

TWO TRAGEDIES IN HARMONY IN *JULIUS CAESAR** —SHAKESPEARE'S REINTERPRETATION OF PLUTARCH—

NAOMICHI YAMADA

Cic. But men may construe things, after their fashion,
Clean from the purpose of the things themselves. (I.iii.34-5)¹

2 Pleb. If thou consider rightly of the matter,
Caesar has had great wrong. (III.ii.111-2)

This study is an attempt to reveal Shakespeare's methods and purposes in dramatizing *Julius Caesar* by comparing the play with the source material.² To put it another way, it will be a study of Shakespeare's dramatic craft and artistic design in the play as a whole. Let me first make a brief chronological survey of some of the principal source studies in this century. Then I wish to argue for my method in the context of source study in general and finally deal with detailed scene by scene analysis.

I

One of those scholars who saw clearly the importance and fruitful future of source-study early in this century was Allardyce Nicoll. In 1927, he published *Holinshed's Chronicle as Used in Shakespeare's Plays*, in the introduction of which he says:

That study, the value of which lies in the revelation of Shakespeare's method of dramatic composition, must be undertaken by each individual student of Shakespeare. Unless the passages in Holinshed are compared carefully with Shakespeare's reworking, little understanding can be gained into the ways of his art.

* This paper, which had been partly read at the annual meeting of the Shakespeare Society of Japan held at the University of Niigata in 1983 under the title of '*Julius Caesar* as a Revenge Play', was newly developed and greatly enlarged while I was at the Shakespeare Institute of the University of Birmingham from July 1985 to March 1986. I wish to express my gratitude to Professor Philip Brockbank and the Fellows of the Institute who allowed me to stay and make liberal use of their fine library. My thanks are also due to Dr. Susan Brock, who kindly gave most valuable advice on all matters in the course of my writing this paper.

¹ This and subsequent quotations from *Julius Caesar* are from the New Arden edition edited by T.S. Dorsch, 1964.

² There has been much discussion about the amount of Shakespeare's learning. His learning might be called "sources" in a broad definition of the word and moreover it can be said that it has much to do with the Roman world of *Julius Caesar*. But in the present article, as is usually done, I would like to limit "source" to a narrow definition, to external materials used by Shakespeare to be incorporated into the tissue of the play with some artistic intentions. Cf. T.W. Baldwin, *William Shakspeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*, 2 vols (University of Illinois Press, 1944), Virgil K. Whitaker, *Shakespeare's Use of Learning* (The Huntington Library, 1953), J.A.K. Thomson, *Shakespeare and the Classics* (George Allen Unwin Ltd., 1952).

As Holinshed provided Shakespeare with materials for his history plays, as well as *Macbeth*, *Lear*, *Cymbeline*, he assumed the role of source book to Shakespeare, and Nicoll emphasized that it should be our task to explore Shakespeare's actual selection, alterations from and additions to the source materials. Though applied by Nicoll to Holinshed, this has a plain bearing on Plutarch who stands out prominently in Shakespeare's library as well. About thirty years later, in 1958, K. Muir's *Shakespeare's Sources (1)* and G. Bullough's *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, vol. 1*, were published. The former was a critical study of Shakespeare's plays and their sources, dealing with twenty comedies and tragedies and scrutinizing how the dramatist "combined a variety of different sources in the texture of his verse." Muir aimed in his book to "ascertain what sources Shakespeare used for the plots of his plays, to analyse the use he made of them, and to give illustration . . . of the way in which his general reading is woven into the texture of his work." Here we seem to find the definition of "source-study" in the narrow sense of the word because the source-study has since been developed more or less in line with this idea. The work by Bullough is intended to be the first step in a series of source-books to "explore the working of Shakespeare's mind" and is therefore a collection of what he believed to be "the chief narrative and dramatic sources and analogues of Shakespeare's plays and poems" which runs to 8 volumes. Moreover, he classified the source material into source, analogue, possible and probable source, and compared the play with the sources and made inquiries into the departures from them. In 1964, T.J.B. Spencer published *Shakespeare's Plutarch* in which he edited North's translation of Plutarch's lives of *Caesar*, *Brutus*, *Antony*, and *Coriolanus* with passages from Shakespeare in parallel with the relevant descriptions of Plutarch for comparison. He made Shakespeare subordinate to North's Plutarch because Shakespeare seemed to respect North's literary merits, and discussed how much Shakespeare depended on each of the respective lives. Two years later, J. Satin edited *Shakespeare and his Sources* in which he drew the line between central and subordinate sources chiefly for educational reasons and claimed that both kinds of sources function as illuminating the genius of Shakespeare. He suggested that after the inquiry into Shakespeare's way of using sources should follow that of why Shakespeare transformed them, namely an investigation of the reasons for Shakespeare's remoulding of the original materials. Though he did not pursue it himself, he mentioned K. Muir's *Shakespeare's Sources (1)* as an illustration of what he proposed to be the further study of Shakespeare's dramatic craft. Two years after this source-book, R. Hosley published *Shakespeare's Holinshed* in which he presented the selections from Holinshed in Holinshed's chronological order to criticize the attitudes of the previous editors of the source materials who, he claims, put Holinshed in a subordinate position to Shakespeare by slighting the quality of Holinshed as a story-teller. He was dissatisfied with the earlier treatment of Holinshed shown in such authorities on source-study as Boswell-Stone, Nicoll, Bullough, who tried to dissect the source material and select the relevant and corresponding passages to Shakespeare for editorial and scholarly reasons. It seems that these different attitudes derive from their evaluation of Holinshed and from whether they put more emphasis on Shakespeare or Holinshed as an immediate issue which interests them. In 1977, K. Muir wrote *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays* and he added his elaborate analysis of Shakespeare's histories which he omitted from his first *Shakespeare's Sources (1)*. He argues as he did in the earlier work that Shakespeare increases dramatic effectiveness in the individual scenes of his play by deviating from the sources. Here we can see an accumulation of source ex-

plorations and arguments of the relevance of individual source to the play from the viewpoint of plot, characters and dramatic effect, and it reminds us of Hardin Craig³ who asserted that plot should be something like "a mosaic with varying skill and ingenuity in putting the parts together" and that Elizabethan dramatists did not have a habit of inventing plots, but sought for materials widely and combined them into unity with excellent technique.

When sketching the work of some of the scholars of source-study from Nicoll to Muir thus, Bullough, Spencer, Satin and Hosley who, on account of their work, may be able to claim themselves to be valuable sources of accumulated raw materials for Shakespeare's dramatic composition, left the task of detailed comparison to the reader. Among them, Bullough and Satin have classified the source material into two or more groups. Each scholar seems to be interested in collecting as much material as possible which he believes Shakespeare might have used for dramatization, so that he may set them into a play leaving no space inbetween and also in studying any kind of materials which can boast a predominant coverage of the events of a plot in a play. K. Muir is a good example of this.

In addition to these source books and critical studies, there is a section in practically every edition of Shakespeare's plays in this century, from the New Temple Shakespeare to the Oxford and Cambridge Shakespeares, devoted to the sources of the play in which respective editors discuss the disparity between the source material and the play and the dramatic effects achieved thereby.

But some noticeable attempts made in the early fifties must be examined closely. These are studies to advance a further and direct step into Shakespeare's dramatic genius through a particular and elaborate comparative study of the play and the source. That is, they were engaged in the pursuit of the reasons why Shakespeare departed from source materials together with the fashion in which he utilized them. For instance, C.T. Prouty in his book, *The Sources of 'Much Ado About Nothing'* (1950), after pointing out that Renaissance authors were intent on the "reevaluation of the ideas implicit in a source," first tries to perceive the play as a whole, then sees that alterations, omissions, and additions "take in a new importance as indications of the playwright's method and purpose," as Shakespeare was "singularly purposeful in the construction of plot." He therefore aims to explore not only individual scenes but also the dramatist's whole design of the play, by which he means "a new study of the sources." And in 1953, R.K. Presson carried out a comparative analysis of the legends of Troy which Shakespeare used in *Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida' and The Legends of Troy* and explored the reasons for alterations chiefly by comparing Shakespeare with Chapman's *Homer*. As K. Muir pointed out,⁴ these were new attempts to contribute to the understanding of Shakespeare's craft, which Allardyce Nicoll approved greatly. To put it briefly, the present century's source-study has been inclined to become more introverted than before in that scholars have made more effort to clarify the relationship between individual plays and the sources for the fuller understanding of Shakespeare's art, while it has concurrently been extrovert and scholars have been constructing a jigsaw puzzle to find a new material to set in a play.

³ "Motivation in Shakespeare's Choice of Materials" (*Shakespeare Survey*, 4, Cambridge University Press, 1951), p. 29.

⁴ *Shakespeare's Sources (1)* (Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1957), Preface, p. vii.

II

It has been proved that Shakespeare made direct use of quite a few sources. Through comparison, his dramaturgy, and moreover his responsibility for the creation of an artistic work has gradually dawned upon us. Here I would like to explain my method first.

If we assume according to the theory of drama that Shakespeare opened his source book on the desk, and leafing back and forth, adapted situations he found there with dialogues, finished dramatizing, and that the work was acted on the stage by actors in front of the audience, then the following diagraming may be possible⁵:

Source → Shakespeare → Dramatic Works → Stage (Actors)
→ Audience (familiar with the source sometimes)

Therefore, the comparative study deals with the first half of this diagram, that is, the generative process of the dramatic work and the process of Shakespeare's labour to give birth to his play.

The comparison itself appears an easy task at first glance, but it involves many difficulties. How is it possible to compare dramatic works with sources of such various kinds as narrative, dramatic and poetic, covering the whole range not in a relative, but in an absolute way? What is the source material of which Shakespeare evidently made a direct use thus rendering it possible for us to grasp his explicit attitude toward a play as a whole? If such source material can be named, we are capable of absolute comparison of the whole texture of the play, and what sort among raw materials would it be? As mentioned above, there is, moreover, the problem of comparison itself, namely, that of criteria of comparison applied commonly to both play and source. One criterion must be elaborated which should be above every genre of source material, have much in common with play and source, be regarded as a basic dramatic component and an irreducible cell which build up the system of an entire play. According to A. Nicoll again, audible exchange of words and visible actions of actors are essential to drama.⁶ And F. Fergusson remarks that "we grasp the stage life of a play through the plot, characters, and words which manifest it" and points out the vital importance of the words resulting "from the underlying structure of incident and character."⁷ Therefore, a play may be said to be composed basically of exchanges of words among characters, that is to say, dialogues between one character and the other. And moreover, it is very important to know who utters, what lines and to whom he utters, because they are "exchange" of words themselves. So, dialogue relationship emerges as the constituent which forms a play into an integral morphology.⁸ Then, what kind of source material seems best for the investigation of the dramatist's artistic design as a whole, and how can it be systematically compared with the dramatic work? Here, my solution is to consider

⁵ I have already briefly argued about this diagraming and method elsewhere. Cf. Naomichi Yamada, "A Study of *King Richard II*" (*Reports of the University of Electro-Communications*, 25-2, 1975, pp. 271-276).

⁶ *The Theory of Drama* (Benjamin Blom, 1966), pp. 35-38.

⁷ *The Idea of a Theater* (Princeton University Press, 1968), p. 12.

⁸ I have "discourse analysis" and "speech act" theory in mind here, but I am thinking of dialogue relations in the context of the comparative study of a play and its main source. Cf. K. Elam, *Shakespeare's Universe of Discourse* (Cambridge University Press, 1984).

the main source⁹ and dialogue relations respectively.

First of all, let me propound the meaning of the main source. Shakespeare uses the main source for materials for dramatization throughout the play, like Holinshed in the histories, Plutarch in the Roman plays and *Pandosto* in *The Winter's Tale*. He then deviates from it for another source or adds some invented material (which might not be called so because some unknown source may be still hidden behind them), or omits some part of the main source, but when he thus departs from the main source, what kind of meaning does it begin to assume? Here I would like to bring the implication of "main" in main source in question. Does the main source have no meaning when the dramatist leaves it for some other sources? In other words, does the dramatist not have any motive as he leaves the main source? Is it admissible to imagine that the dramatist leaves the main source to borrow from other sources without any motive? The dramatist's motive is understood to be a creative motive such as an artist should have. Then, it appears more natural that the dramatist should leave the main source because he cannot satisfy his inner creative motive within the main source. When Shakespeare seems to deviate from the main source, for instance, in the case where we cannot find the corresponding passages in Plutarch, the results of his deviation can be recognized as the response of his inner creative motive. Then, the task left to us is only to interpret the results of the deviations and inquire through the interpretation why Shakespeare makes deviations. Therefore the moment when Shakespeare departs from the main source becomes as important as the results of such departures and they are the means through which I am trying to approach and discover Shakespeare's intentions. What secondary source he leaves the main source for is another subject matter for inquiry.

The next real step in the method which I have devised to compare Shakespeare with his main source involves a very real difficulty, namely, placing the criteria of comparison between narrative, poetic, dramatic source and dramatic work. My solution, as I have discussed above, has been to study the essence of drama, to select dialogue relation as the criterion of comparison and to apply as feasibly as possible the criterion to the narrative, poetic and dramatic descriptions of the main source. In Shakespeare's dramatic works, there is no play without lines, without exchange of words, without dialogue relations in short, and lines and dialogic exchange play an important part in constituting interpersonal relationships between the characters. In other words, Shakespeare must have considered first and deeply how he should choose two different characters and what kind of words or exchanges he should devise between them. One character is on the stage. If he does not speak a word throughout a play, he has no relations with the other characters. If he speaks to some other character who answers, then the dialogue relation comes into being, and if the relation continues and accumulates, then it may change into some specific relations supported by the dialogue relations in the past. This unit of dialogic relation between two characters multiplies itself because one character who has already some particular relation with some other, can have another dialogue relation with another character and thereby develop them into some unique relations. Therefore, one character is able to have two kinds of relations and, if he wishes, he can create multiple relations. In this way the characters on the stage seem to be able to have the various kinds of relations with other characters of their own volition, but the dialogue relations supporting their marked relations and the words sup-

⁹ Also called "principal" and "primary." See 5.

porting the dialogue are created by the dramatist's artistic mind. In that sense, the dramatist is responsible for all the lines, dialogue relations, and unique interpersonal relations, the fact of which is essential to the drama.

If Shakespeare invents some character on the stage and makes him develop some particular relations with other characters by means of the dialogue, then the relations become Shakespeare's invention. If Shakespeare invents some relations between characters which are lacking in the main source, the relations become invention. Therefore, Shakespeare's intention of inventing some character can be included in the intention of inventing relations between the character and others. Therefore much attention should be paid on the invented relations between characters historical or not, and it would be dramatically more essential to inquire into the reasons for creating such relations between invented character and others than for inventing such a character itself.

Besides inventions, alterations both minor and major must be examined; for example, the added material serves for inquiry into the artistic impulse born in Shakespeare's mind.

In this way, being grounded on the basic theory of drama, dialogue relation can be considered to carry with it like a gene the playwright's dramatic intention as well as being defined as a network of irreducible tissue constituting the entire organic play like a precision machine. For an absolute and total comparison, we single out the dialogue relations not found in the main source by comparing the dialogue relations in the play with interpersonal relations as they are in the main source, and we regard the relations between characters woven by the dialogue relations as the object for consideration because they are supposed to harbour the dramatist's artistic aim within themselves.

So far, I have been discussing source-study in this century in general, and developing my method of using main source and dialogue relations to delve into Shakespeare's dramatic method and purpose. Bullough collects several kinds of source material, Satin divides the material into central and subordinate sources, but neither mentions such meaning of main source in relation to the playwright's artistic design as I have proposed. Prouty and Presson explore the reasons why Shakespeare deviated from source materials but do not evaluate the main source in particular. My attitude is to look at a play not as a flat mosaic of various kinds of source materials, but as a three-dimensional organic whole with cross sections caused and revealed by the axe of the main source and I attach much significance to the cross sections as informative of Shakespeare's intention. If I consider the play as an organic body of accumulated dialogue relations and let fall a drop of reagent of main source, what sort of dramatic design would be revealed to our eyes?

III

I propose to study *The Tragedy of Julius Caesar* in the present article by using the above mentioned method. The main source is Plutarch's lives of Julius Caesar, Brutus, and Marcus Antonius¹⁰ in *Parallel Lives of the Greeks and Romans* translated from French to English by Sir Thomas North (1579; reprinted 1595). I shall begin to tackle this play by drawing up a table illustrating and tabulating dialogue relations (hereafter DR(s)) in *Julius Caesar*

¹⁰ References to North's Plutarch used in the present article are to *Shakespeare's Plutarch* edited by T.J.B. Spencer (Penguin Books, 1964).

and relations between persons in Plutarch, and then I shall show some statistics covering the percentage of the lines of principal dialogue relations to the total number of lines in the play.

SHAKESPEARE				PLUTARCH
Act	Scene	Line	Dialogue Relation (DR) ¹¹	Characters & their Relation
I	i	1-5	Flav. ¹² →Commoners.	"But the triumph he made . . . did much offend the Romans, . . ."
		5-6	Flav.↔Carpenter.	(Caes.—people) <i>Caesar</i>
		7-8	Mar.↔Carpenter.	"he (Caesar) . . . had destroyed the sons of the noblest man of Rome, . . ."
		9-19	Mar.↔Cobbler.	(Caes.—Pompey's sons) <i>Caesar</i>
		20-31	Flav.↔Cob.	" . . . two tribunes . . . went and pulled down; . . ."
		32-55	Mar.→Cob.	(Flav.—Mar.) <i>Caesar</i>
		56-60	Flav.→Commoners.	
		61-75	Flav.↔Mar.	
	ii	1	Caes.→Cal.	"Antonius, . . . was one of them that ran this holy course . . . and he came to Caesar, and presented him a diadem . . ."
		1	Casca.→crowd.	(Ant.—Caes.) <i>Caesar</i>
		1-4	Caes.↔Cal.	" . . . there rose a certain cry of rejoicing . . . done only by a few appointed for the purpose." (flatterers—Caes.) <i>Caesar</i>
		4-11	Caes.↔Ant.	"But when Caesar refused the diadem, then all the people . . . made an outcry of joy."
		12	Sooth.→Caes.	(people—Caes.) (Ant.—people)
		13	Caes.→crowd.	(Caes.—Ant.) <i>Caesar</i>
		14	Casca.→crowd.	" . . . the two tribunes . . . meeting with them that first saluted Caesar as king, they committed them to prison. The people followed them rejoicing at it. . ."
		15-17	Caes.→crowd.	(tribunes—flatterers)
		18	Sooth.→Caes.	(tribunes—people) <i>Caesar</i>
		18	Caes.→all.	"Caesar was so offended withal, that he deprived Marullus and Flavius of their tribuneship, . . . he spake also against the people . . ." (Caes.—tribunes)
		19	Bru.→Caes.	(Caes.—people) <i>Caesar</i>
		20	Caes.→all (with him).	" . . . but I mistrust rather these pale and lean men, meaning Brutus and Cassius, . . ."
		21	Cas.→Sooth.	(Caes.—Bru., Cas.) <i>Antonius</i>
		22-23	Caes.↔Sooth.	"they did cast sundry papers into the praetor's seat . . ." (people—Bru.) <i>Caesar</i>
		24	Caes.→all (with him).	"Cassius, finding Brutus' ambition stirred up . . . did prick him forward and egg him on . . ." (Cas.—Bru.) <i>Caesar</i>
		25-187	Cas.↔Bru.	" . . . Cassius . . . did . . . speak to Brutus, since they grew strange together for the suit
		188-211	Caes.↔Ant.	
		212-221	Casca.↔Bru.	
		222-223	Cas.↔Casca.	
		224-227	Bru.↔Casca.	
		228-229	Cas.↔Casca.	
		230	Bru.→Casca.	
		231-247	Casca.→Bru., Cas.	
		248-250	Cas.↔Casca.	
		251	Bru.→Casca, Cas.	
		252-253	Cas.→Bru., Casca.	
		254-258	Casca.→Cas., Bru.	
		259	Bru.→Casca.	
		260-272	Casca.→Bru., Cas.	
		273-274	Bru.↔Casca.	
		275-281	Cas.↔Casca.	
		281-284	Casca.→Bru., Cas.	

¹¹ My policy in defining DR is to search for the answerer to a questioner. If the unit of a questioner and the answerer is clear, I combine them with the arrow pointing both directions. When one character asks or orders and does not receive an answer, the arrow points in one direction. In cases where the answerer does not exist and the speaker is put in a condition of soliloquy, the speech heading stands alone with no arrow. In making this table, I followed the New Arden edition of *Julius Caesar* edited by T.S. Dorsch.

¹² Speech headings are from the New Arden edition.

		285-291	Cas.↔Casca.	they had for the praetorship . . ."
		291	Casca.→Bru., Cas.	(Cas.—Bru.) <i>Brutus</i>
		292-304	Bru.↔Cas.	"Cassius felt his friends, . . ."
		305-319	Cas.	(Cas.—conspirators) <i>Brutus</i>
				"there was a certain soothsayer that had given Caesar warning long time afore, . . ."
				(Sooth.—Caes.) <i>Caesar</i>
iii		1-40	Cic.↔Casca.	
		41-133	Cas.↔Casca.	"... the strange and wonderful signs that were said to be seen before Caesar's death." (people) <i>Caesar</i>
		133-152	Cas.↔Cin.	
		153-164	Cas.↔Casca.	
II	i	1-9	Bru.↔Luc.	"... when night came . . . he was clean changed: for either care did wake him against his will . . . that his wife . . . found that there was some . . . matter that troubled his mind, . . ."
		10-34	Bru.	(Bru.—Por.) <i>Brutus</i>
		35-43	Luc.↔Bru.	"There was a good encouragement for Brutus and Cassius to conspire his death, who fell into a consort with their trustiest friends, . . ." (Bru.—Cas.)
		44-58	Bru.	(Bru., Cas.—conspirators) <i>Antonius</i>
		59-60	Luc.↔Bru.	All the conspirators, but Brutus, determining upon this matter, . . ."
		61-69	Bru.	(Bru.—conspirators) <i>Brutus</i>
		70-76	Luc.↔Bru.	"So Brutus by this means saved Antonius' life." (Bru.—Ant.) <i>Brutus</i>
		77-85	Bru.	"For this cause they durst not acquaint Cicero with their conspiracy, . . ."
		86-100	Cas.↔Bru.	(conspirators—conspirators) <i>Brutus</i>
		101	Dec.→Casca., Cin., Met., Treb.	"Brutus, . . . said unto him: 'Ligarius, . . .' Ligarius rising up . . . said unto him: 'Brutus,' . . ." (Bru.—Cai.) <i>Brutus</i>
		102	Cas.→Dec.	"... loving her husband well, . . . because she would not ask her husband . . ."
		103-104	Cin.→Casca.	(Por.—Bru.) <i>Brutus</i>
		105-111	Casca.→Cin., Dec.	"... there was one called Caius Ligarius, who had been accused unto Caesar . . ."
		112	Bru.→Casca., Dec., Met., Treb., Cin.	(Cai.—Caes.) <i>Brutus</i>
		113	Cas.→Casca., Dec., Met., Treb., Cin.	
		114-119	Bru.→Cas.	
		119-140	Bru.→Cas., Casca., Dec., Met., Treb., Cin.	
		141-142	Cas.→all.	
		143	Casca.→Cas.	
		143	Cin.→all.	
		144-149	Met.→all.	
		150-152	Bru.↔all.	
		152	Cas.→Bru.	
		153	Casca.→all.	
		154	Dec.→all.	
		155	Cas.→Dec.	
		155-161	Cas.→all.	
		162-171	Bru.→Cas.	
		171-183	Bru.→all.	
		183-189	Cas.↔Bru.	
		190-191	Treb.→Cas.	
		192	Bru.→Treb.	
		192	Cas.→Bru.	
		193	Treb.→all.	
		193-201	Cas.→all.	
		202-212	Dec.↔Cas.	
		213	Bru.→all.	
		214	Cin.→all.	
		215-217	Met.→all.	

		218-220	Bru.→Met.		
		221	Cas.→Bru.		
		222-223	Cas.→all (but Bru.)		
		224-228	Bru.→all.		
		229-233	Bru.→Luc.		
		233-302	Por.↔Bru.		
		302-303	Bru.→gods.		
		304-309	Bru.→Por.		
		309-312	Luc.↔Bru.		
		312-334	Bru.↔Cai.		
<hr/>					
	ii	1-3	Caes.		"... he heard his wife Calphurnia ... weep and sigh ... For she dreamed that Caesar was slain, ..."
		4-7	Serv.↔Caes.		(Caes.—Cal.) <i>Caesar</i>
		8-37	Cal.↔Caes.		"... she prayed him ... not to go out of the doors that day." (Cal.—Caes.) <i>Caesar</i>
		37-40	Caes.↔Serv.		"Decius Brutus ... in whom Caesar put such confidence ..."
		41-57	Caes.↔Cal.		(Dec.—Caes.) <i>Caesar</i>
		58-64	Dec.↔Caes.		"... he reproved Caesar, saying that he gave the senate occasion to dislike with him, ..."
		65	Cal.→Dec.		(Dec.—Caes.) <i>Caesar</i>
		65-67	Caes.→Cal.		
		68-104	Caes.↔Dec.		
		105-108	Caes.→Cal.		
		109	Pub.↔Caes.		
		110	Caes.→Bru.		
		111	Caes.→Casca.		
		111-113	Caes.→Cai.		
		114	Caes.→all.		
		114	Bru.→Caes.		
		115-117	Caes.→all.		
		117-119	Caes.↔Ant.		
		120	Caes.→Cin., Met.		
		120-124	Caes.↔Treb.		
		124-125	Treb.		
		126-127	Caes.→all.		
		128-129	Bru.		
<hr/>					
	iii	1-14	Art.		"... one Artemidorus ... knew the most part of all their practices against Caesar, ..."
					(Artemidorus—Brutus' confederates) <i>Caesar</i>
	iv	1-5	Por.↔Luc.		"Portia being very careful and pensive ... asking every man ... what Brutus did, ..."
		6-9	Por.		(Por.—men) <i>Brutus</i>
		10-20	Por.↔Luc.		
		21-33	Por.↔Sooth.		
		33-38	Sooth.		
		39-42	Por.		
		42-43	Por.→Luc.		
		43	Por.		
		44-46	Por.→Luc.		
<hr/>					
III	i	1-2	Caes.↔Sooth.		"Caesar ... speaking merrily unto the soothsayer, told him: 'The Ides of March be come.' 'So be they,' softly answered the soothsayer, 'but yet they are not past.'"
		3	Art.→Caes.		(Caes.—Sooth.) <i>Caesar</i>
		4-5	Dec.→Caes.		"Artemidorus ... pressed nearer to him and said: 'Caesar, read this memorial ... Caesar took it of him, but could never read it, ...'"
		6-10	Art.↔Caes.		(Art.—Caes.) <i>Caesar</i>
		10	Pub.→Art.		
		11-12	Cas.→Art.		
		13-14	Pop.↔Cas.		
		15-18	Bru.↔Cas.		
		19	Cas.→Casca.		

20-26	Cas.↔Bru.
27-29	Dec.↔Bru.
30	Cin.→Casca.
31-32	Caes.→all.
33-48	Met.↔Caes.
49-51	Met.→all.
52-55	Bru.↔Caes.
55-57	Cas.→Caes.
58-73	Caes.→all.
74	Cin.↔Caes.
75	Dec.↔Caes.
76	Casca.→Caes.
77	Caes.→Bru.
78-79	Cin.→all.
80-81	Cas.→some conspirators.
82-83	Bru.→People, Senators.
84	Casca.→Bru.
84	Dec.→Cas.
85-86	Bru.↔Cin.
87-88	Met.→all.
89	Bru.→Met.
89-91	Bru.→Pub.
92-93	Cas.→Pub.
94-95	Bru.→Pub.
96-98	Cas.↔Treb.
98-100	Bru.→Fates.
101-105	Casca.↔Bru.
105-110	Bru.→conspirators.
111	Cas.→conspirators.
111-113	Cas.
114-116	Bru.
116-118	Cas.
119-121	Dec.↔Cas.
122	Bru.→all.
123-142	Serv.↔Bru.
143-146	Bru.↔Cas.
147	Bru.→Ant.
148-150	Ant.→Caesar's body.
151-163	Ant.→conspirators.
164-176	Bru.→Ant.
177-178	Cas.→Ant.
179-183	Bru.↔Ant.
184	Ant.→all.
185	Ant.→Bru.
186	Ant.→Cas.
187	Ant.→Dec., Met.
188	Ant.→Cin., Casca.
189	Ant.→Treb.
190-193	Ant.→all.
194-210	Ant.→Caesar's body.
211-219	Cas.↔Ant.
220-222	Ant.→all.
223-231	Bru.↔Ant.
231-243	Cas.↔Bru.

"Another Senator, called Popilius Laena, . . . told them: 'I pray the gods you may go through with that you have taken in hand . . .'" (Pop.—Bru., Cas.) *Brutus*

"Popilius Laena . . . went unto Caesar and kept him a long time with a talk."
(Pop.—Caes.) *Brutus*

"(Brutus) with a pleasant countenance encouraged Cassius." (Bru.—Cas.) *Brutus*

"Trebonius . . . drew Antonius aside . . ."
(Treb.—Ant.) *Brutus*

"Caesar . . . simply refused their kindness and entreaties . . ."
(Caes.—conspirators) *Brutus*

". . . one Tullius Cimber . . . made humble suit . . ." (Cimber.—Caes.) *Brutus*

"Caesar did still defend himself against the rest, . . ."
(Caes.—conspirators) *Caesar*

". . . when he saw Brutus . . . then he pulled his gown over his head and made no more resistance."
(Caes.—Bru.) *Caesar*

"Brutus . . . stayed the other Senators . . ."
(Bru.—senators.) *Brutus*

"Brutus . . . sent back again the noblemen . . ." (Bru.—noblemen) *Brutus*

"Antony and Lepidus . . . fled into other men's houses . . ." (Ant.—Lep.) *Caesar*

". . . there were sudden outcries of people . . ." (the Roman people) *Brutus*

". . . the Senate . . . filled all the city with . . . fear and tumult . . ."
(the Senate) *Caesar*

"Then the conspirators thronging one upon another because every man was desirous to have a cut at him, . . ."
(conspirators—Caes.) *Brutus*

"Brutus and his consorts . . . went straight to the Capitol, . . ."
(Bru.—conspirators) *Brutus*

". . . When this was done, they came to talk of Caesar's will and testament, . . . Antonius thinking good his testament should be read openly . . . Cassius stoutly spake against it . . ."
(Ant.—conspirators) (Ant.—Cas.) *Caesar*

	244-253	Bru. ↔ Ant.	
	254-275	Ant. → Caesar's body.	
	276-280	Ant. ↔ Serv.	
	281	Serv. → Caesar's body.	
	282-297	Ant. ↔ Serv.	
ii	1-2	Plebeians. ↔ Bru.	<p>"When the people saw him in the pulpit, . . . they kept silent, . . ."</p> <p>(people—Bru.) <i>Brutus</i></p> <p>"Antonius making his funeral oration in praise of the dead, . . . he framed his eloquence to make their hearts yearn the more . . ." (Ant.—people) <i>Brutus</i></p> <p>" . . . to conclude his oration, he unfolded before the whole assembly the bloody garments of the dead, . . ."</p> <p>(Ant.—all.) <i>Antonius</i></p> <p>" . . . it appeared that he bequeathed unto every citizen of Rome seventy-five drachmas a man . . ."</p> <p>(Caes.—people) <i>Brutus</i></p> <p>" . . . the people fell presently into such a rage and mutiny . . ."</p> <p>(all.—all.) <i>Brutus</i></p> <p>" . . . they set them on fire, and thereupon did put the body of Caesar, and burnt it . . ." (all.—all.) <i>Brutus</i></p> <p>"Brutus . . . and his accomplices, for safety of their persons, were driven to fly the city . . ." (Bru.—conspirators)</p> <p>(Bru., conspirators—people) <i>Antonius</i></p>
	3-4	Bru. → Cas.	
	5-8	Bru. → Plebeians.	
	8-10	1. Pleb. ↔ 2. Pleb.	
	11	3. Pleb. → all.	
	12-49	Bru. ↔ all.	
	50	1. Pleb. → all.	
	51	2. Pleb. → all.	
	52	3. Pleb. → all.	
	52-53	4. Pleb. → all.	
	54	1. Pleb. → all.	
	55	Bru. → all.	
	55	2. Pleb. → all.	
	56	1. Pleb. → all.	
	57-63	Bru. → all.	
	64	1. Pleb. → all.	
	65-66	3. Pleb. → all.	
	66	3. Pleb. → Ant.	
	67	Ant. → all.	
	68-70	4. Pleb. ↔ 3. Pleb.	
	71-72	1. Pleb. ↔ 3. Pleb.	
	73	2. Pleb. → all.	
	74	Ant. → all.	
	74	all. → all.	
	75-109	Ant. → all.	
	110-112	1. Pleb. ↔ 2. Pleb.	
	112-113	3. Pleb. → Plebeians.	
	114-116	4. Pleb. ↔ 1. Pleb.	
	117	2. Pleb.	
	118	3. Pleb.	
	119	4. Pleb. → all.	
	120-139	Ant. → all.	
	140	4. Pleb. → Ant.	
	141	all. → Ant.	
	142-148	Ant. → all.	
	149-150	4. Pleb. → Ant.	
	151-154	Ant. → all.	
	155	4. Pleb. → Ant.	
	156	all. → Ant.	
	157-158	2. Pleb. → Ant.	
	159-162	Ant. → all.	
	163	all. → Ant.	
	164	2. Pleb. → Ant.	
	165	3. Pleb. → Ant.	
	166	4. Pleb. → all.	
	167	1. Pleb. → all.	
	168	2. Pleb. → all.	
	169	Ant. → all.	

170	all.→all.
171-199	Ant.→all.
200	1. Pleb.→Caesar's body.
201	2. Pleb.→Caesar's body.
202	3. Pleb.→Caesar's body.
203	4. Pleb.
204	1. Pleb.→Caesar's body.
205	2. Pleb.→all.
206-207	all.
208	Ant.→all.
209	1. Pleb.→all.
210	2. Pleb.→all.
211-232	Ant.→all.
233	all.
233	1. Pleb.→all.
234	3. Pleb.→all.
235	Ant.→all.
236	all.→all.
237-240	Ant.→all.
241	all.→all.
242-244	Ant.→all.
245	2. Pleb.
246	3. Pleb.
247	Ant.→all.
248	all.→all.
249-254	Ant.→all.
255	1. Pleb.
255-258	1. Pleb.→all.
259	2. Pleb.→all.
260	3. Pleb.→all.
261	4. Pleb.→all.
262-263	Ant.
263-273	Ant.↔Serv.

iii	1-4	Cin.
	5	1. Pleb.→Cin.
	6	2. Pleb.→Cin.
	7	3. Pleb.→Cin.
	8	4. Pleb.→Cin.
	9	2. Pleb.→Cin.
	10	1. Pleb.→Cin.
	11	4. Pleb.→Cin.
	12	3. Pleb.→Cin.
	13-16	Cin.→all.
	17-20	2. Pleb.↔Cin.
	21-22	1. Pleb.↔Cin.
	23	2. Pleb.
	24-25	4. Pleb.↔Cin.
	26-27	3. Pleb.↔Cin.
	28	1. Pleb.→all.
	29	Cin.→1. Pleb.
	30-31	4. Pleb.→all.
	32	Cin.→4. Pleb.
	33-34	1. Pleb.→all.
	35-38	3. Pleb.→all.

"When he came thither, one of the mean
sort asked him what his name was? . . .
they fell upon him with such a fury . . ."
(people—Cin.) *Caesar*

IV

i

1

Ant.→Oct., Lep.

2-3

Oct.↔Lep.

3

Oct.→Ant.

4-10

Lep.↔Ant.

11

Oct.→Lep.

12-51

Ant.↔Oct.

ii

1

Bru.→Lucil.

2

Lucil.→Army.

3-6

Bru.↔Lucil.

6-13

Bru.↔Pin.

13-31

Bru.↔Lucil.

32

Cas.→Army.

33

Bru.→1. Sold.

34

1. Sold.→2. Sold.

35

2. Sold.→3. Sold.

36

3. Sold.→Army.

37-47

Cas.↔Bru.

47-49

Cas.→Pin.

50-52

Bru.→Luc.

iii

1-91

Cas.↔Bru.

92-99

Cas.

99-122

Cas.↔Bru.

123-127

Poet.↔Lucil.

128-132

Cas.↔Poet.

133

Bru.→Poet.

134-136

Cas.↔Bru.

137

Bru.→Poet.

137

Cas.→Poet.

138-139

Bru.→Lucil., Tit.

140-141

Cas.→Lucil., Tit.

141

Bru.→Luc.

142-157

Cas.↔Bru.

157

Bru.→Luc.

158-159

Bru.↔Cas.

160

Cas.→Luc.

161

Cas.→Bru.

162-164

Bru.→Tit., Mes.

165

Cas.

165

Bru.→Cas.

166-177

Bru.↔Mes.

178

Cas.→Bru.

178-179

Mes.→Cas.

180-192

Mes.↔Bru.

193-229

Cas.↔Bru.

230

Bru.→Luc.

230

Bru.→Mes.

231

Bru.→Tit.

231-236

Bru.↔Cas.

237

Tit., Mes.→Bru.

238-242

Bru.↔Luc.

243

Luc.

244-250

Var.↔Bru.

“ . . . thereupon all three met together . . . But yet they could hardly agree whom they would put to death;” (Oct., Ant., Lep.) *Antonius* “ . . . both of them . . . together suffered Lepidus to kill his own brother Paulus . . .” (Ant., Oct.—Lep.) *Antonius* “Antonius at the first made no reckoning of him . . .” (Ant.—Oct.) *Antonius* “(Brutus and Cassius) were marvellous joyful, . . . when they saw the great armies together . . .” (Bru.—Cas.) *Brutus* “Brutus sent to pray Cassius to come to the city of Sardis; . . .” (Bru.—Cas.) *Brutus* “Therefore before they fell in hand with any other matter, they went into a little chamber together . . .” (Bru.—Cas.) *Brutus* “Brutus, upon complaint of the Sardians, did condemn and noted Lucius Pella for a defamed person, . . .” (Bru.—Sardians) (Bru.—Pella.) *Brutus* “This judgement much misliked Cassius . . . And therefore he greatly reproved Brutus for that he would show himself so strait and severe, . . .” (Cas.—Bru.) *Brutus* “Brutus prayed Cassius to let him have some part of his money, . . . Cassius’ friends hindered this request . . .” (Bru.—Cas.) (Cassius’ friends—Cas.) *Brutus* “ . . . he would needs come into the chamber, though the men offered to keep him out . . .” (Poet.—Bru., Cas.) *Brutus* “This Faonius . . . rehearsed the verses . . .” (Poet.—Bru., Cas.) *Brutus* “ . . . she, . . . took hot burning coals and cast them into her mouth, . . .” (Por.) *Brutus* “After that, these three . . . did set up bills of proscription and outlawry, . . . among that number Cicero was one.” (Oct., Ant., Lep.—Cic.) *Brutus* “ . . . Thereupon it was presently determined they should fight the next day.” (Bru.—Cas.) *Brutus* “ . . . looking towards the light of the lamp . . . he saw a horrible vision of a man . . .” (Bru.—Ghost.) *Caesar* “So Brutus boldly asked what he was,

		251-271	Bru.↔Luc.	... The spirit answered him: 'I am thy evil spirit, Brutus; ...'
		272-277	Bru.	(Bru.—Ghost.) <i>Brutus</i>
		277-285	Bru.↔Ghost.	
		286-287	Bru.	
		288-289	Bru.→Luc., Var., Clau.	
		290-298	Luc.↔Bru.	
		298-305	Bru.↔Clau., Var.	
V	i	1-12	Oct.↔Ant.	"Brutus prayed Cassius he might have the leading of the right wing, ... Cassius gave it him." (Bru.—Cas.) <i>Brutus</i>
		12-15	Mess.→Oct., Ant.	"Messala, I protest unto thee, ... that I am compelled against my mind and will, ... to jeopard the liberty of our country ..."
		16-20	Ant.↔Oct.	(Cas.—Mes.) <i>Brutus</i>
		21	Bru.	"... we shall hardly meet again, what art thou then determined to do—to fly, or die?" (Cas.—Bru.) <i>Brutus</i>
		22	Cas.→Tit.	"Brutus answered him: 'I trust (I know not how) a certain rule of philosophy ..."
		23-25	Oct.↔Ant.	(Bru.—Cas.) <i>Brutus</i>
		26	Oct.→Sold.	
		27	Bru.→Oct., Ant.	
		28-29	Oct.↔Bru.	
		30-32	Ant.→Bru.	
		32-35	Cas.↔Ant.	
		36-38	Bru.→Ant.	
		39-44	Ant.→Bru., Cas.	
		45-47	Cas.→Bru.	
		48-55	Oct.→Bru., Cas.	
		56-60	Bru.↔Oct.	
		61-62	Cas.→Oct.	
		63	Ant.→Cas.	
		63	Oct.→Ant.	
		64-66	Oct.→Bru., Cas.	
		67-68	Cas.	
		69-70	Bru.↔Lucil.	
		71-92	Cas.↔Mes.	
		93	Bru.→Lucil.	
		93-126	Cas.↔Bru.	
	ii	1-6	Bru.→Mes.	"Brutus ... sent little bills to the colonels and captains of private bands, ..."
	iii	1-8	Cas.↔Tit.	(Bru.—captains) <i>Brutus</i>
		9-12	Pin.↔Cas.	"... he took an ensign ... and stuck it fast at his feet; ... So Cassius himself was ... compelled to fly, with a few about him, unto a little hill ..."
		12-19	Cas.↔Tit.	(Cas.—ensign-bearer)
		20-22	Cas.→Pin.	(Cas.—a few followers) <i>Brutus</i>
		23-25	Cas.	"Cassius was ... angry to see how Brutus' men ran to give charge upon their enemies ..."
		25-33	Cas.↔Pin.	(Cas.—Brutus' men) <i>Brutus</i>
		34-35	Cas.	"... he sent Titinius ... to go and know what they were ... Brutus' horsemen ... went and embraced him ..."
		36-45	Cas.→Pin.	(Cas.—Tit.) (Tit.—Brutus' horsemen)
		45-46	Cas.→Caes.	<i>Brutus</i>
		47-50	Pin.	"Cassius himself saw nothing, for his sight was very bad ..."
		51-71	Mes.↔Tit.	(Cas.) <i>Brutus</i>
		72	Tit.→Pin.	"Cassius thinking indeed that Titinius was
		73-79	Mes.↔Tit.	
		80-90	Tit.	
		91-93	Bru.↔Mes.	
		93	Cato.→Bru.	
		94-96	Bru.	
		96-97	Cato.→all.	
		98-101	Bru.→Cassius' body.	
		101-102	Bru.→all.	

	103	Bru.→Cassius' body.	taken of the enemies, he then spake . . .
	104-106	Bru.→all.	I have lived to see one of my best friends
	106-110	Bru.→Labio., Flav., Lucil., Cato.	taken . . . before my face." (Cas.—followers) <i>Brutus</i> "After that he . . . took Pindarus . . ." (Cas.—Pin.) <i>Brutus</i> "Titinius . . . came . . . unto Cassius . . . he drew out his sword, . . . and so slew himself . . ." (Tit.—Cas.) <i>Brutus</i> ". . . after he had lamented the death of Cassius, . . ." (Bru.—Cassius' body) <i>Brutus</i>
iv	1	Bru.→all.	" . . . the son of M. Cato slain, . . . fight-
	2-6	Cato.	ing amongst the lusty youths . . ." (Cato.—enemies) <i>Brutus</i>
	7-8	Lucil.	" . . . he . . . told them that he was
	9-11	Lucil.→Cato.	Brutus; . . . He was glad of it, and went
	12-15	1. Sold.↔Lucil.	out to meet them that brought him . . ." (Lucil.—enemies)
	16	2. Sold.→all.	(Antony.—Lucil.) <i>Brutus</i>
	17	1. Sold.→2. Sold.	"Lucilius was brought to him, . . . said:
	18-19	1. Sold.↔Ant.	'Antonius, I dare assure thee . . .' (Lucil.—Ant.) <i>Brutus</i>
	20-25	Lucil.→Ant.	"Antonius . . . said unto them: 'My
	26-32	Ant.→1. Sold.	companions, . . ." (Ant.—companions) <i>Brutus</i>
v	1	Bru.→all.	" . . . he said: 'If Statilius be alive, he will
	2-7	Cli.↔Bru.	come again . . .'" (Bru.—Statilius) <i>Brutus</i>
	8	Bru.↔Dar.	"Brutus . . . bowed towards Clitus . . .
	9-14	Cli.↔Dar.	and told him . . .'" (Bru.—Cli.) <i>Brutus</i>
	15-29	Bru.↔Vol.	" . . . he . . . said somewhat also to him,"
	30	Cli.→Bru.	(Bru.—Dar.) <i>Brutus</i>
	31-42	Bru.→all.	" . . . this spirit appeared again unto him,
	43	Cli.↔Bru.	. . .'" (Bru.—Ghost.) <i>Brutus</i>
	44-50	Bru.↔Stra.	" . . . he came to Volumnius . . . and
	50-51	Bru.→Caes.	speaking to him . . ." (Bru.—Vol.) <i>Brutus</i>
	52-53	Oct.↔Mes.	" . . . one of them said, . . . that they must
	53-57	Mes.↔Stra.	needs fly." (one—Bru., others) <i>Brutus</i>
	58-59	Lucil.→Brutus' body.	"We must fly indeed, said he . . ." (Bru.—all.) <i>Brutus</i>
	60	Oct.→all.	" . . . he said these words unto them. . . ." (Bru.—all.) <i>Brutus</i>
	61-62	Oct.↔Stra.	"He came as near to him as he could, . . ." (Bru.—Stra.) <i>Brutus</i>
	63	Oct.→Mes.	" . . . he brought Strato, . . . unto him . . ." (Mes.—Stra.) (Mes.—Oct.)
	64-65	Mes.↔Stra.	(Oct.—Stra.) <i>Brutus</i>
	66-67	Mes.→Oct.	"Antonius spake it openly . . . that . . .
	68-75	Ant.→all.	there was none but Brutus only that was
	76-81	Oct.→all.	moved to do . . .'" (Ant.—Bru.) <i>Brutus</i> "Antonius having found Brutus' body, he caused it to be wrapped up . . ." (Ant.—followers) <i>Brutus</i>

Statistics

I. THE COVERAGE OF THE LINES OF DR IN PROPORTION TO THE TOTAL LINES IN THE PLAY: THE NUMBER OF LINES OF DR/2526 (including 74 doubling lines).

Order.	Dialogue Relation	Percentage.	(Number of Lines)
1	Bru.—Cas.	18.88%	(477)
2	Ant.—all.	6.02%	(152)
3	Cas.—Casca.	5.07%	(128)
4	Bru.—Luc.	3.05%	(77)
5	Bru.—Por.	3.01%	(76)
6	Bru.	2.97%	(75)
7	Pleb.—Pleb.	2.69%	(68)
8	Ant.—Oct.	2.45%	(62)
9	Caes.—Cal.	2.33%	(59)
10	Bru.—all.	2.06%	(52)
10	Bru.—conspirators.	2.06%	(52)
12	Caes.—Dec.	1.86%	(47)
13	Bru.—Ant.	1.78%	(45)
14	Ant.—Caesar's body.	1.66%	(42)
15	Cicero.—Casca.	1.58%	(40)
15	Casca.—Bru., Cas.	1.58%	(40)
17	Cas.	1.54%	(39)
18	Caes.—Ant.	1.39%	(35)
18	Mar.—Cobbler.	1.39%	(35)
20	Ant.—Octavius' Serv.	1.27%	(32)
20	Bru.—Mes.	1.27%	(32)
<hr/>			
	Ant.—Cas.	0.67%	(17)
	Caes.—Bru.	0.40%	(10)
	Caes.—Cas.	0.12%	(3)

II. MULTIPLE DIALOGUE RELATIONS.

Order.	Character.	Number of Lines.
1	Brutus	1105
2	Cassius	807
3	Antony	442
4	Plebeians	362
5	Casca	237
6	Caesar	233
7	Portia	119
8	Lucius	100
9	Octavius	99
10	Decius	70
11	Calphurnia	60
12	Cicero	40

IV

The alterations and inventions of DRs extracted with some analysis and interpretations from the scene by scene comparison¹³ are as follows:

I.i * DR between the Roman people and two tribunes.

—Caesar's triumph over Pompey's sons and the Lupercalia are combined to stress the supporting attitude of the Roman people toward Caesar. Unlike in Plutarch, they make holiday and put on their best "to see Caesar and rejoice in his triumph," and moreover they decorate the images with "ceremonies" and "Caesar's trophies." In contrast, Flavius and Marullus stop them, reproach their ingratitude and disperse them from the streets. Therefore this dialogue relation is intended to show the Roman people and the tribunes in a complete frontal clash.¹⁴

* DR between Flavius and Marullus

"Caesar's flatterers . . . did put diadems upon the heads of his images, supposing thereby to allure the common people to call him King, . . ."
(*Brutus*, p. 110)

—Flavius sees that the Roman people are "mov'd" and "tongue-tied" in their guiltiness and that they depart. But are they so changeable as to stop supporting Caesar being checked thus by the tribunes?

—It is not diadems but ceremonious ornaments and "scarfs" with which the people decorate Caesar's images, and it is not a few followers of Caesar but the Roman populace in general who decorate them. Therefore they are unanimous in support of Caesar, but never wish Caesar to be crowned because they do not put "diadems" on the images.

—Flavius orders the images to be stripped and the people dispersed from the streets by saying:

I'll about
And drive away the vulgar from the streets;
So do you too, where you perceive them thick.
These growing feathers pluck'd from Caesar's wing
Will make him fly an ordinary pitch,
Who else would soar above the view of men
And keep us all in servile fearfulness.

Many critics point out the metaphor of falconry here, and even if this is so, what does "these growing feathers pluck'd from Caesar's wing" stand for? Flavius compares Caesar

¹³ I owe much to Professor Norman Sanders's Commentary to the New Penguin Shakespeare edition of *Julius Caesar* for this scene by scene comparison.

¹⁴ Brents Stirling asserts that "the note of plebeian stupidity and mutability is struck powerfully in the opening scene of the play." He sees the scene from the viewpoint of the populace's change of heart away from Pompey towards Caesar. But Shakespeare transforms Plutarch's people who follow the tribunes rejoicing and makes them denounced by the tribunes. One of his aims seems to be the direct presentation of the structure of the play, namely conflict around Caesar between the Caesarean faction and the anti-Caesarean faction. Cf. Brents Stirling, *The Populace in Shakespeare* (Columbia University Press, 1949), p. 26. Also see Dover Wilson's arguments about I.i. in the introduction of *Julius Caesar* (Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. xvii.

to a falcon and fears that Caesar would gain more flying power and become stronger to make them slaves under him unless he “plucked” the “growing feathers” from his wing to keep the “ordinary pitch.” But here as they plan to disrobe the images as well as to keep dispersing the people from the streets, they “pluck”¹⁵ the ornaments in honour of Caesar from Caesar’s images as well as driving away the people who are gathering “thick” in support of Caesar like “growing feathers” on Caesar’s wing in support of his flying. Here, Caesar and the common people may be regarded as “wing” and “feathers” respectively, and Flavius is worried about the increasing support of the people toward Caesar, which he fears would result in Caesar’s tyranny, and the uneasiness compels him to scatter (“pluck”) the thickening people (“feathers”) away from the streets.

I.iii * DR between Caesar and Calphurnia, between Caesar and Antony.

—Shakespeare creates an active Caesar who devotes himself entirely to the main event of the Lupercalia in assigning Calphurnia and Antony to be touched and to touch in the “holy chase.” Unlike Plutarch’s Caesar who sits on the pulpit in a golden chair, in triumphant dress and beholds the sport, secretly in wait for Antony to run up and offer him a crown, who is standing aloof from the “holy course,” making cunning use of the occasion to satisfy his own kingly ambition, Shakespeare’s Caesar is so essentially active and so entirely absorbed in the festival of Lupercalia as to become himself the chief organizer and originator and he makes sure of it when he orders “Set on, and leave no ceremony out” to Antony. Shakespeare invents Caesar’s commitment to the Lupercalia festival.

There has been much discussion about Caesar’s superstitious trait in his belief in “the holy chase,” but as has been pointed out, it was a common belief of the people in those days, and consequently Caesar is not to be regarded as superstitious in particular.¹⁶

Antony, by answering to Caesar, “I shall remember;/When Caesar says, “Do this,” it is perform’d,” means to carry out Caesar’s orders without delay. The instantaneousness or rather simultaneity of Caesar’s utterance and Antony’s execution of Caesar’s orders is emphasized, which may indicate Antony’s supporting and obedient attitude to Caesar as well as his immediate execution of Caesar’s orders. He never discusses the rights and wrongs of the orders, and becomes a quick executioner of them as if receiving the orders through the motor nerves from the brain.¹⁷ According to Brutus’s reference to Antony in II.i, he is “a limb of Caesar” and Brutus compares Caesar to “the head” and Antony to “Caesar’s arm,” and this head and arm relationship between Caesar and Antony in one body seems to have been illustrated as early as in this dialogue relation.

—Did Antony actually carry out the orders? He is reported to have offered Caesar a crown by Casca later and Shakespeare follows Plutarch in this respect, but he mentions nothing about Antony’s role in the “holy chase.” Shakespeare, therefore, depicts Antony

¹⁵ For example, Ernest Schanzer interprets “disrobing” of Caesar’s images as plucking feathers from Caesar’s wing. Cf. Ernest Schanzer, “The Problem of *Julius Caesar*” (*Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. v, 1954, p. 300).

¹⁶ Cf. T.S. Dorsch in his introduction to the Arden edition of *Julius Caesar*, p. xxix.

¹⁷ Cf. R.R. Simpson, *Shakespeare and Medicine* (E. & S. Livingstone Ltd., 1959), chap. 2, “Shakespeare’s Knowledge of Elizabethan Medicine,” pp. 9–24. Hippocrates might be one of the sources of Shakespeare’s medical knowledge. Robert Burton’s *The Anatomy of Melancholy* gives “Anatomy of the Body” which suggests the depth of knowledge about anatomy in those days. Shakespeare would not have had detailed anatomical knowledge and might have written Antony’s words based upon knowledge acquired empirically. Also see Devon L. Hodges, *Renaissance Fictions of Anatomy* (The University of Massachusetts Press, 1985).

who does not answer Caesar's expectations, who leaves all ceremonies out and offers him a crown as in Plutarch, to emphasize Caesar's commitment to the "holy chase."

* DR between Soothsayer and Caesar, between Casca and a great crowd, between Caesar and Brutus, between Cassius and Soothsayer.

"there was a certain soothsayer that had given Caesar warning long time afore, to take heed of the day of the Ides of March, for on that day he should be in great danger".

(*Caesar*, pp. 87-8)

—The substance of the soothsayer's warning to Caesar is transferred from Plutarch as it is, but the situation in which the warning is given is invented through the dialogue relations. Shakespeare puts the soothsayer among a great crowd who favour Caesar and makes him give a shrill cry of warning to Caesar. His cry substantially prays for Caesar's personal safety and it is natural that the cry should come from the jostling crowd described as supporting Caesar. The soothsayer, therefore, steps forward like a representative of the common people who take Caesar's side, and must have seen in Casca, Brutus and Cassius who stand and mediate between Caesar and him, men dangerous to Caesar because the soothsayer's duty is to see the future in the present. He sees that Caesar is now unconsciously encircled by the future assassins and, being seized with fear, he warns.

—The principal characters of the play thus "make a ring about" Caesar. From this point on, Shakespeare visualizes the "ring" encircling Caesar on the stage and tries to show its transformation punctuating the action of the play.

—Caesar is made to disregard the warning by saying "He is a dreamer. Let us leave him. Pass." He is told, "Beware the ides of March" twice by the soothsayer and once by Brutus, and ignores it. Shakespeare makes Caesar the first to hear the shrill voice of the soothsayer in spite of his deafness of one ear and lets him hear the direct warning from the soothsayer and the indirect one from Brutus, and finally makes him call the soothsayer out before him to repeat the warning. Shakespeare creates the situation in which Caesar cannot fail to hear the warning by any means, and makes him disregard it. He is, therefore, considered to be free from superstition.

* DR between Brutus and Cassius.

—The distance between Brutus and Cassius in Plutarch is caused by Caesar's decision to give the praetorship to Brutus rather than Cassius but Shakespeare makes Brutus worry ("with himself at war") so profoundly as to forget "the shows of love" to Cassius. And Cassius in Plutarch, after their dissension, approaches Brutus for reconciliation only with the secret intention of winning Brutus into the conspiracy, but Shakespeare's Cassius has been estranged by Brutus, which dissatisfies him to such an extent that he asks him the reason for it. In that sense, he sets a high value on the friendship between Brutus and himself.

On the contrary, Brutus is transformed into a man so inwardly worried that he forgets to show kindness to his friend. He shuns Cassius and would not share his personal worries with him. Among 2526 lines of the whole play, the dialogues between them occupy 477 lines (18.9%) which far exceed the second most frequent dialogues between Antony and the Roman citizens which count 152 lines. At the outset of the relationship Shakespeare creates Brutus and Cassius who are in a striking contrast to each other in their attitude towards friendship.

—Shakespeare invents Cassius's role to serve Brutus as his glass:

And since you know you cannot see yourself
So well as by reflection, I, your glass,
Will modestly discover to yourself
That of yourself which you yet know not of.

Cassius has already played the role of glass to reflect Brutus who chose his own worries to be intent on, rather than his best friend. He conceived "worthy cogitations" in his mind, but hesitated to disclose them on account of Brutus's estrangement from him. And once Cassius knows that he is not responsible for it, he begins to talk without reserve and speak his mind to share with his friend, his frank manner an antithesis to the reserved attitude of Brutus who, though he says that he is afflicted with "passions of some difference," tries to conceal his heart and is so cautious of Cassius's flattering words that his troubled thoughts still remain his own. Shakespeare sets the glass of Cassius before Brutus to mirror his reflection unknown to him, by which he means to place Cassius's role in relation to Brutus as a foil. Brutus is reflected in the glass of Cassius as an image preferring his own worries to friendship here.

—By inventing the people's shouting off-stage twice, Shakespeare represents Brutus who does not wish the people to choose Caesar for their king despite his personal affection to him. He views the common people as wanting to have Caesar as their king, but in fact they only support Caesar on one condition that he should not become king. The Roman people in Shakespeare are republican as in Plutarch, although they love Caesar and support him. The shoutings are later proved to be people's joyful cries to see Caesar's refusal of the crown, therefore Brutus's wrong interpretation of the shouts are created.

—Shakespeare transforms Plutarch's Caesar into a coward of a feeble temper to make Cassius envious of Caesar who "is now become a god" in spite of his physical and spiritual weaknesses. But Brutus's internal anxiety derives from "these hard conditions" under Caesar and he thinks of "the general good" before his private affection toward Caesar. On the contrary, Cassius feels personal envy towards Caesar.

—Even though Brutus becomes softened by Cassius's words on Rome's present conditions under Caesar, he would not be moved by him any further and cannot be urged to make any decision. Shakespeare can be considered to be most creative in transforming Brutus from a man to be won by Cassius to a man who keeps his hands free to decide for himself by inventing Brutus's rejection which appears more friendly than the first one.

—Caesar and his company make a startling entrance because their outward appearances are quite contrary to expectations. Brutus cannot understand the "angry" and "chidden" relationship between Caesar and his train and Calphurnia's pale cheek which might have been red on account of Antony's touch to get rid of the curse of sterility. Even Cassius must have looked puzzled because he says "Casca will tell us what the matter is." Shakespeare creates their total misunderstanding of the people's shouting by keeping the Lupercalia off-stage and making the celebrations reach their ears, and makes them aware of it when they see Caesar and his train reappear on the stage. Then what happened to the festival? Casca's report will serve to solve the problem.

* DR between Caesar and Antony.

“‘As for those fat men and smooth-combed heads’ quoth he, ‘I never reckon of them. But these pale-visaged and carrion lean people, I fear them most’—meaning Brutus and Cassius.”
(*Caesar*, p. 85)

—Caesar picks out only Cassius from Brutus and Cassius and regards him as dangerous to himself. Caesar’s mistrust and fear of both Brutus and Cassius and suspicion toward Cassius are mentioned by Plutarch, therefore Shakespeare omits Brutus and discriminates Cassius from Brutus as dangerous to Caesar. Cassius’s envy toward Caesar is already described and here Caesar’s view toward Cassius is created to combine to form the antagonistic relation between them. They are mutual enemies, which is shown clearly in the statistics that the exchange between them is only 3 lines and that is Cassius’s unanswered entreaty to Caesar about the enfranchisement of Cimber. This may formally and substantially indicate the total lack of communication between them and it is because they are enemies.¹⁸ Cassius knows that “Caesar doth bear me hard,” which means that Cassius knows that Caesar thinks of him as dangerous, and actually Caesar judges Cassius’s character rightly and considers him dangerous. Shakespeare defines their antagonistic relationship clearly enough to leave no room for misunderstanding here.

—Shakespeare makes Antony contradict Plutarch when he, asked by Caesar, answers as if soothingly, “Fear him not, Caesar, he’s not dangerous. / He is a noble Roman, and well given.” Antony is transformed so that he is unfamiliar with Cassius; as a matter of fact, he is given no dialogue with the conspirators before Caesar’s assassination. His view of Cassius is, of course, wrong considering Shakespeare’s Cassius and this misinterpretation induces Caesar’s request to Antony to say of Cassius again.

—Caesar’s arrogance is invented along with his nervousness lest he should be thought to be afraid. He says, “Would he were fatter! But I fear him not; / Yet if my name were liable to fear, . . .” and “I rather tell thee what is to be fear’d / Than what I fear; for always I am Caesar.” He seems to believe that he must not surrender himself to “fear” in any circumstance.

—Caesar’s deafness in one ear is Shakespeare’s own. Caesar requests to Antony:

Come on my right hand, for this ear is deaf,
And tell me truly what thou think’st of him.

There has been much discussion about this by critics; for example, Douglas Petersen argues from the proverbial point of view that “this ear is deaf” means that I cannot accept your opinion. J.D. Wilson points out the dramatic effect caused by the gap between the previous arrogance and physical infirmity. But once shifting our attention from “this ear is deaf” to “Come on my right hand,” a new possibility of interpretation seems to be suggested. “On my right hand” usually means the direction and Antony, requested, shifts his position to Caesar’s right hand side and consequently shows visually his physical relationship to Caesar, that is to say, Antony transforms himself in an eye-catching way into Caesar’s right-hand¹⁹ man or his devoted servant by changing his position as if to associate himself with

¹⁸ This fact reminds us of the lack of communication between Hamlet and Claudius, which is shown in the few lines of DR between them.

¹⁹ N. E. D., s.v. Right hand l. c.

Caesar's right hand. Or, it can be suggested that Caesar, unsatisfied with Antony's opinion, calls to him, "Come on, my right hand," as it may sound to the audience. In this case, "my right hand" becomes a title and exactly means Antony, his right-hand man. This device of Caesar's deafness, therefore, seems to carry Shakespeare's other intention to visualize Antony's physical relationship to Caesar; Antony is his right-hand man, his right hand, literally, and metaphorically expanded to "a limb of Caesar" and "Caesar's arm" as referred to by Brutus later.

* DR between Casca and Brutus, Cassius.

—Casca is mentioned three times by Plutarch, just before and during Caesar's assassination and at the battle of Philippi, but not during the maturing process of conspiracy. Shakespeare has thrust the Lupercalia off-stage and made Brutus and Cassius converse on the stage instead, therefore, he uses Casca's mouth to inform them of the festival. And he invents Casca's report done "after his sour fashion." Shakespeare places Casca as a biased "sour" filter between the Lupercalia and Brutus, Cassius, the audience. The course of events is that Antony offered Caesar the crown three times, Caesar refused it three times with his hand, people welcomed the refusal by shouting, clapping hands, throwing up their caps, Caesar plucked open his doublet and offered the people his throat to cut, was choked by the people's stinking breath, swooned and fell down, came to himself again, apologised for his infirmity and left the place sadly. This is without Casca's "thinking" and "sour fashion." But Shakespeare mixes it with Casca's subjective point of view:

I can as well be hang'd as tell the manner of it:
it was mere foolery; I did not mark it.

..... and, as I told
you, he put it by once; but for all that, *to my*
thinking, he would fain have had it

..... but *to my thinking*
he was very loath to lay his fingers off it

Shakespeare describes Caesar's kingly ambition only through Casca's "thinking" and impression. He separates Caesar from "the covetous desire he had to be called king" by limiting the desire within Casca's personal subjective opinion. Shakespeare describes no ambition within Caesar himself.

—Shakespeare's Roman people are unanimous in supporting Caesar's refusal of the crown with no heterogeneous elements in them like "a few appointed for the purpose." Shakespeare omits their preliminary arrangements and makes Caesar and the people in complete harmony.

—Plutarch's Caesar resents the people's negative reaction toward Antony's offering him a crown and shows his naked neck defiantly, whereas Shakespeare's Caesar flatters the people by offering his throat to cut. And as if he is at the mercy of the people like "players in the theatre," he falls down as a victim of the people's stinking breath. Plutarch's Caesar "sits high," but Shakespeare's Caesar has a fit of epilepsy and falls down. This fit of epilepsy of this scene is purely Shakespeare's invention and Caesar's apology and the people's sympathy and whole-hearted forgiveness toward him are created. They are harmoniously united without any discrepancy, while Plutarch's Caesar insults the people and shows enmity to-

ward them.

—In parallel with Casca's prejudiced report, Shakespeare invents Brutus and Cassius's reaction to it to show their confusion and surprise at Caesar's "angry" and "sad" countenance and his train's "chidden" appearance. As we have witnessed, Calphurnia and Antony were ordered by Caesar to act as protagonists in "the holy chase," but there is no mention of it from Casca. Instead, Antony is bold enough to ignore Caesar's wish and leaving all ceremonies out, offer him a crown which may be interpreted as arousing his anger. Therefore, this disregarded Caesar rejects the crown and directs his anger toward "all the rest" among whom Antony and Calphurnia are following in a "chidden" mood. Shakespeare invents Caesar's commitment to "the holy chase" as we have discussed, and makes him angry at those who have neglected his elaborate order. On the other hand, Caesar "looks sad" and "came sad away." This may mean Caesar's serious and grave feelings caused by his falling-sickness which attacked him in public in an embarrassing manner. Apart from Casca's personal "thinking" that Caesar is ambitious for a crown, Caesar himself seems to be represented by Shakespeare after the Lupercalia as an "angry" and "sad" man because his order was totally disregarded and his "infirmity" made him fall down in front of the surrounding people. His countenance failed to meet Brutus's expectation and even Cassius's as we have discussed. Cassius's surprise at Caesar's fit of epilepsy is very clear because he does not expect Caesar to be thrown into such a position of vulnerability, and he is rather confused because he is quickly aware that accepting Caesar as injured and the Roman citizens as assailant does not suit his purpose of working on Brutus. Shakespeare thus makes Caesar reappear as a man who is "angry" toward his train and "sad" toward himself, and invents Casca's role to add an ambitious side to Caesar in his report.

—Unlike Plutarch's Casca, who when he fails to murder Caesar at the first blow, asks his brother for help in Greek, Shakespeare's Casca is deprived of Greek and cannot understand Cicero who spoke Greek. Therefore, unlearned Casca is Shakespeare's own.

—Casca informs them of the causal relationship between the tribunes' disrobing the images and their dismissal from office, but does not specify the person who punishes them thus. It is Caesar in Plutarch who takes revenge on the tribunes by depriving them of their tribuneships. In Shakespeare, Caesar is not responsible for that and Shakespeare who has already reduced Caesar's kingly ambition in Plutarch into Casca's impressions, is consistent in cutting again the connection between Caesar and ambition whereas Plutarch depicts Caesar as vengeful as he is ambitious and yet his desire is blocked. Casca plays the important role of informing Brutus and Cassius of the news. His role of informant in this scene is Shakespeare's invention.

* DR between Casca and Cassius, between Brutus and Cassius.

—Casca's "sour" and "blunt" way of answering Cassius is invented as well as Brutus's surprise at the "blunt fellow." Cassius, "a great observer," sizes up Casca to be quick and suitable for a noble enterprise. Therefore, Shakespeare prepares Casca to be the first man to strike Caesar in the assassination scene.

—Shakespeare makes a Brutus who has changed now and wants to be involved in this problem more deeply. Cassius has grown more confident in working on Brutus, but Shakespeare is to invent a Brutus who makes a decision to murder Caesar before Cassius comes.

* Cassius's soliloquy.

—Shakespeare has been describing the Roman people who have been favouring Caesar with one accord on the condition that he should not be crowned. And it is quite natural that Shakespeare's Cassius cannot expect those people to write letters, as in Plutarch, to move Brutus to rise against Caesar, therefore he cannot help making up forged letters in different handwritings to falsely show that they are widely supported by the people. He is still on his way to gain Brutus over to his side, and the forged letters are the means to do so and they are Shakespeare's own. Those letters are quite misleading because they look as if they come from a variety of people and that is what Cassius aims at.

I.iii * DR between Cicero and Casca.

—Shakespeare has robbed Casca of Greek as we have witnessed, therefore he creates the exchanges between Cicero “the Greecean” and Casca as those between learned and unlearned. Unlearned Casca is horrified at the storm whereas learned Cicero does not seem discomposed and receives it calmly. This contrast seems to be intentionally aimed at to bring forth Cicero's next words:

But men may construe things, after their fashion,
Clean from the purpose of the things themselves.

Cicero points out in general that man's interpretation may be liable to go wrong and be a long way off the mark, and implicitly suggests that Casca's construction of the portents may not be to the point. It is also this Casca who described the Lupercalia to Brutus and Cassius, therefore Shakespeare invents Cicero's words to indicate that Casca's information interpreted in his own way may be wrong and a misunderstanding. Casca can be considered to misunderstand Caesar's strong desire to be crowned. This idea, however, is not only peculiar to this scene of fearful portents preceeding Caesar's death, but also makes sense in the whole play. For example, Flavius misunderstands the guilty behaviour of the Roman people when the tribunes reproach their ingratitude. They continue to support Caesar afterwards. Brutus misunderstands when he thinks that the people shout for joy to see Caesar receive the crown. The shouting is for his refusal of it. Cassius wrongly thinks that Brutus can be seduced easily; but is he really won over by him later? Various kinds of misunderstandings or wrong constructions²⁰ are to be scrutinized throughout the play.

* DR between Casca and Cassius, between Cinna and Cassius.

—In working upon Casca, Cassius takes an advantage of Casca who is horrified at “the strange impatience of the heavens,” and compares his reaction under the fearful prodigies to that under Caesar's tyranny.²¹ Shakespeare replaces Plutarch's Cassius who works on Brutus with Cassius who works on Casca so that Cassius can win Casca over to his party at the first attempt, and on the contrary, Shakespeare shows Cassius's working on Brutus to be unsuccessful to the extent that the forged letters must be used.

—Casca has an earnest desire to gain Brutus to his party because “that which would appear offence in us,/ His countenance, like richest alchemy,/ Will change to virtue and to worthiness.” Will his understanding of Brutus prove to be true in the last analysis?

²⁰ This may lead to one of Shakespeare's themes of “mistaken identity.”

²¹ See Maurice Charney, *Shakespeare's Roman Plays* (Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 46, and W.H. Clemen, *The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery* (Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1951), pp. 99–100.

—Cassius uses Cinna on an errand to lay the forged papers in the praetor's chair, throw some in at Brutus's window and stick others with wax on old Brutus's statue in order to win over Brutus to his party. Through the invention of Cinna, the conspirator, as a tool to work the forged letters effectively and directly on Brutus, Shakespeare reduces the people's expectations in Plutarch to the conspirators' intentional device to deceive Brutus.

—Cassius suggests visiting Brutus:

Let us go
For it is after midnight; and ere day
We will awake him and be sure of him.

In the word "awake," two meanings may be included; one is literally to awake Brutus from sleep, and the other is to make Brutus awake to the expectations of the Roman people so that he will rise with them against Caesar's tyranny. Here Cassius is in no doubt that Brutus is fast asleep so that he may be surprised in it, but Shakespeare invents Brutus's sleeplessness and makes him wide awake waiting for Cassius and the conspirators contrary to Cassius's expectations in the next scene. Cassius misunderstands Brutus thoroughly, and Shakespeare is to overthrow his expectations immediately after.

II.i * Brutus's exclamation to wake up Lucius.

—Brutus has been worried about whether he should slay Caesar or not and it has been keeping him awake, which is a striking foil to Lucius who sleeps so soundly that he cannot wake up until Brutus exclaims impatiently. Thus, by inventing the character of Lucius who is liable to fall into deep sleep in the play, who is, as it were, a symbol of sleep itself,²² Shakespeare sets him against Brutus who has not slept from worrying about Rome under Caesar since Cassius sowed the seed in his mind. Brutus's worries before his decision to slay Caesar are Shakespeare's invention. He has been too worried about it to sleep soundly like Lucius and Shakespeare also makes Brutus wakeful in order to destroy Cassius's expectations. Brutus is portrayed as making his own decision without any advice and help. His decision is his own.

* DR between Brutus and Lucius.

—Brutus's orders to Lucius to light his study is Shakespeare's own. Consequently Lucius finds the sealed paper at the window by accident and hands it to Brutus. Shakespeare invents these orders to free Lucius from being responsible for the results brought about by the letter.

* Brutus's soliloquy.

—Personally Brutus shrinks from the murder of Caesar who is his friend and a reasonable man, whereas for the general good he must make up his mind to prevent Caesar's

²² See Adrien Bonjour, *The Structure of 'Julius Caesar'* (Liverpool University Press, 1958), pp. 53–57. He discusses the Lucius episodes in relation to the sleep motif and argues that "His(Brutus') murder of Caesar meant breaking established order, here symbolized by the harmony and stillness of sleep and music." In this article, however, I am considering the invented character of Lucius in connection with the revenge theme of the play.

“young ambition” from thriving by slaying him. Brutus chooses the public weal before his personal affection toward Caesar, and is convinced that “Caesar would be crown’d.” There is no reason to kill Caesar considering what he is now, so Brutus “fashions” the reason and is going to nip the future danger in the bud. Shakespeare has not depicted Caesar’s kingly ambition so far as we have witnessed, and invents here Brutus’s misconception that Caesar is a man of “young ambition” who wishes to be crowned as well as his understanding that Caesar is, in fact, reasonable and free from such an ambition, which is in accord with the description of Caesar the dramatist has so far constructed. Brutus prefers public cause to personal love, and in that sense he shows as usual relatively no feelings towards his friend who loves him. Thus, Brutus’s own decision, his living in the public cause in exchange for his dismissal of personal friendship, his wrong judgement of Caesar’s “young ambition” are all Shakespeare’s originals.

* DR between Brutus and Lucius.

—Brutus sends Lucius, who has brought the letter, on another errand to “look in the calendar” and tell if tomorrow is the ides of March contradicting his instructions to Lucius to go back to bed. Brutus keeps Lucius awake to serve him again and again.

* Brutus’s soliloquy.

—When Brutus receives the letter which has been forged by Cassius and thrown in at the window by Cinna and handed to Brutus by Lucius (all of which are Shakespeare’s inventions), and reads the first line, “Brutus, thou sleep’st; awake, and see thyself,” he is calm enough to ignore it because he has “took up such instigation” very often and is accustomed to them, and of course he has been wide awake. He reads the second line, “Shall Rome, etc. Speak, strike, redress!” by making up for the want of words and applies his own interpretation to it to accord with his interest in the public cause and reaches his final decision to murder Caesar. Here he “construes” the letter “after his fashion” as Cicero pointed out; he has the illusion that the letter comes from the Roman citizens and he tries to interpret it by inventing his own arguments and answers their expectations with his resolution of slaying Caesar. Thus, Brutus’s determination is made from his misunderstandings of Caesar’s character and the origin of the letter, and the decision is made before Cassius visits him. Cassius’s view of Brutus as sleeping proves to be wrong and his misunderstanding of Brutus is created.

* DR between Brutus and Lucius.

—Lucius fulfils his task by telling Brutus that it is the ides of March, and is sent again on another errand to go to the gate to find out who is knocking. He then returns and informs Brutus of the visit of Cassius and his followers. Brutus tells him to let them enter. Lucius only moves by Brutus’s directions, and when he acts spontaneously, that is the time for him to sleep.

* Brutus’s soliloquy.

Since Cassius first did whet me against Caesar,
I have not slept.

—Brutus’s deep worries and sleeplessness before Cassius’s entrance are invented.

* DR between Brutus and Cassius and the conspirators.

—Brutus welcomes Cassius who enters saying, “I think we are too bold upon your rest: / Good morrow, Brutus. Do we trouble you?” Brutus naturally answers, “I have been up this hour, awake all night.” Cassius’s misunderstanding and Brutus’s decision-making by himself are invented. Therefore Shakespeare invents that Brutus is not worked on by Cassius to reach his resolution, he has been keeping a free hand to consider the matter even though he was motivated against Caesar by Cassius, and finally decides himself before Cassius arrives to win Brutus over to his party. Therefore, prior to Cassius’s visit, Shakespeare invents Brutus’s sleeplessness in a striking contrast to Lucius’s sound sleep, in order to show firstly Brutus’s own decision-making, and secondly Brutus’s worries caused by the difficult resolution to slay his intimate friend. Cassius’s glass reflects determined Brutus in these dialogue relations.

—Cassius’s suggestion to swear meets the opposition of Brutus who believes that they need no oath for the execution of the good cause. Shakespeare mirrors Brutus in Cassius’s glass here.

—Cassius’s suggestion to win Cicero to their party meets the opposition of Brutus who claims that “he will never follow anything / That other men begin.” This reason may be more relevant to Brutus himself as critics point out. Shakespeare again reflects Brutus in Cassius’s mirror.

—Shakespeare continues to mirror Brutus in Cassius’s glass by making Brutus again reject Cassius’s suggestion of killing Antony together with Caesar. Brutus confronts Cassius and argues for the sparing of Antony’s life:

Our course will seem too bloody, Caius Cassius,
To cut the head off and then hack the limbs.

...

For Antony is but a limb of Caesar.

...

And for Mark Antony, think not of him;
For he can do no more than Caesar’s arm
When Caesar’s head is off.

Brutus’s misunderstanding of Antony is Shakespeare’s invention; he underestimates him and his definition of Antony as “a limb of Caesar” and “Caesar’s arm” is Shakespeare’s own. Then how will Shakespeare make Antony act after he loses “Caesar’s head”?

—Brutus wishes to “carve him (Caesar) as a dish fit for the gods” and says, “Let’s be sacrificers, but not butchers, Caius, / We all stand up against the spirit of Caesar, . . .” Brutus defines slaying Caesar as a ritual of sacrifice and denies “wrath in death and envy afterwards.”

—Trebonius supports Brutus in sparing Antony’s life and in fact his role is to take Antony away from the assassination spot.

—Cassius fears that superstitious Caesar may not go to the Capitol and stay at home. This is proved to be a misinterpretation later.

—Cassius suggests that all the conspirators should visit Caesar and fetch him to the Capitol. This is agreed, but actually Cassius himself does not join them. This escort by all members of the conspirators is Shakespeare’s invention, and Cassius’s absence is also

Shakespeare's own.

—Decius proposed to go to Caesar himself to bring him to the Capitol; he believes that Caesar is susceptible to flattery.

—Brutus stays at home to wait for Ligarius to come and be resolved to join them. He uses Metellus to fetch him.

* Brutus's soliloquy and DR between Brutus and Portia.

—Brutus fails to wake Lucius from his sound sleep, but his loud voice awakens Portia instead. Portia asks her husband to share his secret with her and she finally becomes one of the confederates of the conspiracy. Shakespeare creates Lucius's refusal to obey his master by making him sleep soundly in order to increase the members of the conspiracy.

* DR between Brutus and Ligarius and Lucius.

—Lucius brings sick Ligarius to Brutus to let him persuade him. Shakespeare by means of the invention of the character of Lucius creates the means to hand the letter to Brutus, tell him the ides of March, inform him of Cassius's visit and let Cassius see Brutus wide awake, all of which are important for Brutus's determination and the development of the conspiracy. Shakespeare makes Lucius unaware of the meanings of his own actions, otherwise he could not have slept soundly and would have been worried like Brutus. Brutus's decision is made before Cassius comes, which is only possible through Lucius who works for Brutus as directed. It is kept separate and free from Cassius's influence and can remain his own by means of the creation of Lucius. Also Lucius increases the conspirators; Portia by his sleep, Ligarius by his ushering him without being asked, which he has done unawares; only Shakespeare is aware of inventing Lucius's role to give information to Brutus to reach his decision, and to increase the members of the conspirators. In V.iii, Shakespeare makes Brutus feel sleepy, bid goodnight to everyone, and put on his night gown brought to him by Lucius. Brutus's readiness to sleep is invented as a sign that he is no longer worried.

II.ii * Caesar's soliloquy.

—Caesar hears Calphurnia's words in her dream and clearly understands them.

* DR between Caesar and Servant.

—Unlike Plutarch's Caesar, Shakespeare's Caesar is not so superstitious as to present sacrifice himself, he only sends to the priests to do so and wants to know the outcome.

* DR between Caesar and Calphurnia.

—Caesar insists on going forth to the Capitol in spite of Calphurnia's warnings and his knowledge of their fatal meanings.

* DR between Caesar and Servant.

—In the face of the servant's disheartening report of the augurers's presentation of sacrifice, Caesar does not change his mind, and says "Caesar shall go forth." He ignores the augurers's warnings.

—Cassius's understanding of Caesar who "is superstitious grown of late" proves to be wrong. Shakespeare's Caesar never wavers in his intention to go to the Capitol. In that sense, he is not superstitious as in Plutarch. Cassius's misunderstanding is invented to show

that Cicero is right in pointing out the human propensity to error in understanding things. Brutus is wrong in the judgement of Caesar, he has interpreted the forged letter through his devotion to the public cause. And he slights Antony's value as "a shrewd contriver" and spares him. We shall see that these misunderstandings bring about grave consequences not only to Caesar, but also to Brutus and Cassius. This is one of the structural themes in the play.

* DR between Caesar and Calphurnia.

—Calphurnia persuades her husband by calling it her fear and not his fear that keeps him in the house, and Caesar decides to stay at home to humour her, sending Antony to the Senate House to announce he is not well. As we have witnessed, Caesar dislikes to be thought afraid, and he must not fear. It must not therefore be his fear which keeps him from the Capitol at least. To Decius's inquiring the reason, he again explains that Calphurnia has begged him on her knees to stay at home. He just falls in with the capricious humour of his wife. Therefore it is very easy for Decius to persuade him back to the original plan because Caesar has not changed at the bottom of his heart.

* DR between Caesar and Decius.

—Caesar reveals the true reason for his staying at home to Decius whom he loves. It is in Calphurnia and not in Caesar himself. Decius reinterprets Calphurnia's dream and flatters Caesar not by denying the blood shed by Caesar's statue, but by beautifying it as reviving blood. This reinterpretation proves to be wrong and Calphurnia's dream comes true tragically when Caesar is murdered. But Caesar is flattered and accepts his reinterpretation as a "well expounded" one. Shakespeare has been describing Caesar's obsession that he must appear valiant, and not cowardly as seen in his "Cowards die many times before their deaths;/ The valiant never taste of death but once." Decius, therefore, takes advantage of Caesar's liability to flattery and dislike of cowardice and finally succeeds in having Caesar changed his mind.²³

* DR between Caesar and the conspirators and Antony.

—Caesar meets Brutus, Casca, Ligarius, Antony, Cinna, Metellus, Trebonius who have come to escort him to the Capitol. They have put their plan in action to lure Caesar to the Capitol. Some of them have surprised Caesar more or less; Brutus and Antony by stirring so early, Ligarius by his sickness. Therefore Caesar is deeply moved, thanks them and blames himself by saying, "I thank you for your pains and courtesy," and "I am to blame to be thus waited for." This meeting of the conspirators in a body is, as we have discussed, Cassius's original plan to fetch "superstitious" Caesar to the Capitol to be killed, therefore Caesar's thanks and self-blame show his misconstruction of their intention to escort him. He calls them "Good friends," and wants to go with them "like friends." Caesar's misunderstanding of their intention of accompanying him is Shakespeare's invention and it leads him to his death.

²³ The last part of the dialogues may suggest that Decius' logic can work on Caesar only because he is ambitious for a crown. But the matter of Decius' persuasion is taken almost directly from Plutarch, and here Decius is arguing about Caesar's questionable conduct in not going to the Capitol which must provoke the people's jeering that "Caesar is afraid." Therefore his word "proceeding" in "for my dear dear love/ To your proceeding bids me tell you this," may mean "conduct," and not "advancement" as many critics point out.

—Antony knows that Caesar is scheduled to go to the Capitol and appears to meet him in spite of his revelling deep into night. He is “a limb of Caesar” and his “good friend,” therefore Shakespeare mixes Antony with the conspirators to smooth Caesar’s way to the Capitol.

—The absence of Cassius enables Caesar to call them “good friends” because, as we have discussed, Cassius and Caesar are foes to each other. Shakespeare stops Cassius joining the escort because Cassius’s presence might not serve their purpose to entice Caesar away to the Capitol. It is unusual that the proponent is absent, but all the more for that, Shakespeare’s intention of the invention is clear.

—Brutus’s aside, “That every like is not the same, O Caesar! / The heart of Brutus earns to think upon.” expresses the transformation of the “ring” of people encircling Caesar. The first “ring” in I.ii consists purely of Caesar’s friends, though the soothsayer already sees it split. This “ring” apparently consists of “good friends,” practically the same members of the first ring with the exception of Cassius. Shakespeare creates the ring again on the stage visually and makes Brutus indicate the change in quality of it. He compresses the former actions into the change and intends to show visually the ring which appears the same as before, but has deteriorated during the development of the conspiracy.

II.iii * Artemidorus’s soliloquy.

“one Artemidorus also, . . . who . . . was very familiar with certain of Brutus’ confederates and therefore knew the most part of all their practices against Caesar, came and brought him a little bill written with his own hand, of all that he meant to tell him.”

(*Caesar*, p. 91)

—Shakespeare enhances the dramatic tension by creating the detailed substance of his message, making it known to the audience, and allowing him to give it to Caesar. Once it is in Caesar’s hand, Caesar may know of the assassination plot against himself, and the danger of the disclosure is now realized.

II.iv * DR between Portia and Lucius, between Portia and the Soothsayer.

—Shakespeare invents a Portia who is so anxious and confused that she has come close to revealing the plot. He makes her manage to smooth it over and then invents the Soothsayer’s plan to warn Caesar, which serves to heighten the dramatic tension because the danger of the disclosure is now clear.

III.i * DR between Caesar and the Soothsayer, between Caesar and Artemidorus, between Caesar and Decius, between Artemidorus and Publius, Cassius.

—The premature leaking of the assassination plot against Caesar is eventually avoided. Caesar ignores the Soothsayer’s second warnings that the ides of March are not gone. Artemidorus demands Caesar to read the schedule importunately but Shakespeare invents Decius’s prompt act to interrupt him by bringing forward Trebonius’s suit as if he is in competition with him. The extreme tension in the moment of potential disclosure is produced only because the contents of the paper Artemidorus is holding and wants to hand to Caesar have already been revealed to the audience. Shakespeare continues to invent the situation full of dramatic suspense and thrill and stresses the tension even more strongly than Plutarch.

- * DR between Popilius and Cassius, between Cassius and Brutus, Decius and Brutus, Cinna and Casca.

—The sharp contrast between panic-stricken Cassius and self-composed Brutus is Shakespeare's own. Popilius talks to Cassius only and Cassius imparts what he has said to Brutus. There is difference in time between direct talk and indirect report. Cassius is alarmed and dismayed whereas Brutus, indirectly reported, is very calm and loses no self-control.

—They are on their way to the Capitol and the ring of people surrounding Caesar is formed visually on the stage with Cassius among them. The soothsayer also takes his position in the empty place to "beseech him to *befriend himself*." This time, he already knows that Caesar has no friend to protect him but himself because he is now within the iron ring of the conspirators, and Antony, "Caesar's arm," is drawn away out of it before the assassination takes place. At the same time, Shakespeare reveals the contents of Artemidorus's letter and shows the transmutation of the ring because his words, "There is but one mind in all these men, and it is bent against Caesar" hit it right.

—The homogeneous ring of the conspirators is completed by Trebonius who takes Antony out of the way.

—Various preparations for the assassination are made; Metellus Cimber is ready to sue, indirect aid is to be given to him, Casca is ready to strike first. And Shakespeare, just after thus setting the conspirators ready for action, chooses Caesar to give a word of command, "Are we all ready?" Of course Caesar means the commencement of hearing suits, but it sounds very ironical from Caesar, the last man to be expected to give a signal to murder him, who unawares arouses attention and sets all the conspirators on their marks to assassinate him. Shakespeare puts a ring of conspirators around Caesar and makes Caesar himself unawares declare the completion of preparations for murder.

- * DR between Caesar and the conspirators.

—Caesar presides and hears suits as usual. Plutarch's Caesar postpones the session at the Capitol because he is disheartened by the ominous prodigies. Shakespeare creates Caesar who is not superstitious.

—Shakespeare has invented a Caesar who thinks Cassius dangerous and makes him stiffen his attitude when Cassius goes between Caesar and Brutus who petitions on behalf of Metellus. It is true that Caesar is surprised to see Brutus, his seeming friend, taking sides with Metellus because he reacts, "What, Brutus?" when he hears Brutus's words. The tone of "Et tu, Brute" may sound implicitly here. Caesar, after denying Metellus's flattery, must not have anticipated that Brutus would make petition to him, and could be softened and mellowed if Brutus would continue because Brutus is supposed to be influential over Caesar as his best friend. That seems what Cassius fears and he gives no time to Caesar to answer; he petitions in order to alienate Caesar so as to let him declare himself as "constant as the northern star" and finally refuse. Caesar shuts his ears because Cassius tries to move him. Shakespeare has already invented the antagonistic relationship between Caesar and Cassius and has not given any exchange between them up to this point, but he invented Cassius's words which receive no answer from Caesar here in the play in order to put Caesar firmly on the opposite side and make him reject the petition and be murdered.

—Caesar's "Et tu, Brute?—Then fall Caesar!" indicates his surprise at Brutus's "ingratitude" because he loves Brutus. Brutus pretends to be a friend to him and slays him.

He betrays him and becomes a traitor from Caesar's point of view.

* DR between the conspirators.

—Brutus regards Caesar as ambitious because he declares after killing Caesar that “ambition's debt is paid.” Then he invites the conspirators to bathe their hands in Caesar's blood and define themselves as “sacrificers” and “purgers,” not as “butchers.” This ceremony²⁴ is Shakespeare's invention and is already shown in Calphurnia's dream. Thus her dream comes true, Decius's interpretation turns out to be wrong as far as this scene is concerned, and consequently Caesar was deceived by Decius's misunderstanding of the dream, which also means that Caesar was deceived by Decius's flattery.

—The ring of the conspirators around Caesar's body comes into being on the stage. Shakespeare has been compressing the actions into the transmutation of the ring and the imaginary ring in Calphurnia's dream is actually visualized on the stage.

* DR between Brutus and Antony's Servant.

—Metellus and Cassius knelt before Caesar and Brutus kissed Caesar's hand to beg for freedom of Metellus's brother and they see Antony's servant kneel before them just after the assassination. Shakespeare seems to aim at the reversal of the political balance of power by this vivid visual contrast.

—Antony's servant acts exactly as he is directed by his master in his physical and verbal performance. This means that Antony has been cut off from Caesar: “a limb of Caesar,” “Caesar's arm,” Caesar's “right hand” has been robbed of “Caesar's head” violently so that though he preserves his physically functioning ability still, he cannot move of his own volition because “Caesar's head” which is the headquarters of making and sending directions has been cut off and destroyed. Shakespeare invents this servant and sends him to Brutus in place of his master in order to make up for disabled Antony. What Antony really needs is any kind of direction to move his body and not just the physical ability to move, therefore after he has received the direction from Brutus through his servant, he can act again by himself and appear without his servant. That seems to be the reason for the disappearance of the servant from the stage in spite of his promise of “fetching” his master. Once Antony gets the direction from Brutus, he can enter, and afterwards, he keeps on depending upon other people's instructions to enable him to move.

* DR between Brutus and Cassius.

—Cassius continues to warn credulous Brutus against Antony; he fears Antony as much as always, and Brutus's usual disregard for Cassius's opinions is invented by Shakespeare before Antony's appearance.

* DR between the conspirators and Antony, between Brutus and Cassius. Antony's soliloquy to Caesar's body.

—The moment he enters, Antony bids his farewell to Caesar, his “head,” prior to answering Brutus's greeting, which shows that Caesar and Antony were “head” and “arm” in one body and Antony realizes that their relationship is destroyed. There are two leave

²⁴ See Brents Stirling, “Or else were this a savage spectacle” in *Unity in Shakespearean Tragedy* (Columbia University Press, 1956), and Ernest Schanzer, “The Tragedy of Shakespeare's Brutus,” (*ELH*, vol. 22, March, 1955).

takings in the play, one is here, and the other is between Brutus and Cassius in V.i. The words of both farewells indicate the end of the relationship between Caesar and Antony, and between Brutus and Cassius.

—Antony demands that they kill him because he wants his own death to be at Caesar's side, with the swords red with Caesar's blood, at the time of Caesar's death, and by the same hands that killed Caesar. He wishes, so to speak, to follow his master to the grave, which is quite contrary to Brutus's expectations, and it means that he and his master cannot be separated from each other even in death because of their mutual relationship of "head" and "arm" in one body. Brutus's misunderstanding of Antony is created; Antony asserts himself as Caesar's right-hand man here just after Caesar's death.

—Antony shakes hands with all of the conspirators, ironically calling Casca, the first attacker, "valiant," saying somehow cordially to Trebonius who in support of Brutus's plea to spare Antony's life, removed him away from Caesar and enabled him to escape from the fatal swords, "Though last, not least in love, yours, good Trebonius." And then, looking down at dead Caesar, he defines himself as unchangeable friend to Caesar and the conspirators as "the enemies of Caesar." Antony displays himself as Caesar's friend without apology even when he is surrounded by the conspirators. In parallel with him, Shakespeare invents a Brutus who assures Antony of his life in spite of Cassius's fears and promises to explain to him the reason for Caesar's death. It is Brutus's own decision that they should kill Caesar and spare Antony so that their act of assassination may appear to be a ritual sacrifice rather than "bloody and cruel" butchery, and this noble cause of Brutus enables Antony to remain Caesar's friend openly as before. Antony is, in some ways, protected by Brutus who is confident in the cause of the assassination.

—Antony compares Caesar to a deer stricken dead, and the conspirators to its hunters standing around it. He realized, on the stage, the ring of the conspirators with Caesar lying dead in the centre and, being checked by Cassius, he defines them as "the enemies of Caesar," and himself as his "friend" by saying, "Pardon me, Caius Cassius: / The enemies of Caesar shall say this; / Then, in a friend, it is cold modesty." Caesar was encircled unawares and slain dead by his enemies who have maintained their homogeneous ring by "bathing their hands in Caesar's blood" when Antony, protected by Brutus's pledge, joins as a permanent friend of Caesar's to get the ring heterogeneously transmuted again. These rings are invented by Shakespeare so that even after the death of Caesar in the Capitol, Caesar's dead body is ringed around by the conspirators. Then Antony joins the ring and the body is left to Antony to be carried out to the market place. The rings, therefore, indicate the course of dramatic action at its respective place and time as the personal line-up shifts from one faction to the other.

—Unlike Plutarch's Cassius who speaks fiercely against Antony's thought to read the testament openly and bury the body honourably, Shakespeare's Cassius opposes Antony's speech at Caesar's funeral because "the people may be mov'd / By that which he will utter." Thus, Shakespeare, by inventing Antony's two requests firstly to carry Caesar's body into the market place and secondly to make a funeral speech as Caesar's friend, invents Cassius's warnings to Brutus not to consent, because he has been described as being on guard against Antony who is "a shrewd contriver," and fears people's reactions toward his oration. And then Shakespeare invents a Brutus who is optimistic enough to say "It shall advantage more than do us wrong" and despite Cassius's repeated fears, gives permission to Antony as is

requested though conditionally. Shakespeare has invented an Antony who stays Caesar's friend under the protection of Brutus and demands that Brutus permit him to carry the body into the Forum and make a funeral speech. The matter of his demands are Shakespeare's own and Brutus's permission and detailed directions about the matter and manner of Antony's speech are also Shakespeare's inventions. Here Cassius is functioning as Brutus's glass in that his repeated warnings against Antony act as a foil to Brutus's cause, on the basis of which Antony cannot die, can remain Caesar's friend, can be allowed to bring Caesar's body into the market place and make a funeral speech. In this way, Shakespeare is consistent in describing Antony not as "coward" or "flatterer" but as Caesar's friend who loves him as deeply as ever. And he makes Brutus's cause protect Antony against Cassius's reiterated fears and warnings. Therefore Shakespeare reflects Brutus's different attitude toward Antony in the glass of Cassius's attitude.

—As far as the conditions given by Brutus to Antony are concerned, Antony observes them until the people call the conspirators "traitors," "villains" and "murderers." Until that point, he has been given the directions about the matter and manner of his oration by Brutus. Brutus becomes a new director to Antony, and Antony, robbed of "Caesar's head," has found himself enabled to act again by being instructed by Brutus in the Forum scene. But even before that, when he is left alone, he is instructed by Brutus, his new director, to "prepare the body, then, and follow" them. Shakespeare makes Antony find in Brutus a new director to take Caesar's place.

* Antony's soliloquy.

—Antony has received Caesar into his hands from Brutus and his faction, and has reunited himself with Caesar in a different way from the amalgamation of "head" and "arm" in force before the death of Caesar. Antony, looking at Caesar's wounds, prophesies:

Over thy wounds now do I prophesy
(Which like dumb mouths do ope their ruby lips,
To beg the voice and utterance of my tongue),
A curse shall light upon the limbs of men;
Domestic fury and fierce civil strife
Shall cumber all the parts of Italy;

...

He is groping for his new relationship with Caesar's body and here he finds the union of the "dumb mouths" of Caesar's "wounds" with "the voice and utterance" of his "tongue" to prophesy "civil strife" in Italy and that "Caesar's spirit, ranging for revenge, / With Ate by his side come hot from hell, / Shall in these confines with a monarch's voice / Cry havoc . . ." As Caesar's mouthpiece, he prophesies the breaking-out of civil disorders in Italy and the revenge of Caesar's spirit on the conspirators. This definition of Antony as Caesar's mouthpiece; the new relationship of Caesar's "wounds" and Antony's "tongue" are invented and Antony becomes a prophet and begins to act as Caesar's mouthpiece by using his "tongue" on behalf of Caesar's "wounds." The statistics show that Antony has 7 lines and only 35 lines of DRs with Caesar before Caesar's death. After that he has 319 lines and 407 lines of DRs with other characters, which may be one of the indications that he needs no words as "a limb of Caesar" before his death, whereas he becomes a great talker by serving as the "tongue" for "Caesar's wounds" after his death.

* DR between Antony and Octavius's Servant.

—Antony reveals the purpose of his oration to Octavius's servant as follows;

there shall I try,
In my oration, how the people take
The cruel issue of these bloody men;

He cannot anticipate the reaction of the people toward his oration until he actually makes his speech before them and so he assumes a cautious attitude to test the people's feelings about Caesar's assassination. He is considered to be modest as he has no initial purpose to move the people into some direction. He plans to wait and see the response of the people and "the state of things" while he is delivering his speech.

—Antony asks Octavius's servant for help to bear Caesar's corpse into the market place as he has surely obtained the directions from Brutus. He still acts as if he was a flying-kite with the string cut from the hauler. He goes on accompanying Caesar's body since he has taken it back from the assassins and identified with it as the "tongue" to its "wounds" until the Roman populace carry it away. The ring is reduced into Antony with Caesar's body and then Octavius's servant joins. It has become homogeneous again; Caesar's corpse is transferred from Brutus's faction to Antony's faction which is to grow in the next scene.

III.ii * DR between Plebeians and Brutus, between Brutus and Cassius, between Plebeians.

—Plebeians follow Brutus saying "We will be satisfied: let us be satisfied," which means that they have not been satisfied with Caesar's death, and they are demanding Brutus to give a plausible reason for it. They try to hear Brutus and Cassius separately to compare their individual reasons afterwards, which means that they are sceptical and doubtful about Brutus and Cassius and cautious enough to compare the reasons given by them separately. Shakespeare has invented the Roman people who favour and support Caesar with no kingly ambitions as we have already witnessed, and here he makes them consistent in belonging to Caesar's faction after his death.

—Brutus attributes the reason for killing Caesar to his ambition as he explains it to the people. By saying, "I slew my best lover for the good of Rome," "as he was ambitious, I slew him," and "death for his ambition," he still values the noble cause more than his personal love toward Caesar as he has done in the past. Shakespeare invents Casca's "thinking" and has described no kingly ambition in Caesar as we have discussed, therefore Brutus's claim that Caesar was ambitious and has paid his ambition's debt in his death proves to be wrong and brings about the fatal results for Brutus and his group. Brutus had misunderstood Caesar and murdered him, driven by the misunderstanding. Brutus makes much of this point without being aware of his mistakes, which Antony is to confute at once at the beginning of his oration. Then what is Shakespeare's dramatic purpose of this invention?

—Hearing Brutus's speech, the citizens express their approval to him saying "Give him a statue with his ancestors," in which they deem Brutus identical with his ancestors who are honoured for having banished a tyrant from Rome. They are showing their dislike for tyrants here and Shakespeare has already defined and emphasized more than Plutarch the republican citizens by making them decorate the images with "ceremonies" and "trophies"

and not with “diadems,” and here Shakespeare describes the republican citizens though they love Caesar still and are dissatisfied about his death. They keep on responding:

3 Pleb. Let him be Caesar.
4 Pleb. Caesar’s better parts
 Shall be crown’d in Brutus.

It is true that these words “Let him be Caesar” sound ironical as has been pointed out, in that Brutus never killed Caesar in order to become himself a tyrant and destroy republic Rome, but from another point of view, together with the next words, “Caesar’s better parts . . .,” the plebeians show that they still love Caesar and by excluding from Caesar the worse parts, that is his ambition to be a tyrant, they try to crown Brutus with what they think are “Caesar’s better parts,” namely Caesar’s virtues which they have never ceased to love and respect. This is quite natural with them because they have been depicted as favouring Caesar while he has no desire for a crown. They are consistent in this respect considering Shakespeare’s former description of them. If “Caesar” is taken to be “ambitious” as Brutus pointed out, the words surely sound ironical, but if “Caesar” is considered the character supported by people with respect and affection, the people are unchangeable in their support of him and are expressing their respect and favour toward Brutus by comparing Brutus to Caesar, their hero. Shakespeare’s citizens approve Brutus’s speech because Brutus’s claim that Caesar was ambitious and had a desire for a crown, whether it is true or not, is convincing as they have had a deep-rooted general dislike for a tyrant. When they say that “This Caesar was a tyrant” and “We are blest that Rome is rid of him,” it is indicated that they are convinced and satisfied with Brutus’s arguments of Caesar’s ambition because they detest tyrants. But they still love Caesar and his “better parts” because of which they take an ambivalent attitude, as it were, toward Caesar. Like Brutus, they love Caesar and yet prefer republican Rome, where Brutus’s speech works strongly and persuasively. They are not fickle and capricious,²⁵ they are consistent in loving Caesar in particular and hating tyrants in general. But Shakespeare does not make them scrutinize whether it is true or not that Caesar was an ambitious tyrant as Brutus insists; Shakespeare makes them quickly satisfied and convinced, which seems to show Shakespeare’s intention to leave some room for Antony’s arguments to work effectively, for Antony takes advantage of that unargued point. If the arguments are maintained that Caesar was not an ambitious tyrant and desired no crown, Caesar’s worse parts would disappear and Brutus’s assertions would fail. It is clear that the dramatist has intentionally created Brutus’s misunderstanding of Caesar’s ambition so that it can be confuted by Antony in his oration as ungrounded, and he therefore makes the people leave the point to be argued by Antony later. They are not responsible for it, but Shakespeare is. Therefore his ultimate purpose must be examined closely.

* DR between Antony and the Plebeians, between Plebeians, between Antony and Octavius’s Servant.

—Unlike Plutarch’s Antony, Shakespeare’s Antony has obtained Brutus’s permission to speak and waits for the people to “let him go up into the public chair.” Actually he waits until they say “Noble Antony, go up.” It is true he seems modest, but he cannot act with-

²⁵ Cf. Brents Stirling, *The Populace in Shakespeare*, pp. 25–28 and George Brandes, *William Shakespeare* (English translation, William Heinemann, 1909), pp. 532–550.

waiting for the people to call Brutus and his faction "traitors," "villains," and "murderers." He shifts the source of his direction from Brutus to the people here and asks them for permission to descend from the pulpit modestly:

Shall I descend? and will you give me leave?

"Caesar's arm" without the head receives their permission, "Come down," "Descend," "You shall have leave." They make a ring leaving room for Antony with Caesar's body in the centre. Even though he is united with Caesar as his "tongue," he cannot help depending still on the people for his directions. Here the homogeneous ring of the people and Antony, all of whom are in Caesar's faction, comes into being again on the stage visually, and Antony can reassert his identity as "Caesar's arm" by being united with the Roman people with Caesar's corpse in the middle. The transmutation of the ring has been achieved and Caesar succeeds in assembling his own faction around him and is about to speak out through the "dumb mouths" of "wounds" by borrowing "the voice and utterance" of Antony's "tongue."

—Antony asserts himself as the "tongue" of Caesar's "wounds" when he showed them as ocular proofs of butchery to the ring of the people. He has become a voluble man all the more because he has lost "Caesar's head" and found a new relationship with the "ruby lips," and indicates here the individual dagger cuts by pointing at them on the mantle. He puts an epithet before the name of Casca and calls him "envious Casca" which is convincing because he cowered before Caesar and became the first, treacherous attacker from behind.²⁶ But he does not add anything to the name of Cassius, because Cassius was created as an enemy to Caesar, therefore, even if he stabbed Caesar, it is a natural act done by his enemy. But to the name of Brutus, Antony attaches "well-beloved" and continues to refer to him as "Caesar's angel" who gave Caesar "the most unkindest cut of all," because Brutus requited Caesar's kindness with the cruel act of murder. Both Casca and Brutus are the executioners of "bloody treason" because of their deceptive behaviour to Caesar. Antony finally concludes his speech with "Here is himself, marr'd, as you see, with traitors." The role of the "tongue" for "Caesar's wounds" has been successfully played by Antony in this scene, for he showed the open cuts and identified each of them as if he gave his voice to the wounds.

—Seeing the uncovered body of Caesar, the people cry, "We will be revenged." The word "revenge" comes from their mouth for the first time, and after that, they begin to cry in unison for revenge. They were already defined as Caesar's "heirs" and here they react as those who are to fulfil the duty of heirs²⁷ to take revenge on traitors for the murder of Caesar.

—Antony pretends to be modest by saying "I am no orator, as Brutus is, / . . . I tell you that which you yourselves do know, / Show you sweet Caesar's wounds, poor poor dumb mouths, / And bid them speak for me." As a matter of fact, he is surely an eloquent orator because he has moved the people by his oration in the funeral speech. He tries to hide his inner intention from moment to moment by asserting that he is no orator. Rather, he admits his role as the mouthpiece of Caesar in this scene, and moreover he tries to underestimate his role by making "Caesar's wounds" so eloquent as to speak for him. In fact, he

²⁶ Casca's stab in the back of Caesar combined with his speech behind his back has been pointed out by critics as establishing his treacherous nature.

²⁷ See Fredson Bowers, *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy* (Princeton University Press, 1940); pp. 38–39, and Percy Simpson, *Studies in Elizabethan Drama* (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1955), p. 145.

has been appointed as the "tongue" for "Caesar's wounds" by Shakespeare, therefore he has spoken eloquently for the "dumb mouths" of "Caesar's wounds." Then he says that if eloquent Brutus becomes Antony, "there were an Antony / Would . . . put a tongue/ In every wound of Caesar that should move / The stones of Rome to rise and mutiny." We know that Shakespeare did not give such qualities of a good orator that Antony mentions to Brutus at all. Rather, Antony is well qualified by the dramatist to show that his words above are in fact applied to himself to move the people to rise against the traitors. Antony denies his ability as an orator, but Shakespeare actually endows him with it and lets him work on the people.

—Shakespeare invents an Antony who reveals the will of Caesar to the people and shows that the Plebeians are substantially his heirs. Deeply moved by Caesar's considerate attitude toward them, the people are united with Caesar's body by carrying it away for revenge while Antony is left behind alone. Now, the ring of the people with Caesar's body in the centre is formed and disappears. This is the last ring visualized on the stage and Caesar is carried away by the hands of the revengers and never returns. Antony, after seeing it off the stage, bids farewell to the ring by saying, "Now let it work. Mischief, thou art afoot, / Take thou what course thou wilt!" He never takes part in that ring to the last. He does not depart from the stage with the ring. He is left alone on the stage because he is not Caesar's revenger in the sense that the Roman people are. Here, Shakespeare splits the ring into Caesar's body carried by avengers for Caesar's death and Antony, in order to separate Antony who cannot act since "Caesar's head" was off, from the people who will be revenged. Even now he must depend on Octavius's servant to be brought to him, and then what relationship will he seek with Octavius?

—It is Antony's instigations and not the death of Cinna the poet that precipitates Brutus and Cassius's escape from Rome. This causal relationship between Antony's abetment of the people and Brutus and Cassius's defeat is Shakespeare's own.

III.iii * DR between Cinna the Poet and the Plebeians.

—Unlike Plutarch's Cinna the poet who is taken for Cinna the murderer and killed by the common people, Shakespeare's Cinna the poet is killed by the Plebeians, even though they are aware that he is not a conspirator, so incited by Antony to violence that they have lost their self-control. In that sense, the frenzy of the Plebeians is stressed by Shakespeare more than Plutarch, and this establishes them as the revengers for Caesar's death. They are fulfilling their sacred duty as the heirs of Caesar. This is the last scene in which the Plebeians are seen on the stage.

IV.i * DR between Antony and Octavius and Lepidus.

"all three met together. . . . But yet they could hardly agree whom they would put to death; for every one of them would kill their enemies, and save their kinsmen and friends."

(*Antonius*, p. 194)

—Shakespeare excludes Octavius from the Triumvirs involved in making up of the list of proscriptions, and through the creation of Publius who is Antony's nephew and by the exception of Cicero, he restricts the mutual demands of Antony and Lepidus to the equal terms of killing one of each other's blood relatives at the same time. Octavius is made to

keep his neutral position between them by suggesting the arrangement to Antony and Lepidus.

—Shakespeare invents the perfect victory of the Triumvirs over the republicans by depicting the proscription scene immediately after Antony's victory over Brutus and by omitting the political conflict and disorders brought to a close by the Triumvirate in Plutarch.²⁸

—After sending Lepidus to fetch Caesar's will, Antony criticises him to Octavius:

This is a slight unmeritable man,
Meet to be sent on errands.

He slights Lepidus and in spite of Octavius's opposition, he continues to make light of him saying:

It is a creature that I teach to fight,
To wind, to stop, to run directly on,
His corporal motion govern'd by my spirit.
And, in some taste, is Lepidus but so:

Octavius is different from Antony in the estimation of Lepidus; he regards him as "a tried and valiant soldier," but Antony regards him "as a property" to use as a mere tool. Antony had been Caesar's right-hand man before Caesar's death, and therefore has been paralyzed since his death, having lost his "corporal motion" as a result of the total destruction of the seat of direction. He has been brought to Octavius by his servant, a sign that he is still paralyzed. So far he has been 'Caesar's arm' without "corporal motion" as it were and here he tries to govern Lepidus's corporal motion with his will. Therefore he reveals his wish to become "spirit" this time, and Shakespeare invents an Antony who aims to become "head" by gaining his "spirit." The "head" and "arm" relationship between Caesar and Antony is being replaced by "spirit" and "corporal motion" relationship between Antony and Lepidus. He wishes to become "head" himself and goes to Octavius to ally with him. And what is Shakespeare's intention in inventing their "alliance combin'd" in relation to his original description of Antony's desire for "head"?

IV.ii * DR between Brutus and Lucilius, between Brutus and Pindarus.

—Sickening and decaying "love" between Brutus and Cassius is the quarreling point. Brutus regards Cassius as "a hot friend cooling," but is it right to deem him so?

IV.iii * DR between Brutus and Cassius.²⁹

—Cassius relies on Brutus because he thinks that Brutus is his intimate friend and will grant his request about his other friend Lucius Pella, but he is flatly refused by Brutus and feels neglected and wronged. His expectations of Brutus's friendship are ruined by his cold attitude, and he turns upon Brutus in a fury. Cassius here is considerate toward Pella and believes in his friendship with Brutus, showing a Cassius who values friendship as highly as ever. On the other hand, Shakespeare invents a Brutus who values the noble cause of the

²⁸ Cf. M.W. MacCallum, *Shakespeare's Roman Plays* (Macmillan, 1935), p. 190.

²⁹ A.C. Bradley ignores this Quarrel scene as a mere "episode," but Shakespeare seems to reflect Brutus in the glass of Cassius as distinctly as possible in this scene. Therefore this quarrel serves best for Shakespeare's intention of depicting Brutus and Cassius as cold to friendship and true to friendship respectively. Cf. A.C. Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy* (Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1926), p. 60. See also G. Wilson Knight, "The Eroticism of *Julius Caesar*" (*The Imperial Theme*, Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1931, pp. 74-76).

assassination of Caesar and tries to keep it from being stained by the personal faults of Cassius. Brutus is, therefore, consistent in choosing the cause of "the ides of March" above the friendship with Cassius. He has already abandoned the friendship with Caesar in order to defend his republic cause. Shakespeare reflects the consistent figure of Brutus in the glass of Cassius who is also unchanged as a man of true friendship.

—Cassius, who has had patience with Brutus's reproach of "itching palm" and insult of "slight man," has reached the end of his endurance and asserts that "Brutus hath riv'd my heart. / A friend should bear his friend's infirmities; / But Brutus makes mine greater than they are." and says "You love me not" to Brutus who answers, "I do not like your faults." Cassius says "A friendly eye could never see such faults" to Brutus who answers, "A flatterer's would not . . ." Cassius is disillusioned at last about friendship with Brutus and is about to put an end to the relationship by presenting his dagger to Brutus to kill him. He tries to remain Brutus's friend to the last extremity by directing Brutus to destroy the friendship. They are constructed by Shakespeare as opposite characters in that Brutus is cold to personal friendship and holds fast to the public cause and justice whereas Cassius holds to friendship even to the extent of sacrificing the cause slightly. Brutus was strange to Cassius at the outset of their relations and he never shared his troubled thoughts with Cassius except by disclosing them in spite of himself. He is consistent in his attitudes toward friendship and public good whereas Cassius is consistent in his attitude towards friendship. Both identities are kept inviolate by Shakespeare up to this scene, on account of which their friendship comes nearly to the catastrophe. Cassius's glass functions again to reflect Brutus in it.

* DR between Brutus and Cassius, between Brutus, Cassius and a Poet.

—Brutus and Cassius become reconciled to each other before the Poet requests them to "love and be friends," which is Shakespeare's own making. They are visibly friends again in uniting to drive him away. They have already reunited inwardly, therefore the Poet enables them to appear reconciled outwardly.

* DR between Brutus and Lucius.

—Brutus sends Lucius for "a bowl of wine." He prepares for his complete reconciliation with Cassius.

* DR between Brutus and Cassius, between Brutus and Lucius, between Brutus and Titinius, Messala.

—Shakespeare, by transferring the description of Portia's death from the end of the life of *Brutus* to this particular scene near Sardis, constructs a sorrowful Brutus who has been informed of her death beneath the Brutus who reproaches Cassius so bitterly, a device by which Shakespeare explains how Brutus could attack Cassius emotionally, and yet draws some sympathy toward the character.

—Unlike Plutarch, Shakespeare has Portia's death caused by the disadvantageous political situation. Portia, who loves Brutus and has shared the secret with him thus becoming one of the confederates, could not stand the absence of her husband and the increase in power of Octavius and Antony and has killed herself. Shakespeare embodies in her a wife who loves Brutus and an unchanged member of the conspiracy to the last.

—The reconciliation of Brutus and Cassius is finally confirmed by the wine brought in by the invented character of Lucius. Cassius's joy in regaining Brutus's love is eloquently

expressed in his “I cannot drink too much of Brutus’ love.” He is a man of true friendship through and through.

—Cassius is more sentimental than Brutus about Portia’s death. He is checked by her husband when he speaks to himself, “Portia, art thou gone?” and reacts toward Brutus who bids farewell to Portia, saying “I have as much of this in art as you, / But yet my nature could not bear it so.” He is also surprised at the news of Cicero’s death by proscription. Cassius here is sentimentally intent on the dead whereas Brutus puts aside the death of Portia and twice requests Cassius to speak no more of Portia turning “to our work alive.” He rejects sentimentalism over the dead in which he includes Portia and Cicero. The death of his wife and the deaths of senators are weighed equally in Brutus’s mind and he returns to the immediacy of the present military situation by saying “to our work alive.” He can bear the truth like a Roman as requested by Messala here. He has declared himself, “a son of Rome,” and acted like a Roman. At the same time, he has commanded Cassius, and Messala here to do so. But now it is his turn to act like a Roman because Messala asks him to bear the truth. Brutus can bear it because he has already been informed, which is Shakespeare’s invention. He can act like a Roman as requested by Messala only because he knew of Portia’s death and confessed to Cassius. Then when will he be asked to act like a Roman again and then how will he act? Shakespeare begins to invent a Brutus who, having urged others to be Romans so far, is now urged by others to do the same. Sentimental Cassius is a foil to cool Brutus, therefore Cassius’s glass to mirror Brutus is invented. At the same time, Brutus’s turn to act like a Roman is invented.

—The difference between Brutus and Cassius about the judgement of the war situation is turned into accord by the concession of Cassius. This is intentional because Shakespeare depicts this conflict just after he has given the solution to the previous conflict. Cassius against his will endeavours to be united with Brutus’s will. He confronts Brutus and then yields. This paradigm has been repeatedly invented to present Cassius’s mirror to Brutus. In this dialogue, Brutus’s impatient decision to march to Philippi is in a striking contrast to Cassius’s cautious idea of waiting for the enemy.

—Brutus invites the others to sleep thus:

The deep of night is crept upon our talk,
And nature must obey necessity,
Which we will niggard with a little rest.

Brutus could not sleep before the assassination of Caesar, but now he feels sleepy. He bids good night to Cassius and Messala and they do the same to Brutus. All of them are ready to sleep, and Cassius says:

Never come such division ’tween our souls!
Let it not, Brutus.

And Brutus answers, “Every thing is well.” In fact, there is no “division” between them just as Cassius hopes; they part friends after all. Then what does it mean when they cease to quarrel and what is the purpose of Shakespeare in having Brutus ready to sleep?

* DR between Brutus and Lucius.

—Brutus puts on the night gown brought and given to him by Lucius. Lucius, as we

have discussed, is one of a few characters created by Shakespeare in the play and seems to symbolize harmony and order by his sound sleep. Moreover, he plays an instrument to produce music which is also symbolic of harmony.³⁰ Lucius once brought "a bowl of wine" to Brutus, by means of which Brutus and Cassius could confirm their friendship and be reconciled with each other. Lucius, therefore, heals the damaged relationship into sound harmony and this role has been invented by Shakespeare throughout the play.

Lucius answers drowsily and plays "a sleepy tune" for Brutus and falls into sleep himself while playing. Brutus allows him to sleep tenderly and has turned to reading when he sees the ghost of Caesar and converses with it. Shakespeare changes Plutarch's "thy evil spirit" into the ghost of Caesar which says, "thou shalt see me at Philippi" to Brutus who answers "I will see thee at Philippi then." Brutus is overcome by sleep and sends Lucius to fetch a night gown, which means that he is about to sleep by putting on the night gown brought by Lucius, the personification of sleep. This is Brutus transmuted into Lucius and shows that Brutus has no worries which cause sleeplessness as he had before the assassination. He is well ready for sleep and has no troubled thoughts and can sleep soundly after the murder. This indicates that he cannot conquer his sleeplessness and regain sound sleep until he murders Caesar, which is quite contrary to Macbeth who cannot sleep after he murders Duncan. His mind is peaceful because he has confidence in the Roman cause and believes in the just motive of the assassination. And it is at that moment that the ghost of Caesar appears and tells him that it will revenge Caesar's death on him. This not only prevents Brutus from sleeping soundly, but also keeps him restless. The ghost, therefore, appears to pull Brutus back from the world of sleep where Brutus can peacefully unite himself with Lucius and to fill him with fears that make his blood cold and his hair stand on end and consequently to take revenge on Brutus for the murder of Caesar. Shakespeare invents the sleepiness of Brutus and makes the ghost of Caesar obstruct it to show the will of vengeance clearly in it. Brutus does not wake up Lucius this time as he kept doing before the assassination and it is because his sleep and Lucius's sleep are incorporated in one. Unconsciously, Lucius plays the role of launching and bringing to success the conspiracy, removing the worries of his master and inviting him to sleep according to Shakespeare's intention. Shakespeare invents the ghost of Caesar who robs Brutus of his sleep once again, shocks Brutus out of his satisfaction with the just cause of the assassination and forces him to worry about the unjust murder of Caesar to be revenged. Shakespeare invents Brutus's insomnia and sleepiness before and after the assassination in relation to the sound sleep of Lucius and he creates the ghost of Caesar to destroy Brutus's sleep and reveal the framework of revenge play. The ghost does not appear to Lucius, Varro and Claudius who are sleeping; it appears only to Brutus, a sign that it means to take revenge only on Brutus. Here Antony's prophecy comes true; "Caesar's spirit" surely appears to revenge his death on Brutus who stood "up against the spirit of Caesar." Thus, sleepless Brutus and sleepy Brutus in relation to the sleep of Lucius and the ghost of Caesar are all Shakespeare's inventions to give the play the framework of revenge.

V.i * DR between Octavius and Antony.

—Unlike Plutarch's Octavius who was sick and defeated in battle by Brutus and who

³⁰ Cf. Adrien Bonjour, *op. cit.*, p. 56. He does not mention the role of Lucius in bringing Brutus and Cassius into harmony.

fought separately from Antony, Shakespeare's Octavius is at the plains of Philippi with Antony.

—Octavius points out Antony's wrong conjectures about the military movements of the enemy. Shakespeare invents Brutus's assertion that they should attack the enemy before it advances, and then he makes Cassius obey him resulting in Antony's incorrect judgements about the movements of Brutus and Cassius's army, and consequently he invents an Octavius who stands at advantage over Antony. When they know that the enemy is advancing, a disagreement arises:

Ant. Octavius, lead your battle softly on
 Upon the left hand of the even field.
 Oct. Upon the right hand I. Keep thou the left.
 Ant. Why do you cross me in this exigent?
 Oct. I do not cross you; but I will do so.

Shakespeare invents an Antony who fails to impose his orders on Octavius and invents an Octavius who neglects Antony's request, issues orders to Antony in return and does his own will. Shakespeare again invents Octavius's superiority over Antony. In IV.i, Antony exercises priority over Lepidus and forms an alliance with Octavius seeking for the leadership. However, when his misjudgements about the war situation are pointed out, having failed in manipulating Octavius according to his military strategy, he is subject to Octavius's orders. Antony has been "Caesar's arm" as we have discussed, and the "tongue" for "Caesar's wounds" and has expressed his desire to give directions to others. He is successful in his efforts with Lepidus, but he fails with Octavius. Shakespeare, through this departure from Plutarch, makes Octavius act with Antony, allows him to have precedence over Antony, and to take the leadership of their army. Immediately after the quarrel, when they meet Brutus and Cassius, Antony, who has called him "Octavius" up till then calls him "Caesar" for the first time, and as the commander Octavius orders his army to "stir not until the signal." The struggle for leadership between Octavius and Antony has come to an end with Octavius as the winner, Antony the loser. After that, Antony exits with Octavius who orders him, "Come, Antony; away!," and asks his soldiers to keep on searching for Brutus adding "And bring us word unto Octavius' tent / How every thing is chanc'd." Antony is in Octavius's tent, follows him now. Antony is finally subordinate to Octavius, which is a great alteration from Plutarch. Then what seems to be Shakespeare's ultimate purpose of it?

* DR between Brutus and Antony, between Cassius and Antony, between Octavius and Brutus, between Cassius and Brutus.

—The meeting of both parties before the battle is not found in Plutarch, and "words" and "blows" are the key words in this scene. With Cassius's words, "Antony, / The posture of your blows are yet unknown; / But for your words, they rob the Hybla bees, / And leave them honeyless.", Shakespeare confirms Antony as "Caesar's arm" with no "corporal motion" nor "the posture of" his "blows," and as a good orator as well. This is shown in Cassius's words, "Now, Brutus, thank yourself. / This tongue had not offended so today, / If Cassius might have rul'd." He means that it is due to Brutus's mistake in sparing Antony's life that they are called "flatterers" by Antony now, and terms Antony as "this tongue."

Surely Shakespeare has given him the "tongue" as a powerful weapon in place of "the posture of" his "blows" in the Forum scene. Antony is defined even by his enemy as the "tongue," an eloquent orator.

—While Antony is intent on reproaching Brutus and Cassius for Caesar's murder, Octavius keeps silent, and then he speaks to attract their attention to the immediate present, saying, "Come, come, the cause.," and "I draw a sword against conspirators. / When think you that the sword goes up again? / Never, till Caesar's three and thirty wounds / Be well aveng'd; . . ." Here in his words, Octavius, Caesar's adopted son, declares his intention to revenge Caesar's death. While this declaration of revenge is being made, Antony keeps silent except for his short criticism of Cassius. In this invented scene, Shakespeare draws separately Antony, the "tongue," to attack verbally Brutus and Cassius, and Octavius, "the posture of" his "blows," to draw his sword against conspirators to take revenge on Brutus and Cassius for Caesar's death. Antony lives in the past, whereas Octavius lives in the future.

—Cassius asks Brutus how to conduct himself in case the battle is lost. Brutus regards suicide as "cowardly and vile" according to his Stoic philosophy, but Cassius asks Brutus again if he is contented to be led through the streets of Rome as a result of his rejection of suicide, and Brutus replies in haste, "No, Cassius, no: think not, thou noble Roman, / that ever Brutus will go bound to Rome; / He bears too great a mind. . . ." Cassius draws this promise from Brutus who is at a loss for a moment to decide whether he should hold fast to his own philosophy or conduct himself like a Roman, but finally prefers the latter. How his "too great a mind" will find its way onwards must be investigated.

—Brutus and Cassius bid farewell to each other:

- Bru. For ever, and for ever, farewell, Cassius.
 If we do meet again, why, we shall smile;
 If not, why then this parting was well made.
- Cas. For ever, and for ever, farewell, Brutus.
 If we do meet again, we'll smile indeed;
 If not, 'tis true this parting was well made.

One of the most important characteristics of this parting is that it is composed of almost the same words and the same matter, and they are united in perfect consent. This is the parting of homogeneity and they part as friends for ever. They have had repeated quarrels and been reunited through the concession of Cassius. Here in this parting, Shakespeare places them into perfect union only to be separated for ever intending that, paradoxically, they do not cease to quarrel nor are united homogeneously until they part for ever. Moreover Cassius has functioned as Brutus's glass. Shakespeare, who has so constructed the character of Brutus that his reflection in Cassius's glass may be focussed distinctly, now prevents Brutus from having a distinct reflection in Cassius's glass by making Brutus and Cassius homogeneous. Cassius' role as Brutus's glass has vanished and this farewell is a perfect union of Brutus and Cassius and an end of the function of Cassius as Brutus's glass as well.

V.iii * DR between Cassius and Messala, between Cassius and Pindarus.

"he sent Titinius . . . to go and know what they were. Brutus' horsemen saw . . . and went and embranced him . . . But this marred all. For Cassius, thinking indeed that

Titinius was taken of the enemies. . . . After that he . . . took Pindarus with him. . . ."
(*Brutus*, pp. 159–160)

—Shakespeare invents a Cassius who is not responsible for the misunderstanding which causes his death, but becomes a victim of Pindarus's misunderstanding which is Shakespeare's addition. Cassius believes what Pindarus witnesses and misunderstands, and it is not Cassius himself who misunderstands the real situation in which Titinius, his friend, is involved. By having Cassius borrow good eye-sight from Pindarus, Shakespeare is careful not to make Cassius's death the result of his own misunderstanding. Rather, Shakespeare emphasizes that his death is caused by his strong feeling of responsibility because he has sent Titinius to be captured by the "enemy." It thus is shown that Cassius, after ceasing to function as Brutus's glass, makes friends with Titinius and continues this friendship. Cassius is defined as a man of true friendship again and this time the object of his friendship is Titinius. Therefore, Cassius blames himself for his "capture," and makes Pindarus help him to kill himself. He asks Pindarus to kill him with the sword that slew Caesar and says, "Caesar, thou art reveng'd, / Even with the sword that kill'd thee." His suicide indicates the achievement of Caesar's revenge as well as his fidelity to his friend. The meaning of revenge is symbolized in the use of the same weapon.

* DR between Titinius and Messala.

—Returning safe from his mission with Messala, Titinius learns of Cassius's suicide and laments by saying, "Alas, thou hast misconstrued every thing." He realizes that Cassius killed himself because he felt responsible for his apparent capture, and commits suicide with Cassius's sword, to show Brutus how he "regarded Caius Cassius." Titinius understands Cassius's misconception, but in fact, he misunderstands Cassius who did nothing but to believe what Pindarus witnessed and erroneously reported, and as a result of his friendship, he kills himself. Cassius and Titinius actually risked their lives for the friendship between them. Shakespeare adds one more victim of misunderstanding here which reminds us of Cicero's words about human misconstructions, and, by making Titinius use Cassius's sword, he applies Caesar's revenge on Titinius as the sword was used to murder Caesar.

* DR between Brutus and Messala, between Brutus and Cato.

—On entering to see Cassius and Titinius dead, Brutus says:

O Julius Caesar, thou art mighty yet!
Thy spirit walks abroad, and turns our swords
In our own proper entrails.

Shakespeare, having killed Cassius by means of Pindarus's misunderstanding and Titinius through his own misunderstanding in order to show their mutual pure friendship, makes Brutus declare their suicides to be the result of Caesar's revenge being taken on them. Here Antony's prophecy about the revenge of "Caesar's spirit" has come true and Shakespeare makes Brutus well understand the meaning of their deaths.

V.iv * DR between Antony and Lucilius.

—Lucilius becomes a double of Brutus and being captured and brought before Antony, he says:

I dare assure thee that no enemy
 Shall ever take alive the noble Brutus.
 The gods defend him from so great a shame!
 When you do find him, or alive or dead,
 He will be found like Brutus, like himself.

This is the echo of Brutus's promise to Cassius before his death; Lucilius will watch carefully how Brutus will prove that he "bears too great a mind."

—Antony goes back to Octavius's tent, which means that he is subordinate to Octavius as we discussed above.

V.v * DR between Brutus and "poor remains of friends."

—Brutus calls to Dardanius, Clitus, Strato and Volumnius to rest on the rock. He has lost Cassius, Titinius, Cato and Lucilius to become a man with "poor remains of friends." He has lost great friends indeed and a few friends who are also lesser friends in the play remain with him now. Therefore, "poor remains" usually means "a few," but it could suggest Brutus's coldness to lesser friends in calling them so. Shakespeare may include some literal meaning to indicate quality in the word "poor" such as "unworthy" or "bad," quite apart from Brutus's subjective intention. Furthermore Brutus shows his lack of concern about the safety of Statilius by saying "Slaying is the word; / It is a deed in fashion." He is very cold and even contemptuous towards his friends here. This Brutus, then, asks Clitus and Dardanius to kill him and meets their refusal. Then he turns to Volumnius and tells him that the ghost of Caesar has appeared to him twice as it promised before and he realizes that his "hour is come." Accordingly, he requests Volumnius to hold his sword-hilt while he runs on it, for he counts on his friendship as he was once his fellow student. But again he is rejected flatly by Volumnius who says, "That's not an office for a friend, my lord." Shakespeare makes a Brutus who wants to kill himself and asks "poor remains of friends" for their help to do so in order to avoid his going "bound to Rome," being "led in triumph through the streets of Rome," "so great a shame" to be taken "alive" by the "enemy" and in order to "be found like Brutus, like himself." Here Brutus wishes to prove his "too great a mind" and conduct himself like a Roman, but he fails. True friends would help Brutus out of this predicament, but "poor remains of friends" refuse his request. This is surely his turn to be like a Roman now, but Shakespeare does not allow him to attain his purpose by inventing their flat refusal. Brutus can find no "friend in need." He has been strange to Cassius and unkind to Caesar, and even in this scene he is cold to the "poor remains of friends" and Statilius. Therefore it seems to be natural that he cannot depend on friends when he is forced to solve his own difficulty. In that sense, when they refuse, it can be said that they are revenged on Brutus. Of course, in general, those who help one to die are no friends, so they want to be friends by not assisting Brutus's suicide here, but in Brutus's case, those who help him to die are true friends. Brutus cannot find a true friend when he needs one most.

* DR between Brutus and Strato.

"He went a little aside with two or three only, among the which Strato was one. . . . Others say that not he, but Strato, at his request, held the sword in his hand, . . .

(*Brutus*, pp. 171–2)

—By making Strato sleep while the other three are refusing Brutus's request, Shakespeare makes Brutus turn to Strato who knows nothing of the refusals and just succeeds in employing him for his suicide by taking advantage of his ignorance. Shakespeare invents Cassius's inquiry and Brutus's promise and Lucilius's attention in order to have Brutus worried about his inability to commit suicide without the aid of friends. Strato's sleep is Shakespeare's invention which enables Brutus to die at last. And Shakespeare invents Strato who did the last service to his "master," therefore, by creating a master-servant relationship and not friendship between them, Shakespeare invents a Brutus who has been unable to obtain any help from friends right to the last.

* Brutus's soliloquy.

—As he runs on the sword held by Strato, Brutus addresses himself to the spirit of Caesar:

Caesar, now be still;
I kill'd not thee with half so good a will.

Caesar's ghost, having been avenged, may now become still and Caesar's revenge is created by the dramatist. Antony's prophecy has come true in the case of Cassius and Brutus; Caesar's spirit has taken revenge on them for the murder of Caesar. Then what is the ultimate purpose of this invention?

As far as this scene is concerned, Brutus kills himself more willingly than he killed Caesar because he can at last prove himself to be "too great a mind" to the satisfaction and relief of Cassius and Lucilius. Cassius must have been satisfied if he were alive and Lucilius actually thanks Brutus that he has proved Lucilius to be right. These words express the happy feelings which Brutus can enjoy since he can commit suicide like a Roman at last.

* Antony's soliloquy.

—Antony, who has been silent under the initiative of Octavius, steps forward and speaks a tribute to Brutus:

This was the noblest Roman of them all.
All the conspirators save only he
Did that they did in envy of great Caesar;
He only, in a general honest thought
And common good to all, made one of them.

Antony distinguishes Brutus from Cassius in their motives for the murder of Caesar. As Antony claims, Shakespeare has reflected Brutus's "general honest thought" and the cause of "common good to all" in the glass of Cassius's personal envy toward Caesar. Surely Antony is well-qualified to make this speech because his life was spared by Brutus's noble cause. Here Antony does not point out friendship as one of the ties between Brutus and Cassius, he is very eager to praise Brutus and denounce the other conspirators. But Shakespeare described Brutus's shortcomings in relation to Cassius as we have witnessed.

* Octavius's orders.

—Octavius is made by Shakespeare to pay tribute to Brutus by saying "Within my tent

his bones to-night shall lie, / Most like a soldier, order'd honourably." Antony has already paid his tribute with words, whereas Octavius does so with actions. He declares an armistice as the commander and acts as victor. He is defined as the revenger of Caesar's death as he proclaimed himself, therefore his triumph over Brutus and superiority to Antony have been created to show the framework of the play as a tragedy of revenge for Caesar.³¹

V

We have been discussing Shakespeare's deviations from Plutarch, the main source, and trying to find the dramatic purposes behind these departures by means of a scene by scene analysis of the dialogue relations. Then, what kind of play is it? There has been much discussion about the definition of this play; a great tragedy like *Hamlet*,³² a problem play like *Measure for Measure*³³ or a history play.³⁴ And there have been many attempts to interpret the principal characters, the theme, the assassination. There is such a polarity of views that there seems to be no final solution to the problems. On the other hand, the instability and fickleness of the Roman populace in *Julius Caesar* have been illustrated so repeatedly by scholars and critics that the problem of its character seems to have been solved by common assent.

With these problems of interpretation and structural complexities in view, I would like to conclude as follows:

(i) *Julius Caesar* is a revenge tragedy. It is the tragedy of revenge for Caesar. Shakespeare, who omits in his play the kingly ambition in Caesar by means of his creation of Caesar's commitment to the Lupercalia and Casca's report on it, makes Brutus misinterpret him as ambitious and slay him. Therefore it is surely "The Tragedy of Julius Caesar." Antony's "tongue," the ghost of Caesar which, "ranging for revenge" keeps Brutus from sleep, the dissimulation and assimilation of Lucius's sleep with Brutus's sleeplessness and sleepiness, Octavius's victory of the "blows" of revenge, Pindarus's erroneous interpretation which causes Cassius's death, Strato's sleep which makes Brutus's suicide possible, all of these inventions serve to exact revenge from Brutus and Cassius for Caesar who "has had great wrong." After the death of Caesar, the play deals with revenge for an unrighted wrong by Antony, the Roman people and Octavius. Therefore one apt title for the play would be "The Tragedy of Revenge for Julius Caesar." Also inquisitive Cassius, attentive Lucilius, the refusals of "poor remains of friends" are invented by Shakespeare to take a subtle revenge on Brutus for his neglect of friendship and his self-righteousness. Brutus who asks others to act as Romans cannot commit suicide like a Roman himself and becomes full of "grief."

(ii) In accordance with Cicero's words, "men may construe things, after their fashion,/

³¹ William and Barbara Rosen consider Octavius as wielding "power in the spirit of Caesar," becoming "spiritually his heir," and assuming "the duty of revenge." See introduction to the Signet Classic Shakespeare edition of *Julius Caesar*, p. xxviii. See also M.W. MacCallum, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

³² Cf. A.C. Bradley, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

³³ Cf. Ernest Schanzer, *The Problem Plays of Shakespeare* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963). He singles out *Julius Caesar*, *Measure for Measure*, and *Antony & Cleopatra* as Shakespeare's problem plays, and there are many critics who have asserted that the play should be read as a problem play.

³⁴ Cf. H.B. Charlton, *Shakespearean Tragedy* (Cambridge at the University Press, 1948), pp. 69-79.

Clean from the purpose of the things themselves," numerous misunderstandings and misconstructions are found throughout the play as we have witnessed. What is important above all is Casca's "thinking" of Caesar's "ambition," Brutus's misconceptions about Caesar's "ambition" for a crown shown in his "He would be crown'd," and his interpretation of the forged letter of Cassius, Decius's reinterpretation of Calphurnia's dream, Caesar's misinterpretation of the meeting and escorting to the Capitol by the conspirators, Brutus's underestimation of Antony as "a limb of Caesar," Pindarus's mistake, and by these misconstructions, Caesar, Brutus and Cassius become the victims of their own and other people's wrong interpretations. Therefore another apt title for the play would be "The Tragedy of Misconstructions of Julius Caesar, Brutus and Cassius."

(iii) The Roman populace in *Julius Caesar* are steadfast in loving and supporting Caesar throughout the play. At the same time, they dislike tyrants. They decorate Caesar's images with festal adornments in I.i., rejoice to see Caesar refuse a crown in I.ii., and approve Brutus's speech in III.ii., only because they detest tyrants. They condemn Brutus and his confederates as traitors and want to be revenged only because they love Caesar and realize that Caesar was a wronged person and they are Caesar's heirs themselves. Since they respond to Brutus and Antony only according to their own thoughts and feelings, they are neither inconstant nor fickle.

(iv) Cassius is made to act as Brutus's glass which reflects the clear image of Brutus from moment to moment in the play.³⁵ The contrasting motives for the assassination: the public cause and personal envy, and the totally opposite attitudes towards friendship are invented by Shakespeare in parallel.

(v) Antony, as Caesar's "right hand," "a limb of Caesar," "Caesar's arm," "tongue" for "dumb mouths" of "Caesar's wounds," "spirit" to govern Lepidus's "corporal motion," wants to rule over Octavius, but fails. On the other hand, Octavius, who is the revenger of Caesar's death, wins victory over Antony, which means that he defines the play as a tragedy of the revenge for Caesar. Their struggle for the initiative ends with Octavius as the final winner.

(vi) Lucius, and Antony and Octavius's servants are Shakespeare's invented characters. By his sleep, Lucius contributes unconsciously to the maturity of the conspiracy before the assassination and involves Brutus with his sleep by handing him a night gown when the ghost of Caesar appears to destroy his sleep, in which is shown the ghost's desire for revenge. Lucius brings "a bowl of wine" to the quarrelling Brutus and Cassius to reconcile them in harmony. His roles are "sleep," union and "music." Antony's servant brings Brutus's directions to Antony, whereas Octavius's servant takes Antony to Octavius's tent because he has not brought any directions from Octavius.

(vii) The significance of the action of the play can be compressed into the transformation in quality of the ring of the people which encircles Caesar or Caesar's body. This Caesarean society is visually realized on the stage from moment to moment up to III.ii., together with the development, success and failure of conspiracy.

Then, what does Shakespeare intend the whole play to be about and what sort of dramatic design has been revealed to us? Considering the play as a whole, there are close causal relationships between the revenge theme and the misconception theme. If Brutus had not

³⁵ Palmer points out the function of Cassius "as a foil to Brutus," but does not refer to Cassius as Brutus's glass. Cf. John Palmer, *Political Characters of Shakespeare* (Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1945), p. 5.

had the misconception that Caesar was ambitious to become king, if he had not taken the forged letter from Cassius to be from the people, if he had not underestimated Antony, he would not have slain Caesar and would not have died a tragic death fully realizing Caesar's revenge on him. Had Caesar not been flattered by Decius's wrong reinterpretation of Calphurnia's dream, had he not regarded the escort of conspirators to the Capitol as friendly, he would not have met his unexpected death, and if Cassius had discredited Pindarus's wrong report, he would not have died, allowing Caesar to take revenge on him. Thus, the tragedy of revenge for Caesar and the tragedy of misconstructions are incorporated with each other by Shakespeare to form a single harmony.

HITOTSUBASHI UNIVERSITY