

Contents

<i>General Editor's Preface</i>	vi
<i>Preface</i>	vii
1 The Text and Early Performances	1
2 Commentary	13
3 The Play's Sources and Cultural Context	85
4 Key Productions and Performances	108
5 The Play on Screen	125
6 Critical Assessments	132
<i>Further Reading</i>	147
<i>Index</i>	152

1 *The Text and Early Performances*

Stoop, then, and wash. How many ages hence
Shall this our lofty scene be acted over
In states unborn and accents yet unknown!

(III.i.111–13)

This response by Cassius to Brutus' injunction to 'bathe our hands in Caesar's blood / Up to the elbows' (ll. 106–7) is remarkable in its invitation to the audience to respond not just to the death of Julius Caesar seconds earlier, and to the deliberate glorification of the assassination by the conspirators, but also to the self-conscious theatricality of an actor invoking an image of future actors re-staging the scene for centuries to come to other audiences in other countries and languages. We are invited to respond emotionally, even viscerally, to the bloody moment, but at the same time to admire the intellectual double focus: Shakespeare, through Cassius, is using his own craft of the theatre (the 'lofty scene') to point out the momentous reverberations of an action that is as true when re-staged as when first performed. For actors to draw audience attention to the fact that it is only a play requires audacity; to do so in a way that deepens our response to the play is masterful.

However, the lines quoted above tell us less than we could wish to know about how Shakespeare's company, the Lord Chamberlain's Men, staged this moment. Did Cassius remain standing and speaking while the other conspirators stooped around the body of Caesar? If so, did his words seem to be a form of commentary to the audience, perhaps legitimizing what might otherwise appear brutal, even psychotic? Or did Cassius stoop and smear his own arms before 'How many ages hence'? Would that acting decision be more likely to make his own bloody appearance undercut the claim to noble action? Are the rest of the conspirators confident in their bloody arms and swords

as emblems of liberty for Rome; or do they exhibit uncertainty at the spectacle, perhaps starting to fear that they have left Caesar 'a carcass fit for hounds' rather than 'a dish fit for the gods' (II.i.174–5)? And whatever they think of themselves, what is the audience drawn to think? These questions and more face the actors (and in modern theatre, the directors, designers and others) in every new production of the play. The text of the play is first and foremost a story in potential, waiting to be given life in performance with the willing collaboration of spectators.

We are fortunate to have an eyewitness account from one of the early spectators of *Julius Caesar* at the new Globe Theatre (then only recently erected on the south bank of the Thames from the timbers of the company's old theatre, surreptitiously removed from its previous site in the north of London). Thomas Platter, a Swiss doctor, was a tourist in London in the autumn of 1599, and recounts that:

On the 21st of September, after dinner, at about two o'clock, I went with my party across the water; in the straw-thatched house we saw the tragedy of the first Emperor Julius Caesar, very pleasingly performed, with approximately fifteen characters; at the end of the play they danced together admirably and exceedingly gracefully, according to their custom, two in each group dressed in men's and two in women's apparel.

(Humphreys, p. 1)

Quite apart from Platter's pleasure at the Elizabethan theatre custom of finishing a play with a jig, it is clear that he enjoyed and responded to the drama itself. Nor did he have any doubt that it was 'the tragedy of . . . Julius Caesar'. He took particular note of the 'approximately fifteen characters', which appears an odd reaction to a play with over fifty parts; it seems likely he meant 'fifteen actors'. There are fourteen or sixteen or so characters on stage in the busiest scene, III.i (the exact number depends on whether there are non-speaking senators, lictors, guards, etc.), which presumably explains Platter's statement. Since the Lord Chamberlain's Men at this time probably had ten or so principal actors, and maybe six hired men to play minor roles and groups such as commoners, senators, or soldiers, plus youths to play the female roles and pages such as Lucius, most of the company was on stage in the early part of III.i.

What is surprising is that Shakespeare wrote so many more roles than he had actors. Given more than fifty identifiable roles in the play, nearly all the actors except those playing Brutus, Cassius, and Mark Antony

(and perhaps Caesar) would have had to double at least one other role, and some several. While Shakespeare was familiar from his English history plays with how to write his scenes to allow time backstage for doubling, in *Julius Caesar* he was under less historical compulsion to do so. A number of the conspirators with Brutus when Caesar was assassinated were also with him to the end, and present at the battle of Philippi. Why, then, did Shakespeare in effect kill off all the conspirators except Brutus and Cassius at the end of III.i? Why not retain Casca, Decius, Metellus Cimber, Trebonius and the rest, rather than presenting the audience in Act IV with Lucilius, Titinius, Messala and many other new characters? It is a striking theatrical decision that reinforces the sense of readers and directors that the play is divided in two, and it tends to support a critical view that whereas Shakespeare was intent on portraying in the first half a critical action in the history of the world, he had more interest in the second half in exploring the personal and emotional repercussions of the act, and perhaps in ensuring sympathy for Brutus (see pp. 145–6).

Platter also took note of the ‘straw-thatched’ playhouse (its new thatch conspicuous on Bankside). It is virtually certain that *Julius Caesar* was one of the first plays performed at the new Globe, perhaps the first. Shakespeare knew the kind of theatre he was writing for, and that he, as an actor in the Lord Chamberlain’s Men, would perform in. Visual spectacle, such as the tableau of the conspirators holding aloft their bloody swords, was an essential element of his stagecraft, a central part of telling a story on a large, bare platform stage with almost nothing of what we would call scenery. The stage was architecture for the actor, not a realist scenic environment within which the fictional characters lived. It was the actors who provided nearly all the spectacle which worked in tandem with their words to inform the spectators where they should imagine the story to be.

The stage doors – certainly one at each end of the tiring-house façade behind the actors; and probably a large central opening, perhaps reserved for spectacular entries such as Caesar’s in I.ii – did not in themselves resemble any particular door, but any door that might be needed. Indeed, although Flavius and Marullus enter at the start of the play from one door, and encounter the commoners entering from the door at the other side, we quickly forget the doors and accept, from the dialogue, that the scene takes place in a public street. The doors, in other words, belong to the theatre, not to scenic fiction. The effect is so simple, however, that it is easy to miss how powerfully it points to the

essence of the entire scene: what matters is not architecture or scenery, but the fact that the scene is an encounter, a confrontation of energies from different directions. The same effect is used at I.iii.o.1 when Casca meets Cicero, and when the armies parley in Acts IV and V. Similarly, for characters to leave by different doors, as Marullus and Flavius do at the end of the first scene, and Portia and Lucius at the end of III.i, is a simple and powerful image of independent action by each. By contrast, characters entering or leaving together give a strong image of association, whether of friendship or purpose (the entry of Marullus and Flavius together, even prior to confronting the commoners, illustrates the point).

The entry of large processions, perhaps by the impressive central opening, provides meaningful spectacle in itself: the first time we see Caesar he carries with him a train of followers like a comet's tail. The power and importance of the greatest man in the world is emphasized by the size of the procession, and its purposeful direction across the stage and out after the interruption by the Soothsayer. And the stage, having been full of people a moment earlier – at least twelve actors – suddenly becomes quiet with just two men left: Cassius and Brutus. Naturally, our attention and interest are drawn to them; later, when the procession returns, these two men remain of special interest, because we have seen them apart from the procession.

Whether we are focused on one or two characters, or on a stage full of people, whether we think of the Globe performances or modern productions, costume plays a vital part in our understanding. On the bare Elizabethan stage the actors' costume was even more important than in a modern production, because costume was almost the only visual display available, and also because Elizabethan sumptuary laws laid down by statute who could wear what materials in everyday life (commoners had to wear hats of wool, and were forbidden to wear the velvet, satin, silk, or other rich materials that knights could; cloth-of-gold was reserved to the aristocracy; and so on). When Flavius and Marullus berate the commoners for their dress in I.i, they do so in precise terms. Profession, social standing, and wealth were minutely indicated by clothing, and audiences could recognize the code.

How this code worked for a play set in Roman times is difficult to determine, because we do not know how historicized the costume was. The three main possibilities are that costume was contemporary, that it was Roman, or that it was a mixture of the two. In support of the argument that such plays would have been performed in

contemporary costume, critics point to a number of Elizabethan references in *Julius Caesar*: Casca's toga with a 'sleeve' to be plucked (I.ii.179), Caesar's 'doublet' (I.ii.263) and 'nightgown' (II.ii.o.2), the conspirators' 'hats' and 'cloaks' (II.i.73–4), Brutus walking 'unbracèd' (II.i.263), and wearing a 'gown' with a 'pocket' (IV.ii.303). Other Roman plays of the period include references to 'Renaissance accessories: silk stockings, ladies' masks and cork-soled shoes, rebatoes, billements (spangled headtires) and similar finery' (MacIntyre, pp. 258–9). Given also chiming clocks and other non-Roman elements, this is a basis for claiming that Shakespeare constructed his Roman society in terms of their Elizabethan equivalents, that audiences at the time would read the visual codes accordingly, and that we therefore must be alert to these codes.

An alternative view is that Roman costume was used (or at least, Roman as the Renaissance understood its costuming). Part of this argument is based on the fact that Elizabethan words might be used to translate Latin words for Roman garments (like 'gown' for 'toga'; the reference to Caesar's 'doublet' mentioned above is actually taken from North's translation of Plutarch), and part on contemporary designs and inventories of 'antique' costumes such as shaped breastplates, plumed helmets, and senators' togas (see Humphreys, pp. 50–1 and Ronan, pp. 76–9).

A third possibility is that there was a 'mixed' style. The famous 'Pea-cham drawing' (reproduced by Humphreys, p. 50) appears to depict a scene from Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* with the major male characters wearing an approximation of Roman dress, but other characters and soldiers wearing Elizabethan dress. In some cases characters may have worn a suggestion of Roman costume over Elizabethan clothing. In that case, the Roman costume elements become emblematic and representative of historical period and individual status rather than realistic depiction.

The appearance of the senators may serve to illustrate how costume affects meaning. Many references from plays of the period confirm that senators on stage normally wore scarlet gowns. (Historically Roman senators had only a band of 'purpura' bordering their white togas, but Renaissance authorities seem to have understood the gowns of the senate to have been entirely the colour of 'purple blood'.) If the costuming was Elizabethan, then the stage image of the senate would be of an assembly of scarlet-gowned judges. Caesar seated on a raised throne in the Capitol (III.i) might well have looked, to a London audience, like a monarch surrounded by his judges or nobility. And since all the

men would be in doublet and hose, the distinction between senators and soldiers would not be great, apart from the gowns. (Stage soldiers often wore the crescent-shaped 'gorget', throat armour, to represent full armour.) However, in either a Roman or a 'mixed' style, the scarlet togas of the senate would have presented a picture not of a hierarchical monarchy, but of the Roman Republic. The implications of the death of a potential king would be very different.

Large properties would also have had a role to play in creating spectacle and influencing audience interpretation. Just as a recognizable stage throne on a dais might imply royal legitimacy for Caesar, so special benches for the senators might invoke historical knowledge of the Roman senate. (*Julius Caesar* does not absolutely require such seating, but some other Roman plays of the period did specify them.) When Brutus describes the dead Caesar as lying 'on Pompey's basis', does that mean that a statue of Pompey with a base on which Caesar could fall, as described in Plutarch's history (see p. 104), was provided on stage? Or is Brutus simply painting a word picture? Or does the dais, the 'basis', for the throne substitute imaginatively for the basis for a statue? We do not know, any more than we know how Brutus' tent was indicated in Act IV. But our lack of knowledge does not mean the questions are unimportant, for visual signs help orient an audience in its reception of the play's emotion and meaning.

Small props serve the same function, and often have a symbolic as well as a pragmatic function. For instance, any book on stage is likely to signal melancholy (as in *Hamlet*, for instance), so Brutus' reading is an indication of more than a desire to sleep. A sword may stand for 'Justice', as in some of Queen Elizabeth's famous portraits, so the manner in which the swords are held during the assassination scene may be significant. Even stage blood is important, since both savage blood-letting and noble suicide were widely regarded as particularly Roman attributes.

The trumpets and drums which contribute much of the sense of battle on the Elizabethan stage are only part of a Roman context of trumpet flourishes and 'sennets' frequently specified in the stage directions. Lucius' lute is the only relief from the harshness of Roman public music. *Thunder and lightning* are called for at the start of both I.iii and II.ii, as if 'The heavens themselves blaze forth the death of princes' (II. ii.31). The thunder continues throughout I.iii (note the stage direction '*Thunder still*' at l. 100), Shakespeare's first use of this effect (which would develop further in *Macbeth*) to reinforce the mood of an entire scene. It may also have been the first significant use of the new thunder machine

at the Globe. Does the thunder continue ominously in the background of the orchard scene (II.i), as in some modern productions, or does the brief stage direction ‘Thunder’ at the last line of the scene merely prepare for its resumption in II.ii? How will each choice affect an audience as it views the conspirators?

We are often faced with questions like these that underline how little we know about the original productions. Even hints, therefore, are valuable. The author of one of the commendatory poems prefaced to the Shakespeare First Folio in 1623, Leonard Digges, declared that he could not and would not believe Shakespeare dead until some other playwright could match *Romeo and Juliet*,

Or till I hear a scene more nobly take
Than when thy half-sword parleying Romans spake.

That this refers to the quarrel scene between Brutus and Cassius, IV.ii, is confirmed by a later version of Digges’s poem. Since *Julius Caesar* was not published prior to 1623, the comment must refer to contemporary staging. It may be surprising to think of both men having their swords half-drawn in their anger – and some eighteenth-century productions lost any sense of subtlety by having the two repeatedly clash their sword hilts together – but it is a useful reminder of how the energy of actors makes this one of the most memorable scenes in the play.

Ben Jonson, Shakespeare’s contemporary, found the play memorable for a different reason. Despite his admiration for Shakespeare, he joked at the absurdity of Caesar replying to Metellus that ‘Caesar did never wrong, but with just cause’, and Jonson even put the line in one of his plays as a joke. It would seem to make sense as a joke in a play only if audiences had heard it in *Julius Caesar*. However, Caesar does not say this in the text as we have it (III.i.47–8). This leads us from the first performances to consideration of the First Folio.

The First Folio

The first actors of *The Tragedy of Julius Caesar* (as it is called in the First Folio) did not have a printed book from which to learn their parts or study the play; they had only handwritten copies of their own parts, with the skimpiest of cues indicating when to speak. There would have been a complete manuscript copy of the play that had been authorized

by the Master of the Revels, the 'Book' that was the company's licence to perform, but that is long lost. The only authoritative text of the entire play that survives is that in the First Folio of 1623, the collected edition of Shakespeare's works published seven years after his death.

Whereas writing is a solitary activity, producing and publishing plays are communal activities with many social interactions and collaborations involved. A scribe wrote out the parts for the actors, and errors were possible. Changes might be introduced during the brief rehearsal period (especially when one of the actors, Shakespeare, was also the playwright), or during subsequent performances of the play, for a variety of reasons. Any confusions in the text could be resolved, the book-keeper (what we would call stage manager or prompter) might adjust a scene to fit the company's resources, actors might invent new lines or cut unsatisfactory ones, depending on audience reaction, or the playwright himself might revise the play.

A similar range of interaction applied when a play was published. Shakespeare would initially have written the play out himself, but there may have been scratchings-out, insertions, and even minor confusions, as is common in most authors' drafts. A scribe probably copied the entire play into a fair copy, and it was probably such a fair copy that was given to the printers in 1623. But revisions by Shakespeare or others could have been added to that fair copy beforehand. Then the compositors in the printing house added their contribution: adopting their own favourite spellings, inserting punctuation they thought was needed (for punctuation was at this period much more the responsibility of the actor in the theatre or the compositor in the printing house than of the author). Compositors might also misread their manuscript copy, whether because it was badly written, or because they were tired, lazy, or even drunk. Thus, given the collaborative nature of both theatre and publishing, and the continuing performance and possibly adjustment of the play, we can have no certainty about how close the 1623 First Folio text is to what was first performed in 1599, or to how Shakespeare wished it to be performed when he finally retired from the company.

That Jonson laughed at a line that does not appear in the Folio suggests the possibility that Shakespeare realized that he had written an absurdity, and changed the line to what we have: 'Know, Caesar doth not wrong, nor without cause / Will he be satisfied' (III.i.47-8). But it is not enough in itself to prove the case (though the Oxford *Complete Works*/Norton *Shakespeare* has accepted Jonson's evidence as to what

Shakespeare originally wrote, and reads 'Know Caesar doth not wrong but with just cause, / Nor without cause will he be satisfied')

There are a few further indications of possible revision in addition to the line that Jonson mocked. Some are small matters that may have been sorted out at the first rehearsal, but were never adjusted in the manuscript, such as the inclusion of Lepidus in the entry direction at III.i when we would expect Ligarius, but of more significance is the question of the double reporting of Portia's death: first by Brutus himself (IV.ii.197–207), then by Messala, with Brutus denying any prior knowledge (ll. 231–45). Some critics argue that Shakespeare must have revised the scene, inserting ll. 189–212 (from the exit of the Poet to the entry of Titinius and Messala), but forgetting to delete the Messala section he had written earlier. It may be so; but other critics defend the double report in various ways as deliberate and highly dramatic. It can for instance be argued to demonstrate the stoic strength of Brutus despite his grief, or a less admirable Brutus not matching the image he has of himself. Given such disagreement, the question of revision cannot be resolved. The issue reminds us that a dramatic script is never fixed; both during the playwright's life, and even afterwards, the collaborators in the play – actors, printers, audiences, and many others – ensure that the script is always ready in potential for a new manifestation, a new enactment.

Nevertheless, the First Folio text of *Julius Caesar* is generally a very clean text, and presents few problems. It is divided into acts, but not scenes. Although it is possible that Shakespeare had a five-act structure in mind when writing, it is equally likely that the act divisions are a later addition, resulting either from the stage necessity after about 1610 of having act breaks to allow time for trimming candles in the company's new indoor theatre, or from the fashion in both theatre and printing houses for neoclassical five-act structure. When Shakespeare wrote *Julius Caesar* in 1599, his dramaturgical thinking is likely to have been most influenced by the English playhouse conception of the scene: starting and ending with a cleared stage. This is the basis for the scene division in all modern editions, and is probably the most useful starting point for thinking about the structure of the play. In the modern theatre, of course, the major element defining the structure the audience experiences is where intervals are placed, and how many there are. No interval (probably how it was originally performed), one interval, two intervals, or even more: these structure the event, and will have a powerful impact on our reaction to the play in performance.

Another crucial area for actors, audiences, and readers is punctuation. Early Modern punctuation operated by different standards to ours, and printers were much less punctilious than we would be. To take an example, here is a transcription of the First Folio version of I.i.36–43:

O you hard hearts, you cruel men of Rome,
 Knew you not *Pompey* many a time and oft?
 Have you climb'd up to walls and battlements,
 To towers and windows? Yea, to chimney tops,
 Your infants in your arms, and there have sat
 The live-long day, with patient expectation,
 To see great *Pompey* pass the streets of Rome:
 And when you saw his chariot. . . .

Here is the same text from Arthur Humphreys's Oxford Shakespeare edition:

O you hard hearts, you cruel men of Rome,
 Knew you not Pompey? Many a time and oft
 Have you climbed up to walls and battlements,
 To towers and windows, yea, to chimney-tops,
 Your infants in your arms, and there have sat
 The livelong day, with patient expectation,
 To see great Pompey pass the streets of Rome.
 And when you saw his chariot. . . .

It is clear enough that the Folio compositor made an error placing his first question mark after 'oft', and this may have caused the erroneous second question mark, following 'windows'. Modern editors make these corrections confidently. But the colon following 'Rome' in the second-last line of the excerpt is more difficult. Humphreys's Oxford text silently replaces the Folio colon with a full stop (as do the Oxford *Complete Works/Norton Shakespeare*, and Marvin Spevack's New Cambridge Shakespeare edition). G. Blakemore Evans's Riverside Shakespeare, however, uses a semicolon, deciding that the structure of the sentence continues, to balance what has already been said with what is about to be said. But this use of the semicolon is largely modern, and unlikely to represent either Shakespeare's writing or an Elizabethan actor's thinking. The most recent scholarly editor, David Daniell, retains Folio's colon in his Arden 3 edition (as does Norman

Sanders in his *New Penguin Shakespeare*), arguing that the Elizabethan use of the colon, unlike ours, can fulfil the demands of a full stop, but also serves a rhetorical need to acknowledge the forward pressure of the speech. He notes the similar use of a colon in Brutus' speech at II.i.10: 'It must be by his death: and for my part. . . .'; here Humphreys, Evans, and Sanders all substitute a semicolon, and Oxford/Norton and Spevack a full stop. But Daniell argues that 'Anything less than a colon runs the thought on too quickly: a full point destroys the appalling forward flow into speciousness' (p. 130). It is useful for actors as well as readers to be wary about how easily we accept modernized punctuation. The collaboration with the playwright should remain active.

Another crucial element for actors is the metre. While much of the dialogue is in a vigorous unadorned blank verse that offers a plain style appropriate to the austerity of Republican Rome, there is still much to be used by actors, clues to character and stage dynamics. A particularly useful tool is offered to the actor of Cassius: he is given a remarkable number of lines starting with a trochaic foot (*tum-te*) rather than the standard iambic foot (*te-tum*). The effect of this contrapuntal stress is to invite the actor to attack the line with energy, and much of the effectiveness of Cassius derives from this characteristic attacking energy:

'Brutus' and 'Caesar': what should be in that 'Caesar'?
 Why should that name be sounded more than yours?
 Write them together, yours is as fair a name.
 Sound them, it doth become the mouth as well.
 Weigh them, it is as heavy. Conjure with 'em,
 'Brutus' will start a spirit as soon as 'Caesar'.
 Now in the names of all the gods at once,
 Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed
 That his is grown so great? Age, thou art shamed!
 Rome, thou hast lost the breed of noble bloods!

(I.ii.142–51)

The first line requires the initial trochee because the name Brutus is stressed on the first syllable. The second line could be spoken as an ordinary iambic pentameter, with stress on 'should'; but if the first foot is inverted, the urgency of Cassius' speech is lifted: 'Why should that name. . . .' Then comes a string of lines starting with an attack: 'Write them', 'Sound them', 'Weigh them', 'Brutus', and probably 'Now'. After the brief respite of the line and a half starting 'Upon what meat', Cassius uses the trochaic attack again, this time yet more forcefully. The first

half to the line, 'That his is grown so great?', is regular iambic pentameter: te-tum, te-tum, te-tum, almost, despite the stress on 'his', suggesting resignation. But it is not so. After the caesura, the pause following the heavy punctuation in mid-line, the anticipated iamb is replaced by a trochee before the final iamb: 'Age, thou art *shamed!*' And the delay between the initial trochaic stress and the following iambic stress gives added emphasis to '*shamed!*' as well. Each time Cassius uses an attacking trochee, he increases the pressure on Brutus, and impresses on the audience how central is his energy in the play.

Such examples could be multiplied many times over. Discussion of the text of the play serves to remind us that it is fluid, in a sense always in process. For actors, it is the starting point towards performance, full of clues and possibilities and potential each time the play is presented. Spectators unfamiliar with the play experience it moment by moment, as it unfolds, aided only by, in most cases, enough Roman history to know that Caesar was assassinated. It was only after Shakespeare's death that we, whether students, teachers, actors, directors, or simply literate and interested individuals, could read and study the play as a whole rather than experiencing it as it unfolds in time as performance.

Note

Julius Caesar is quoted and referred to in this book from the individual Oxford Shakespeare edition edited by Arthur Humphreys, published in 1984. In common with other *Handbooks* in this series, all references to other Shakespeare plays are to the Oxford *Complete Works*, edited by Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (1986), and the *Norton Shakespeare* that is based upon it with Stephen Greenblatt as its general editor (1997).

Index

- Andrews, Harry, 114, 118
Appian, 85, 89
audio recordings, 150
- Barrett, Lawrence, 111
BBC TV production (1938), 125
BBC TV production (1979),
129–31, 149–50
- Belsey, Catherine, *The Subject of
Tragedy*, 141, 142, 150
- Berry, Ralph, *On Directing
Shakespeare*, 119, 148
- Bible, Geneva, 87
- Billington, Michael, 118, 121
- blood, 1, 42, 48–52, 58, 130, 134
- Bonjour, Adrien, *The Structure of
Julius Caesar*, 147
- Booth, Edwin and family, 19, 33,
108–13, 127
- Bradley, A. C., *Shakespearean
Tragedy*, 133–4, 150
- Bradley, David (1950 film), 125–6,
149
- Brando, Marlon, 56, 127
- Brown, John Russell, *Shakespeare's
Plays in Performance*, 145
Shakespeare's Dramatic Style,
145–6, 147
- Bullough, Geoffrey (ed.), *Narrative
and Dramatic Sources of
Shakespeare*, 136, 148
- Burckhardt, Sigurd, 'How Not to
Murder Caesar', 138–9, 150
- Burge, Stuart (1970 film), 126, 128,
130, 149
- calendars, Christian and
Julian, 138–9
- Calhern, Louis, 118, 127
Certain Sermons or Homilies
(1635), 87–8
- Cicero, 85
- Conway, Harold, 114
- Cruikshank, Andrew, 115
- Daiches, David, *Shakespeare: Julius
Caesar*, 148
- Daniell, David, 10–11, 147
- Dante, 85
- Dean, Leonard F. (ed.), *Twentieth
Century Interpretations of Julius
Caesar*, 148
- de Jongh, Nicholas, 122
- Dennis, John, 132
- Digges, Leonard, 7, 132, 143
- Doleman, R., *see* Parsons
- Dorsch, T. S., 135
- Eedes, Richard, *Caesar Interfectus*, 89
- Edwards, Rob, 123
- Elizabeth I, Queen, 6, 86, 87, 88,
138, 141, 142
- Elyot, Sir Thomas, *The Book of the
Governor* (1531), 88
- Essex, Earl of, 141
- Evans, G. Blakemore, 10

- Field, B. S., *Shakespeare's Julius Caesar*, 149
- Findlater, Richard, 115
- Folio text (1623), 7–12
- Garson, Greer, 128
- Gielgud, John, 20, 114, 127, 128, 131
- Globe Theatre, 2–7, 45, 47, 54, 63, 64, 72, 78, 139, 140, 141
- Golding, Arthur (trans.), *see* Ovid
- Granville-Barker, Harley, *Prefaces to Shakespeare*, 144, 150
- Greenblatt, Stephen, 12
- Grey, Charles, 130
- Gurr, Andrew, *The Shakespearean Stage*, 147
- Hazlitt, William, *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*, 132–3, 150
- Heston, Charlton, 125, 128
- Holland, Hugh, 141
- Holland, Peter, *English Shakespeares*, 122–3, 149
- Hopkins, Lisa, *The Cultural Uses of the Caesars on the English Renaissance Stage*, 142, 151
- Houseman, John, 126
- Runthrough, 117, 151
- Front and Center, 150
- Humphreys, Arthur, 5, 10–11, 12, 59, 116, 147
- Hunter, Mark, 135
- Jackson, Russell, 120
- James VI and I, King, 142
- Johnson, Richard, 128
- Johnson, Samuel, 132
- Jonson, Ben, 7–9
- Kahn, Coppélia, *Roman Shakespeare*, 143, 151
- Kemble, John Philip, 48, 108–12, 113
- Knight, G. Wilson, *The Wheel of Fire*, 134, 151
- The Imperial Theme*, 134–5, 151
- Kissoon, Jeffrey, 123
- Langham, Michael, 113–116
- Lincoln, Abraham, 108
- Livy, 85
- Lord Chamberlain's Men, 1–3
- Lucan, 85
- Lynch, Barry, 124
- MacCallum, M. W., *Shakespeare's Roman Plays*, 135, 151
- Macauley, Alastair, 123
- MacIntyre, Jean, *Costumes and Scripts in the Elizabethan Theatre*, 5, 147
- Mahood, M. M., *Playing Bit Parts in Shakespeare*, 145–6, 151
- Mankiewicz, Joseph (1953 MGM film), 33, 46, 56, 114, 118, 126–8, 130–1, 149
- Mason, James, 127
- Meier, Christian, *Caesar*, 148
- Méliès, Georges, 125
- Mercury Theatre, 116–17
- Messina, Cedric, 129
- Miles, Geoffrey, *Shakespeare and the Constant Romans*, 136–7, 138, 151
- Miola, Robert S., *Shakespeare's Rome*, 136, 151
- 'Julius Caesar and the Tyrannicide Debate', 138, 151
- Montaigne, 85
- Mortimer, John, 118
- New York, 108, 116
- Nightingale, Benedict, 122, 124
- North, Thomas *see* Plutarch
- Nunn, Trevor, 117–19

- Olivier, Laurence, 126
 Other Place, see Stratford-upon-Avon
 Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 89
- Parsons, Robert, *A Conference about the Next Succession* (1594), 88
 Pasco, Richard, 130–1
 Paster, Gail Kern, “In the spirit of men there is no blood”: Blood as Trope of Gender in *Julius Caesar*, 142–3, 151
 Platter, Thomas, 2, 3, 132, 143
 Plutarch, 6, 15, 18, 20, 21, 24, 29, 31, 37, 40, 42, 45, 46, 48, 55, 59, 62, 68, 70, 74, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 89–105, 135, 136, 141, 148
 Pope, Alexander, 132
- Quayle, Anthony, 113–16
- Richardson, John, 141
 Ripley, John, *Julius Caesar on Stage*, 117, 144, 149
 Robards, Jason, 128
 Ronan, Clifford, *Anticke Roman*, 137–8, 151
 Rothwell, Kenneth, *A History of Shakespeare on Screen*, 125, 128, 150
 Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC) see Stratford-upon-Avon
 Rylands, George, 150
 Rymer, Thomas, 132
- Salgãdo, Gãmini (ed.), *Eyewitnesses of Shakespeare*, 149
 Sanders, Norman, 10–11
 Saxe-Meiningen, Duke of, 112–13
 Schanzer, Ernest, *The Problem Plays of Shakespeare*, 135, 136, 151
- Shakespeare, William
All's Well That Ends Well, 107
Antony and Cleopatra, 62, 74, 84, 119
As You Like It, 85
Coriolanus, 119
Hamlet, 6, 15, 18, 26, 27, 30, 32, 40, 47, 53, 62, 72–3, 83, 84, 85–6, 106, 111, 119, 133, 141, 142
Hamlet (1948 film), 126
1 Henry IV, 67
2 Henry IV, 106
Henry V, 85, 86, 106
Henry V (1944 film), 126
King Lear, 26, 133
Macbeth, 6, 32, 133, 134
Measure For Measure, 107
Othello, 18, 107, 112, 123, 133
Richard Duke of York [3 *Henry VI*], 105–6
Richard III, 67, 72
Romeo and Juliet, 7
Titus Andronicus, 5, 119
Twelfth Night, 85
- Shapiro, James, 1599, 141, 148
 Shorter, Eric, 118
 Siddons, Sarah, 108
 Sohmer, Steve, *Shakespeare's Mystery Play*, 139, 151
 Spencer, Charles, 120, 122, 123
 Spencer, T. J. B., ‘Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Romans’, 135, 138, 151
 (ed.), *Shakespeare's Plutarch*, 148
 Spevack, Marvin, 10, 147
 Sprague, Arthur Colby, *Shakespeare and the Actors*, 149
 Spurgeon, Caroline, *Shakespeare's Imagery*, 134, 151
- stagecraft
 costuming, 4–6, 14, 30, 32, 37, 39, 58, 60, 62, 63, 64, 71, 78, 79

- double time, 32, 33
 doubling, 2–3, 83
 entrances and exits, 16, 29, 32,
 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 50, 54, 59,
 60, 63, 68, 69, 72–3, 73, 74, 77,
 80–1, 83, 84
 metatheatricality, 1, 24, 44–5,
 83, 121
 music and sound effects, 6, 7, 15,
 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 25, 28, 36, 39,
 45, 63, 64, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78,
 79–80, 82, 83, 84
 properties, 6, 25, 27–8, 31, 33,
 43, 45, 46, 49, 57, 58, 59, 62, 64,
 65, 66, 67–8, 69, 71–2, 74, 75,
 78, 79, 83
 staging, 1, 3–4, 7, 22, 30, 37, 38,
 45–8, 54, 55, 57, 61, 63, 64,
 71–3, 77–8, 79, 82–3
 Stewart, Patrick, 119
 Stratford-upon-Avon, productions
 at, 14, 17, 113–16, 117–19,
 120–4, 127, 149
 structure
 act and scene division, 9, 63, 65
 interval placement, 61
 units of action, 13–14
 Suetonius, 85, 136
 Sumner, David, 123
 Tacitus, 85, 136
 Taylor, Gary, 12
 Taylor, Paul, 121, 123
 Thacker, David, 120–4
 Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, 108
 Thomas, Vivian, *Julius Caesar*, 148
 Thomson, Peter, 118
 Tree, Herbert Beerbohm, 112–13,
 115, 127, 129, 144
 Trewin, J. C., 115–16
 Ure, Peter (ed.), *Julius Caesar:
 A Casebook*, 148
 Venezky, Alice, 115
 Virgil, *Aeneid*, 85, 136
 Walker, Roy, 116
 Wardle, Irving, 117, 119, 121
 Welles, Orson, 14, 60, 116–17, 150
 Wells, Stanley, 12
 Wilders, John, 150
 Williams, Stephen, 114
 Wilson, John Dover, 135, 151
 Wilson, Richard, 'Is This a
 Holiday?', 140, 151
 (ed.), *Julius Caesar*, 148
 Wise, Herbert *see* BBC (1979)
 Wood, John, 118