added importance to gesture over speech on the stage, and helped cultivate an actor's theatre – “il teatro dell'attore” (Alonge 1988) – in which audiences were drawn not by the play *per se* but by the star actors, the *grandi attori* (Adelaide Ristori, Ernesto Rossi, Tommaso Salvini, Eleonora Duse), whose performances became the central ingredient of any production. The success enjoyed by these actors on international tours fostered Italian theatre *outside* the nation's borders, in a transnational environment.

“Cultures come into being at their borders”, argues Alexander Samson, and “in the spaces between” (Samson 2015: 244). Mary Louise Pratt's coinage, “contact zones”, describes a space in which cultures clash and grapple with each other agonistically (Pratt 1991). The phrase invokes a theoretical vogue that risks approximating all cultural activity to a condition of liminality, prizing a “*debordement*” or “overrun” across boundaries (Derrida 1979: 83). The iconography from the early modern period itself might offer a more nuanced analogy for the types of exchange that happen across cultural thresholds. The lexicographic illustration with which this Introduction began might be supplemented by another example of textual practice that emblemizes a two-way cultural exchange, namely parallel-text publication. John Florio's language manuals, to which Shakespeare apparently had recourse, privileged a parallel-text mode of reading, and the format perhaps reaches its apotheosis in Shakespeare's time in John Wolfe's 1588 trilingual *Book of the Courtier*, a feat of printing that brings together Castiglione's Italian (in italic), Gabriel Chappuys' French (in Roman type), and Thomas Hoby's English translation (in black letter) in a tri-column quarto (Hoby 1588). The morphology of the page, as Anne Coldiron has brilliantly demonstrated, visually enacts the cross-cultural threads that Castiglione's book itself celebrates, assisting the reader in experiencing and practising “the very cosmopolitanism its pages advocate”: the “printer's formes internationalized the forms of nationhood”. This tri-column, polyglot *mise-en-page* – the English text occupying the outer margins, encasing the French (a kind of mediating presence), which in turn encased the Italian (bestriding the gutter) – effects a kind of typographic, linguistic egalitarianism: Hoby's English translation becomes “an equal among versions”, Wolfe's implicitly geo-spatial arrangement of texts on the page making visible what Karlheinz Stierle terms the “co-presence of cultures” (Coldiron 2015: 106, 112; Stierle 1996). Three languages, indeed three cultures, are simultaneously present, available for readers to judge and collate; individual national identities are asserted, encoded visually in the different typefaces, but at the same time the page insists on a transnational dialogue between these languages and cultures. This lateral format proved an enduring one in the history of encounters between Shakespeare and Italy. Angelo Olivieri chose, as the format for his 1890 translation of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, a parallel-text edition that invited his readers to assess for themselves the types of lexical exchange and cultural transpassage effected on the page.

Scheme of the book

Manfred Pfister's provocative essay, “Shakespeare and Italy, or, The Law of Diminishing Returns” (Pfister 1997), seemed to cast doubt on what more could be derived from comparative, cross-cultural studies of Shakespeare and Italy. This collection of essays, bringing together international scholars – established and emergent – from English literature, Italian studies, drama, and comparative literature, builds on scholarship from over the last twenty

years since Pfister's piece and ventures new approaches to the question of the relationship between Shakespeare and Italian artistic culture. The volume is mindful of recent theoretical elaborations on the idea of transnational mobility, such as Greenblatt's model of cultural transfer – the “hidden as well as conspicuous movements of people, objects, images, texts and ideas” (Greenblatt 2010: 250). And it also acknowledges a substantial body of scholarship on Shakespeare and Italy: from comparative studies of early modern Italian and English theatre (notably Andrews 2004), to the copious output of Michele Marrapodi, who has authored or edited studies on Shakespeare's Italian sources (Marrapodi et al. 1997), intertextual relationships between Shakespeare and Italy (Marrapodi 2004), and the adaptation of Italian culture by early modern English dramatists (Marrapodi 2007).

Of most direct bearing on this volume is the special issue of *Shakespeare Yearbook* (1999), co-edited by Marrapodi and Holger Klein, entitled *Shakespeare and Italy*, which opts for a fourfold division. Thematic sections are devoted to the nineteenth- and twentieth-century Italian reception of Shakespeare (“Reception, Appropriation, Translation”); Shakespeare's Italian sources (“Sources and Cultures”); British national identity in Shakespeare's plays, articulated through contact with Italian sources and contexts (“Representation and Misrepresentation”); and the cultural sources of Shakespeare's plays (“Intertextuality”). This present volume, by contrast, ventures a division that is both thematic and chronological, its three sections addressing different types and phases of exchange. The goal is to historicize exchange, rather than to suggest a single, monolithic paradigm, and to that end Susan Bassnett's Foreword to this collection establishes some of the shifting theoretical and historical contours of cultural exchange that shape the volume. In her succinct catalogue of the key phases of transnational contact between Shakespeare and Italy, encompassing the “Italianicity of Shakespeare's work” and the emergence in the late eighteenth century of an “Italian Shakespeare”, Bassnett outlines the complex procedures of textual transfer and adaptation that inform acts of lingual and cultural translation, both on the stage (a performance-based Shakespeare) and on the page (a textual Shakespeare).

1) *Early Modern Period: Dialogues and Networks*

The first section examines what might be called Shakespeare's “dialectic with Italy [...] or, rather, Italies, since the English view of Italy is a pliable construct” (Marrapodi 1999: 1), and the ways in which English cultural identity is crafted in response to Italian literature and art. Chapters in this section are devoted to Shakespeare's intertextual encounters with Italian literary, dramatic, and intellectual sources, and his engagement with “Italianism” as variously theorized in early modern England. The transnational exchanges (of people and ideas) discussed in this section are conducted through personal networks and textual dialogues. The conditions for these exchanges – which are both more circuitous and imbricated than mere binary transactions between just two parties – were fostered by the blossoming of the Italian book trade in England from the mid-sixteenth century onwards, as momentum gathered for the translation and publication of Italian books in England, especially romances, poetry, and proverbs (Tomita 1999: 97). The London press of John Wolfe, partly trained in Florence's publishing houses, issued a number of literary and dramatic works in Italian, including Pietro Aretino's comedies, Torquato Tasso's *Aminta*, and Giovanni Batista Guarini's tragicomedy *Il Pastor fido* – a vital source for what Robert Henke has termed Shakespeare's “pastoral reformation of tragedy” in the dramaturgy of his late romances (Henke 1997: 103).

Opportunities for intercultural contact were heightened by the movement of Italian merchants and entrepreneurs; by visiting troupes of Italian players from the *commedia dell'arte*, *commedie regolari*, and *favole pastorali*, or sojourns in Italy made by English actors, including Will Kempe, Shakespeare's colleague in the Lord Chamberlain's Men; by itinerant musicians, like Alfonso Ferrabosco; and mobile humanists and diplomats, including the

Pasqualigo family which served the Venetian Republic in London, including Luigi Pasqualigo, who composed a “pastoral play uncannily resembling *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*” (Clubb 2011: 282). A Protestant church for Italians in London (the Mercers’ Church of St Thomas of Acon) afforded a site in which sixteenth-century Italian travellers and immigrants as well as “Italianate English gentlemen” would converge, provoking Roger Ascham’s disgruntlement in *The Scholemaster* (Tomita 1999: 99–100). This first section of the book is less interested than previous studies in the Italian settings of Shakespeare’s plays, or in positivistic analysis of Shakespeare’s specific Italian sources, or even in Shakespeare’s engagement with “theatergrams” (Louise George Clubb’s coinage for theatrical *topoi*, plot modules, character systems, and framing devices) that made up a common language of European theatre (Clubb 1989; 2011: 283), than in what might be called ideas of “Italianism”. Rather than examining the passive absorption of axiomatic Italian lodestones (such as *sprezzatura*, *petrarchismo*, or *virtù*), these chapters address instead the ways in which Italian forms, ideals, and aesthetic qualities are imitated, recast, and made new in Shakespeare’s handling.

In “Shakespeare, Florio, and *Love’s Labour’s Lost*”, Giulia Harding and Chris Stamatakis trace one likely conduit by which Shakespeare may have accessed and interpreted some of his Italian source materials, namely through John Florio – the lexicographer, Italian-language tutor, and translator, celebrated in his own time as an “Inglese Italianato” mediating Italian humanistic culture to Elizabethan England. This chapter places Florio in a theatrical network encompassing Leicester’s Men and the playwright Robert Wilson; triangulates Florio with the Italian philosophical maverick Giordano Bruno and Sir Philip Sidney; unpacks the Italian subtext of the distinctly Sidneian, “Florioesque” *Love’s Labour’s Lost*; and deliberates on the ways in which Florio’s parallel-text pedagogy emblemizes the dual presence of Italian and English in Shakespeare’s plays, as the playwright negotiates the two languages and their literary cultures. The tantalizing suggestions of a personal connection between Florio and Shakespeare notwithstanding, the chapter argues that Florio’s Italianism permeates Shakespeare’s dramatic writings of the 1590s at a proverbial, intertextual level, and that Florio is a key agent of cultural transaction at the turn of the seventeenth century.

Reconstructing Italian and native English traditions of misogyny, Celia Caputi’s chapter, “A Tale of Two Tamings”, argues for a “proto-transnationalism” in John Fletcher’s *The Tamer Tamed*, which rebuts what might be construed as the misogynistic bias of Shakespeare’s *The Taming of the Shrew*. Shakespeare’s Paduan setting protected English cultural identity by sublimating the misogynistic violence, cast as Italian, whereas Fletcher’s *The Tamer Tamed* transports Shakespeare’s now-widowed Petruchio to England and marries him to Maria, who tames this “woman-tamer” in turn. This chapter demonstrates how English national and linguistic identity is inextricable from questions of gender, not least in Fletcher’s collocation of “country” and “nation” with what his heroine Maria terms “this gulf of marriage”. Placing both plays in an Anglo-Italian context of “shrew” debates, and glancing sideways to Pietro Aretino’s ribald sonnets (*I modi*, accompanied by Marcantonio Raimondi’s scurrilous engravings) and his comedy *Il Marescalco* (a play probably accessed by Fletcher via Ben Jonson’s *Epicoene*), Caputi assesses the respective “Italianism” of Shakespeare’s and Fletcher’s plays and their participation in Anglocentric fantasies about Italian culture and gender politics.

Given Shakespeare’s indebtedness to a vista of European theatrical traditions, Robert Henke’s chapter “Shakespeare and the Commedia dell’Arte” assesses the evidence for Shakespeare’s recourse to the typologized characters and theatrical conventions of the commedia dell’arte – a form of semi-improvised Italian theatre harnessing modular plot outlines. Retracing the transnational movements of actors (both English and Italian), Henke locates Shakespeare’s engagement with the commedia dell’arte in the context of contemporary theatrical practice (Thomas Heywood, Ben Jonson, Thomas Middleton, *inter alia*), sometimes

indirectly via French channels, and considers the satirical, anti-papal applications of the commedia in English plays. Analogues for commedia types (Zanni, Pantalone, innamorato, servo) litter Shakespeare's early comedies, which often celebrate the commedia's capacity for reinvention by announcing their own incessant theatricality and role-playing. Shakespeare's response to this Italian theatrical tradition modulates over his career: while his mature comedies distance themselves from commedia dell'arte types and plots, the commedia resurfaces, unexpectedly, in Shakespeare's tragedies (especially *Othello*), and even leaves its impress on his late pastoral tragicomedies. *The Tempest* betrays a fascinating proximity to a commedia dell'arte scenario ("Arcadia Incantata"), and shows Shakespeare not only transposing but also transforming this dramaturgical inheritance.

Rocco Coronato's chapter, "The Unfinished in Michelangelo and *Othello*", addresses Shakespeare's response to the Italian poetics of the Neoplatonic "Idea" that informs a masterful work of art. Tracing the transmission of this idea of the "Idea" through Italian art and English literary criticism, Coronato discusses how debates over the artificer's "internal design" (*disegno interno*) are broached in *L'idea de' pittori* (1607) by Federigo Zuccaro, resident at Elizabeth's court in 1575, and in Paolo Giovanni Lomazzo's seminal treatise on painting, translated into English (1598). This shared critical discourse in Italy and England on the role of *disegno*, *ingegno*, and the unfinished, and the debates on ideal beauty and the artist's *concetto* (Sidney's "fore-conceit") form a transnational intertext with which Shakespeare's *Othello* is engaged. The play is saturated with the lexicon of Neoplatonic "Ideas" and Michelangelo's *non finito* (embodied most obviously in Iago). This chapter provocatively suggests that, in Iago's case, the idea or *concetto* might finally remain buried beneath the surface, irrecoverable and unknowable – a chastening conclusion for cultural exchange, if the idea to be imitated remains ultimately obscured, inscrutable, unintelligible, untranslatable.

Othello is the test case – with Shakespeare's other Venetian play, *The Merchant of Venice* – for another Anglo-Italian ideological debate in John Drakakis' chapter, "Shakespeare and Italian republicanism". Shakespeare demythologizes Venice's reputation as a thriving republic, exposing instead a political system marked by radical self-division and duplicity. Discussing the fluidity of the term "republic" in English political discourse (subtended by Aristotle's *Politics*, newly Englished in 1598), and tracing the emergent mythology of Venice as a commercial centre economically reliant on outsiders like Shylock, Drakakis argues that early modern Venice became a canvas on which the domestic political anxieties of Elizabethan and early Jacobean London were displaced. Both plays exploit the axiomatic Jacobean continuity between domesticity (the household) and the wider polity (the community), within both of which lurks irreparable division. Both plays show the tendency for "accommodation" of strangers to fail: Othello and Shylock remain, culturally and racially, both insiders and outsiders, leaving the tension between accommodation and insuperable alterity unresolved.

The final chapter in this section, "A kind of conquest: The erotics and aesthetics of Italy in *Cymbeline*", defines the Italianism of *Cymbeline* as an aesthetic impulse originating in Italian tragicomedy and permeating Shakespeare's late romances. Subha Mukherji delves into this play's portrait of the "subtle" Iachimo, a Renaissance Italian interloping in Roman Britain and flitting back and forth between these two geopolitical realms, telescoping historical time, geographical space, and literary, aesthetic identities. "Italy" is not just a place, but a set of generic affiliations: Italian national types are bound up with Italian literary forms (such as tragicomedy) and stylistic modalities (including narrative dilation, deferral, self-consciousness, self-pleasuring artifice, and Ovidian erotic energy). These aesthetic characteristics recur in a fascinating adultery case from 1590s Cambridge, which gives definition to *Cymbeline*'s curiously unresolved hybrid of Britishness and Italianism. This duality, characterizing all the chapters in this first section, is encapsulated in Imogen's image of Britain's "tributary rivers" flowing into Rome's "emperial Seas", which evokes an uneasy tension between a submissive

payment of tax from a compromised sovereignty and an unbidden homage or act of compliment.

2) *Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries: Translation and Collaboration*

The early origins of Shakespeare's European reach are well attested. A Swiss tourist to London, Thomas Platter, attended a performance of *Julius Caesar* at the Globe (21 September 1599), commenting on the localized cosmopolitanism of English theatre-goers: "the English pass their time, learning at the play what is happening abroad [...] since for the most part the English do not much use to travel, but prefer to learn of foreign matters and take their pleasures at home" (Platter 1937: 170). An adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet* was probably performed as early as 1603 on the continent, during a tour of Southern Germany by Robert Browne's English acting troupe (Oppitz-Trotman 2015). But it is not until the turn of the eighteenth century that Shakespeare appears in any meaningful way on Italian literary horizons. The eighteenth century witnesses Shakespeare's nascent reception by a matrix of Italian commentators, critics, translators, and adapters, in addition to, in the nineteenth century, a pantheon of actors, especially the *grandi attori* who exerted considerable sway in the versions of Shakespeare mediated to popular audiences. Chapters in this middle section of the volume consider how Shakespeare is repurposed for Italian audiences, adapted to new forms and metrical systems, and mediated through indirect routes. The networks and dialogues of the first section give way here to collaborations and go-betweens: intermediaries become instrumental in disseminating Shakespeare's dual literary status (split between page and stage), in adapting Shakespeare's language (often deemed untranslatable) to new forms, and in fashioning political, national, and cultural identities through successive rehandlings of his works. The tensions between a read and a performed Shakespeare sound a bass-note throughout this section.

"Until very recently", Hugh Grady recounts, "the story of Shakespeare's reception was almost always told as one in which the world gradually came to terms with Shakespeare's inherent and unchanging greatness" (Grady 2001: 265). This narrative of the emergent cult of Shakespeare, catalysed by Garrick's 1769 Stratford Jubilee, masks the fractious history of Shakespeare's accession to a European canon. For much of the eighteenth century, "Shakespeare" (a metonym less for his oeuvre itself than for the disembodied idea of a particular type of artist) was embroiled in a European literary-critical *querelle* which would spill over into the early years of the Ottocento in Italy too, between (broadly speaking) French critics who objected to his rough-hewn unruliness and a handful of Italian apologists who aligned him with a "tradition of the most prominent Italian literary figures (Dante, Petrarch, Ariosto)" and with an "élite of 'supra-national' [...] geniuses" (Locatelli 1999: 23). The process by which Shakespeare's works and iconicity were adopted as emblems of "a new transnational and transhistorical aesthetics in Italy" (Marrapodi 1999: 4) depended on multilateral interventions. The translator Michele Leoni, for instance, included translations of Nicholas Rowe's 1709 *Biography* and Samuel Johnson's 1765 *Preface to Shakespeare* as a paratextual filter of English literary criticism in the first volume of his 15-volume *Tragedie di Shakespeare* (1819–21).

The first chapter in this section, Sandra Pietrini's "The Eighteenth-Century Reception of Shakespeare: Translations and Adaptations for Italian Audiences", recounts the slow, sporadic appearance of Shakespeare's drama in Italian literary circles over the eighteenth century, restricted in the first instance to isolated translations of his tragedies. Pietrini establishes the dominant context of French neoclassical paradigms, the role played by French intermediaries in disseminating Shakespeare's works to Italian audiences, the polemical squabbles between Italian and French critics over questions of aesthetic taste, and the linguistic impediments to translating Shakespeare's idiosyncratic lexis and turns of phrase. This fascinating history unfurls, variously, through the intervention of Anglo-Italian friendships and

the movement of translators, patrons, and diplomats between the two countries, in a series of transnational collaborations that helped secure Shakespeare's critical bearings in a European literary pantheon. As Italian literary culture wrestled with convictions of native self-sufficiency and anxieties about a dependency on foreign vernacular literatures, Shakespeare's initially lukewarm reception is partly attributable to his linguistic obscurity and generic indecorum; his fluctuating status can be gauged by the recurrence of key terms ("error", "sublimity", "genius", "difficulty") used by critics and translators, opponents and apologists, alike.

Reconstructing the battle-lines between Shakespeare's eighteenth-century champions and detractors, Giovanna Buonanno devotes special attention to the Milanese translator Giulio Carcano in her chapter on Shakespeare's reception in nineteenth-century Italy. Carcano's ambitious project of translating Shakespeare's complete works into Italian verse is considered in relation to defences of translation, by Mme Germaine de Staël and Alessandro Manzoni, as a means of reinvigorating national vernaculars. Buonanno focuses on Carcano's *Macbeth* not least for its simmering political subtexts, all the more resonant in the context of Risorgimento Italy, Carcano's activities as part of the Milanese revolutionary movement, and his tussles with censors. Carcano's *Macbeth* furnishes evidence of his dual roles: first, as a punctilious, sensitive translator of Shakespeare's texts, and secondly as a collaborator, adapting his own translation for the stage, condensing an already brisk play to meet the whimsical demands of the *grande attore* Adelaide Ristori, who insisted on cuts to foreground her character, Lady Macbeth. Given these practical challenges – linguistic difficulties of translating Shakespeare into a new metrical idiom, and dramaturgical contingencies of reframing the action to satisfy its start performer – Carcano plays a potent role in disseminating both a literary, read Shakespeare, and a theatrical, staged Shakespeare.

Dwelling on a similar interplay of page and stage, René Weis considers the imaginative and political sway wielded by Shakespeare over Verdi, focusing primarily on Verdi's *Macbeth* (1847) and *Otello* (1887). This chapter on "Verdi's Shakespeare" recounts how Verdi incorporated Shakespearean stage iconographies and political subtexts even in operas not primarily based on Shakespearean sources (*Rigoletto* invokes *Lear*, *Nabucco* recalls *Macbeth*), and details the processes by which, through a kind of *contaminatio*, Verdi's *Otello* reaches beyond *Othello* to lift from *King Lear* (as Edmund feeds into Verdi's Iago) and from *The Tempest* (a possible model for unified action in a single location). Converting expansive Shakespearean tragedy into the syllabic "brevity" of the libretto, Verdi selectively excerpted Shakespeare's plays in a manner comparable to Shakespeare's own "telescoping" of source materials. For Verdi, Shakespeare was decidedly a *read* author, accessed via Rusconi's prose and Carcano's verse translations, yet Verdi carefully tailored material to specific personnel at his disposal, animating the dormant text by matching the vocal qualities of his singers to the idiolects of Shakespeare's characters.

In "Eleonora Duse as Juliet and Cleopatra", Anna Sica's intensely archival approach reconstructs Duse's acting philosophy in her Shakespearean roles. Duse offers a fascinating illustration of a key phase in the development of the Italian acting tradition known, through its various evolutionary stages, as *la drammatica*. In Duse's hands, this method is best evidenced by her interpretations of two Shakespearean roles: an early, mannerist, medievalist Juliet, and a more mature, nationalistically-inflected Cleopatra, indebted to Arrigo Boito's translation. This chapter compares Duse's annotations and prompt-books, uncovered from *The Murray Edwards Duse Collection* in Cambridge, to the practice adopted by other nineteenth-century Italian actors for accentuating particular syllables to heighten affective communicability with their audiences. Duse's annotations reveal some of the intricate procedures by which Shakespearean play-texts were converted by Italian actors into finely-calibrated subtleties of voice and gesture when those plays were performed, in Italian, for Italian and international audiences alike.

An intriguing example of transnational exchange conducted at two removes can be found in Shakespeare's representations of Italy as reimagined through a Judaizing lens in the first full Hebrew translations of his works, produced in late-nineteenth-century Eastern Europe. Several Italian-centric plays – *Othello* (Isaac Eduard Salkinson's 1874 אית'אל , or *iti'el*), *Romeo and Juliet* (Salkinson's 1878 רם ויעל , or *ram veyal*), and *The Taming of the Shrew* (Jacob Elkind's 1892 מוסר סוררה , or *musar sorera*) – were translated as part of a wider project of Hebrew revernacularization, producing a set of texts for reading rather than performance. In this chapter, “Representations of Italy in the First Hebrew Translations of Shakespeare”, Lily Kahn examines the domesticating strategies used to impart Jewish cultural references to texts that still retained something of their English, and Italian, foreignness. These translations construct an “obviously Jewish Italy” that is also clearly an “imagined Jewish Italy”, underpinned by buried Biblical subtexts. A particularly inventive interplay, in the translation of *The Taming of the Shrew*, of Hebrew and Aramaic (to render Shakespeare's embedded Italian phrases) registers linguistic difference while striving to articulate a Jewish national or cultural identity ‘.’

In another trio of late-nineteenth-century translations that reveal the lexical difficulties of transposing Shakespeare's language to a new literary system, Matteo Brera traces the Italian reception of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*. This chapter, “Through the Fickle Glass”, focuses on the *Sonetti* translated by Angelo Olivieri (1890), Luigi De Marchi (1891), and Ettore Sanfelice (1898), dwelling especially on their struggles in Italianizing Shakespeare's language and prosody – what Giosuè Carducci called *fare alle braccia* [wrestling] with Shakespeare. Olivieri's prose translations sought, in their *mise-en-page*, to preserve the poetic structure of Shakespeare's sonnets; De Marchi's versions reveal the translator's anxieties in reconciling tradition and modernity; and Sanfelice, while dutifully respecting the Elizabethan sonnet's strophic divisions, sought to translate Shakespeare's poems as *sonetti italiani* [Italian sonnets], implying a return to either a Petrarchan model or Carducci's classicist poetics. Repeatedly, these translators favoured a collaborative *contaminatio* fusing Shakespeare's sonnets with earlier nineteenth-century literary traditions, interweaving words and phrases from their predecessors and contemporaries (Angiolo D'Elci, Giacomo Leopardi, Emilio Praga, Giosuè Carducci). The ground had been set for increasingly personalized, intertextually intricate responses to Shakespeare.

3) *Twentieth Century to the Present: Originality and Ownership*

“Shakespeare's special status in the literary canon”, Douglas Lanier posits, “springs from a complex history of appropriation and reappropriation, through which his image and works have been repeatedly recast to speak to the purposes, fantasies, and anxieties of various historical moments” (Lanier 2002: 21). This third section of the book, devoted to Shakespeare's Italian afterlife in the twentieth century and beyond, moves away from the translations of the middle section to examine a series of appropriations and reappropriations by actors, novelists, poets, and directors that are simultaneously personalized and in dialogue with their broader historical moments. Chapters in this section address the constraints and opportunities afforded by adaptation to new settings or new media; consider how selections from Shakespeare are turned into something personal and original; and analyse the strategies of *contaminatio* by which a given Shakespearean play is melded with other Shakespearean plays (especially *The Tempest*) or independent Italian traditions (often retaining their regional identity as Sicilian or Neapolitan). In these personalized visions and revisions, the processes of exchange are inflected in new ways, as Italian writers and artists often reach back to anterior Italian sources, some available to Shakespeare himself. These chapters confront questions of ownership and the paradoxes of originality – the simultaneous return to prior origins and the creation of new ones.

In the first chapter in this section, “Giovanni Grasso: The *Other* Othello in London”, Enza De Francisci reconstructs the reception of the first Sicilian actor to perform Shakespeare in London by examining newspaper archives that record the critical responses to Giovanni Grasso’s *Othello* (Lyric Theatre, 1910). Grasso and his Sicilian troupe enjoyed a reputation for naturalistic immediacy and impulsiveness readily associated with his Sicilian identity: early reviews ventured a romanticized, sentimental portrait of the Italian South (or Mezzogiorno), while simultaneously co-opting a condescending vocabulary of rustic primitivism and animalism – cultural stereotypes about Sicily’s African and Arab heritage that Grasso both exploited and resisted. In the ethnographic context of late-nineteenth-century Italian migration to Britain, and given Sicily’s perceived “otherness” to mainland Italy, De Francisci argues that Grasso’s *Othello* not only synthesized the multilateral cultural threads (Italian, African, “Turk”) of the Jacobean *Othello* but also partnered this racial alterity with a new dramatic language of realism and immediacy.

In “Shakespeare, Vittorini, and the Anti-Fascist Struggle”, another chapter devoted to Shakespeare’s Sicilian afterlife, Enrica Maria Ferrara demonstrates how Elio Vittorini’s novel *Conversazione in Sicilia* (1938–39) mythologizes Shakespeare as a cultural icon and accords his oeuvre undisputed cultural cachet across all levels of society. Moreover, Shakespeare (both as author and oeuvre) was conscripted by Vittorini for factional ends, as a paradigm of political “engagement” and an embodiment of an anti-Fascist ideology. Silvestro, Vittorini’s protagonist and alter-ego, undergoes an Odyssean journey of regeneration – a return to Sicily and to a childhood infused with memories of his father’s recitations of Shakespeare. Scenes of recollecting, re-reading, and re-writing saturate the novel, especially in Silvestro’s visions of his “Shakespearean father”, a resurgent father-figure who keeps activating memories of *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* like an importunate ghost dredging up the past. A second model, besides the “Shakespearean father”, derives from Shakespeare’s late romances, in the director-actor-author figure represented by Prospero. Where *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* resonate for Silvestro because of their buried memories and actorly metaphors, *The Tempest* and (briefly) *The Winter’s Tale* animate Vittorini’s novel because of their meta-narrativity and self-consciously fragile aesthetic illusions.

Reprising these images of textual haunting, Giuseppe Stellardi traces Shakespeare’s legacy on the malleable, shifting poetics of Carlo Emilio Gadda (1893–1973), arguing, in “Hamlet’s ghost”, for the enduring importance of Shakespeare’s works to the career of the Italian author, poet, and essayist. Gadda’s fascination with Shakespeare manifests itself as both a lexical and stylistic indebtedness (part of a “heuristic” approach that unpacks meaning from his oeuvre), and a more personal, autobiographical identification, not with Shakespeare *per se* but with Hamlet. Hamlet is Gadda’s doppelgänger and predecessor (as intimated in Gadda’s 1952 essay “*Amleto* al Teatro Valle”), and a “model character” for Gonzalo Pirobutirro, the autobiographical protagonist of Gadda’s chef d’oeuvre, his novel *La cognizione del dolore*. Yet despite Gonzalo’s “Hamletic” qualities (to use Gadda’s own literary-critical lexicon), Stellardi exposes points of resistance. Shakespeare is undoubtedly an inspiration perpetually haunting Gadda’s literary style and thought, but this Shakespearean inheritance remains an incomplete pattern for Gadda’s own writing: other traditions and influences (principally Alessandro Manzoni) jockey for attention, and Gadda must forfeit *Hamlet*’s ultimately cathartic, restorative conclusion which has no place in the unredeemed universe of *La cognizione*.

Resistance to Shakespeare also dominates Camilla Caporicci’s chapter, “The rest which is *not* silence”, discussing the multifaceted use of Shakespearean echoes in the writings of the Genoese poet, translator, and Nobel Prize-winner Eugenio Montale. Montale’s characteristic lexis and colour symbolism reveal a range of intertextual methods that both align him with and distance him from Shakespeare: Montale’s letters to his American muse, Irma Brandeis, betray

a “casual intertextuality” that hints at Shakespeare’s prestige and quotability; Gadda’s poetry typically echoes *The Tempest* through “allusive” references (conspicuous excerpts meant to be recognised by readers as deliberate quotations); echoes from the *Sonnets*, by contrast, resemble “not allusive allusions” (impressionistic but autonomous references at one remove from Shakespeare). In his later poetry, Montale’s allusivity becomes more explicit, parodic, and subversive, replacing his earlier reverence with something more resistant and interrogative – a poetics of negative citation and countermanding impulses that lifts phrases and images from their Shakespearean moorings and inverts them. Montale’s various strategies – some paratextually explicit, others personalized and biographically-specific, still others abstrusely metatextual – excerpt and recontextualize Shakespeare in provocatively innovative ways.

The dialogue with Shakespeare becomes a vibrant, unresolved “dialectic” in Giorgio Strehler’s *Il gioco dei potenti* [The Game of the Powerful], his magisterial adaptation of the *Henry VI* trilogy and the subject of Mace Perlman’s chapter. Shakespeare’s War-of-the-Roses plays are reimagined by Strehler as a fusion of Brecht and earlier, native, pre-Shakespearean traditions (including the commedia dell’arte), staging political history as a play. In imposing his aesthetic stamp on the trilogy, Strehler expanded minor details; increasingly relinquished the text in order to embrace an all-pervading idea of theatricality; and interpolated new components, demonstrating what he himself termed the “courage to write on Shakespeare’s behalf”. Strehler’s appropriative strategy for filling in the “terrible gaps” in Shakespeare’s Italian reception reveals two related, but counterpointed, imperatives: a rigorous fidelity to the text, and a zest for creative adaptation. Strehler’s legacy is hard to overstate: his portrait of an endlessly-replayed conflict of power, whose agents both perform roles and stand outside them as ironic commentators, possibly inspired La Compagnia del Collettivo’s *Enrico IV* for the Teatro Due di Parma – part of another trilogy, with *Amleto* and *Macbeth* (1979–1982). This production iconoclastically harnessed diverse acting styles, from improvised street theatre to Noh, via musical interludes lifted from, *inter alia*, Brecht’s *Threepenny Opera* (which Strehler had himself directed in 1956), conjuring an aura of an “emblematic cross-cultural montage of ‘strange tongues’” (Hodgdon 1991: 183).

Gonzalo’s utopian vision in *The Tempest* famously denied the conditions for commercial exchange (“no kind of traffic”), yet *The Tempest* itself remains one of Shakespeare’s plays most subject to international reuse and recontextualisation. In this chapter, “Shakespeare behind Italian bars”, Mariangela Tempera examines two plays – *The Tempest* and *Julius Caesar* – chosen for performance by a company of inmate actors at Rebibbia prison on the outskirts of Rome. Fabio Cavalli selected Eduardo De Filippo’s 1984 translation of *The Tempest* into seventeenth-century Neapolitan (in a curious return to early modernity) as his base text: under Cavalli’s direction, *The Tempest* becomes a bricolage of Shakespeare, Neapolitan dialect, and anachronistic Italian popular culture that is (somehow) obliquely sanctioned by Shakespeare’s play. In the Taviani brothers’ handling, *Julius Caesar* undergoes a similar transformation: their 2012 film *Cesare deve morire*, recounting the rehearsal and performance of a Neapolitanized *Giulio Cesare* by the Rebibbia inmates, draws in places on *The Tempest*, not least in exposing the diaphanous boundary between performing actors and performed characters. Through several layers of translation – from English text to regional Italian dialects, from script to stage, from stage to film – Shakespeare’s work and cultural cachet are co-opted for topical, social commentary.

The final chapter, “Shakespeare, Tradition, and the Avant-garde in Chiara Guidi’s *Macbeth su Macbeth su Macbeth*”, taking the form of a dialogue between Sonia Massai and director Chiara Guidi, examines how Italian avant-garde appropriations of Shakespeare negotiate what might be considered an authenticating point of Shakespearean origin. Guidi’s *Macbeth su Macbeth su Macbeth* (2014), a self-consciously disruptive reinterpretation of *Macbeth*, incorporates echoes of *The Tempest* and privileges performance over textuality, and

musicality and soundscape over words-as-signifiers. Conscious of the dramatic, critical, and editorial traditions surrounding Shakespeare's play, Guidi transforms *Macbeth* into a series of minimalist stage props and defamiliarizing, pun-laden phonemes: the burden of cultural heritage is emblemized on stage by a book that disintegrates in the opening scene, and by another piece of stage furniture, an imaginary "pietra d'inciampo" [stumbling block] that hints at Shakespeare's resistance to adaptation. Massai and Guidi consider *Macbeth*'s challenge to the idea of linear succession, and liken Macbeth's temporary illusion of fulfilment to the modern adapter's tentative (perhaps illusory) sense of ownership over Shakespeare. Macbeth's claim that "nothing is, but what is not" becomes a comment on the broader question of how avant-garde reinterpretations like Guidi's actualize something latent, dormant, and not-yet-in-being within Shakespeare.

The volume concludes with a brief afterword, "Shakespeare, an infinite stage". Surveying individual chapters and venturing fresh examples of exchange, Paolo Puppa teases out the volume's recurrent questions of ownership and appropriation; the idea of "accommodated resistance" between Shakespearean text and Italian reincarnation; the licence of actors and translators to adapt; and the endless opportunities to transplant Shakespeare and turn his works into something rich and strange.

Bibliography

- Alonge, Roberto. 1988. *Teatro e spettacolo nel secondo Ottocento*. Rome.
- Andrews, Richard. 2004. "Shakespeare and Italian Comedy". *Shakespeare and Renaissance Europe*, ed. by Andrew Hadfield and Paul Hammond. London. 123–49.
- Ascham, Roger. 1570. *The Scholemaster*. London.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1968. *Rabelais and his World*, trans. by Hélène Iswolsky. Cambridge, MA.
- Betteridge, Thomas. 2007. "Introduction: Border, Travel and Writing". *Borders and Travellers in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Thomas Betteridge. Aldershot. 1–14.
- Castellani, Arrigo. 1982. "Quanti erano gl'italofoni nel 1861?". *Studi linguistici italiani* 8: 3–26.
- Chapman, George. 1598. *Achilles shield [...] out of his eighteenth booke of Iliades*. London.
- Clubb, Louise George. 1989. *Italian Drama in Shakespeare's Time*. New Haven, CT.
- _____. 2011. "How do we know when worlds meet?". *Shakespeare and Renaissance Literary Theories: Anglo-Italian Transactions*, ed. by Michele Marrapodi. Aldershot. 281–285.
- Coldiron, Anne E. B. 2015. "Form[e]s of Transnationhood in the Case of John Wolfe's *Trilingual Courtier*". *Renaissance Studies*, 29.1. Special issue, "Translation and Print Culture in Early Modern Europe", ed. by Brenda M. Hosington. 103–24.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1979. "Living On: Border Lines". *Deconstruction and Criticism*, ed. by Harold Bloom. New York.
- Elden, Stuart. 2013. *The Birth of Territory*. Chicago.
- Florio, John. 1598. *A Worlde of Wordes, or Most copious, and exact Dictionarie in Italian and English, collected by Iohn Florio*. London.
- _____. 1603. *The Essayes ... of Lo: Michaell de Montaigne*. London.
- Grady, Hugh. 2001. "Shakespeare Criticism, 1600–1900". *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. by Margreta De Grazia and Stanley Wells. Cambridge.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. 2010. "A mobility studies manifesto". *Cultural Mobility: A Manifesto*, Stephen Greenblatt et al. Cambridge. 250–253.
- Hackett, Helen, ed. 2015. *Early Modern Exchanges: Dialogues Between Nations and Cultures, 1550–1750*. Farnham.
- Henke, Robert. 1997. *Pastoral Transformations: Italian Tragicomedy and Shakespeare's Late Plays*. Newark.

- _____. 2008. "Introduction". *Transnational Exchange in Early Modern Theater*, ed. by Robert Henke and Eric Nicholson. Aldershot. 1–15
- Hoby, Thomas. 1561. *The courtyer of Count Baldessar Castilio*. London.
- _____. 1588. *The courtier of Count Baldessar Castilio deuided into foure bookes*. London.
- Hodgdon, Barbara. 1991. *The End Crowns All: Closure and Contradiction in Shakespeare's History*. Princeton.
- Hosington, Brenda M. 2015. "Translation as a Currency of Cultural Exchange in Early Modern England". In Hackett. 27–54.
- Klein, Holger, and Michele Marrapodi, eds. 1999. *Shakespeare and Italy. Shakespeare Yearbook*, 10. Lewiston, NY.
- Lanier, Douglas. 2002. *Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture*. Oxford.
- Lepschy, Anna Laura, and Giulio C. Lepschy. 1988. *The Italian Language Today*, 2nd edition. London.
- Lethbridge, J. B. 1999. "Misrepresentation through porous borders: Italy and the conceit of England in Shakespeare". In Klein and Marrapodi. 317–32.
- Locatelli, Angela. 1999. "Shakespeare in Italian Romanticism: Literary *Querelles*, Translations, and Interpretations". In Klein and Marrapodi. 19–37.
- Loomba, Ania. 2002. *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism*. Oxford.
- McEachern, Claire. 1996. *Poetics of English Nationhood, 1590–1612*. Cambridge.
- Marrapodi, Michele. 1999. "Shakespeare and Italy: Past and Present". In Klein and Marrapodi. 1–18.
- _____. ed. 2004. *Shakespeare, Italy, and Intertextuality*. Manchester.
- _____. ed. 2007. *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare & his Contemporaries: Rewriting, Remaking, Refashioning*. Aldershot.
- _____. et al., eds. 1997. *Shakespeare's Italy: Functions of Italian Locations in Renaissance Drama*. Revised edition. Manchester.
- Miola, Robert S. 2006. *Shakespeare's Reading*. Oxford.
- OED Online*. 2016. Oxford University Press.
- Oppitz-Trotman, George. 2015. "Romeo and Juliet in German, 1603–1604". *Notes and Queries*, 62.1: 96–98.
- Pfister, Manfred. 1997. "Shakespeare and Italy, or, The Law of Diminishing Returns". *Shakespeare's Italy: Functions of Italian Locations in Renaissance Drama*, ed. by Michele Marrapodi, A. J. Hoenselaars, Marcello Cappuzzo, and L. Falzon Santucci. Manchester. 295–303.
- Platter, Thomas. 1937. *Thomas Platter's Travels in England*, trans. by Clare Williams. London.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. 1991. "Arts of the Contact Zone". *Profession*. 33–40.
- Rolli, Paolo. 1728. *Remarks upon M. Voltaire's Essay on the Epick Poetry of the European Nations*. London.
- _____. 1739. *Delle Ode di Anacreonte Teio*. London.
- _____. 1742. *Vita di Giovanni Milton. Il paradiso perduto [...] tradotto in verso sciolto dal signor Paolo Rolli*. Paris.
- Samson, Alexander. 2015. "Epilogue: Exchanges: Time to Face the Strange". In Hackett. 243–50.
- Sidney, Sir Philip. 1633. "A Letter to the same purpose". *Profitable Instructions [...] Robert, late Earle of Essex. Sir Philip Sidney, And, Secretary Davision*. London.
- Stierle, Karlheinz. 1996. "Translatio Studii and Renaissance: From Vertical to Horizontal Translation". *The Translatability of Cultures: Figurations of the Space Between*, ed. by Sanford Budick and Wolfgang Iser. Stanford. 55–67.
- Tomita, Soko. 1999. "Elizabethan Dramatists and Italian Books: Henry Cheke's *Freewyl* and the Social Context". In Klein and Marrapodi. 97–121.

Woolfson, Jonathan. 1998. *Padua and the Tudors: English Students in Italy, 1485–1603*. Toronto.