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The phrase ‘lean and hungry look’ (*Julius Caesar*, 1.2.193)[[1]](#endnote-1) is one of those Shakespearean quotations that has become so familiar that we no longer enquire after its implications. Indeed since its meaning seems straightforward—someone who appears lean and hungry, i.e. thin and discontent, and therefore perhaps resentful, or jealous—there is no obvious reason to do so. Even so, this description by Caesar of Cassius, presented as observable fact, quickly slides, as has just been demonstrated, into a matter of interpretation. No editors comment on this slippery function, however, preferring simply to note Shakespeare’s borrowings: David Daniel in the Arden edition, for example, refers the entire block of 22 lines in which the phrase occurs to passages in three of the relevant *Lives* of Plutarch—as translated by Sir Thomas North from the French version by Amyot.

In the *Life of Julius Caesar,* we are told that Caesar ‘suspected’ Cassius and held him ‘in great gelouzie’ saying ‘I like not his pale lookes’. Then a passage that is more or less repeated in the *Life of Marcus Antonius* adds:

‘as for those fatte men and smooth com[b]ed heads,’ quoth he, ‘I never reckon of them: but these pale visaged and carian leane people, I fear them most,’ meaning Brutus and Cassius.[[2]](#endnote-2)

Shakespeare's 'look' preserves North’s use of ‘looks’ as a noun, rather than the intransitive verbal form of customary interpretation (i.e. ‘looks lean and hungry’). His version of Caesar’s wish—‘Let me have men about me that are fat, / Sleek-headed men’—is intensified with ‘and such as sleep a-nights’, and subsequently two long scenes that will show sleepless conspirators in the dark (1,2,191-2;1.3; 2.1). But he drops the paleness, emphasising hunger rather than thinness, and adds an extra anxiety about Cassio’s powers of looking: ‘He reads much, / He is a great observer, and he looks / Quite through the deeds of men’ (1.2.200-2). Caesar’s disquiet thus becomes a shrewder anxiety about what Cassio *does* rather than a merely superstitious fear about what he looks *like* and what his appearance might presage. The ‘lean and hungry look’ can now be seen to have a verbal quality about it, conjuring an image of energetic, devouring wolfishness, rather than Plutarch’s carrion emaciation. The phrase is sufficiently arresting to have caught on quickly; an EEBO keyword search gives five instances in the century following the play's composition.

In this article I argue that the ambiguity of noun-ness and verb-ness in this line exploits contemporary uncertainty concerning the physiology of sight in order to raise a whole set of questions as to the nature of seeing, and also therefore of point of view, and of understanding. Furthermore, active, evocative descriptions, such as this one, that conjure up emotive images of people and events (both on and off stage), are studded through the play to the extent that they become a structural principle of ekphrasis. This contributes to the play’s sense of conflict and, through juxtaposition of different points of view, creates a sense of irony that involves readers and spectators in a powerful argument about the disasters of tyranny.

**The art of ekphrasis**

Etymologically, the rhetorical term *ekphrasis* is derived from *ek* (or *ex*)+*phrasein*—‘out + to speak’—suggesting a tangible sense of something created in or from words. Over the course of the 20th century, it came to signify little more than a description of a work of art, but its original meaning is not limited in that way and covers any evocative description of a person, place, thing, or event.[[3]](#endnote-3)

The first reference to the word listed in *OED* (where it is spelt ecphrasis) dates from 1725. But in Greek lettering it would have been familiar to those with a 16th-century education. Numerous versions and adaptations in Latin of Aphthonius’s *Progymnasmata*, some explicitly for use in grammar schools, had been published by English printers by the time Shakespeare began to write his plays. This textbook on rhetoric comprises a series of different types of rhetorical construction, each with extensive citation and quotation from the best examples. The section, headed in both Latin and Greek, *Descriptio* and eκϕρασις, does not occur until late in the text, but then takes up considerable space, suggesting *that* it is an advanced skill.[[4]](#endnote-4) It states that ekphrasis can be applied to persons, things, times, places, animals, and plants, and is characterised by ἐνάργεια (*enargeia*), vividness: the capacity to lay things, as it were, ‘before the eyes’.

Ekphrasis and *enargeia* work together as rhetoric (i.e. as an art of persuasion) by appealing to the memories, values, imagination, and experience of those that listen. Together they form ‘a conception of language as a quasi-physical force which penetrates into the mind of the listener, stirring up the images that are stored there’.[[5]](#endnote-5) The result is that both speaker and listener feel themselves to be present at the event that is described and emotionally involved with it.

As Quintilian puts it, frequently citing Cicero as his best exemplum, ‘The heart of the matter as regards arousing emotions . . . lies in being moved by them oneself’ (Quintilian, 6.2.26).[[6]](#endnote-6)

The person who will show the greatest power in the expression of emotions [*in adfectibus potentissimus*] will be the person who has properly formed what the Greeks call *phantasiai* (let us call them ‘visions’), by which the images of absent things are presented to the mind in such a way that we seem actually to see them with our eyes and have them physically present to us. (Quintilian 6.2.29-30)

He goes on to demonstrate that descriptions that succeed best in placing people and events before the eyes of a listener depend not so much on adjectives as on actions:

Suppose I am complaining that someone has been murdered. Am I not to have before my eyes all the circumstances which one can believe to have *happened* during the event? Will not the assassin *burst out* on a sudden, and the victim *tremble*, *cry for help*, and either *plead* *for mercy* or *try to escape*? Shall I not *see* one man *striking* the blow and the other man *falling*? Will not the blood, the pallor, the *groans*, the last *gasp* of the *dying* be imprinted on my mind? (Quintilian 6.2.31, my emphases)

The result will be that the orator seems ‘not so much to be talking about something as exhibiting it. Emotions will ensue just as if we were present at the event itself’ (Quintilian 6.2.31-32).

The events so described may or may not be true. But, as Hamlet was later to observe, if actors can exhibit emotional identification with their characters ‘in a fiction, in a dream of passion’, how much more important is emotional identification in those speaking about the trauma of real events (see *Hamlet*, 2.2.551-82),:

Let us identify with the persons of whose grievous, undeserved and lamentable misfortunes we complain; let us not plead the case as though it were someone else’s but take the pain of it on ourselves for the moment. We shall thus say what we would have said in similar circumstances of our own. I have frequently seen tragic and comic actors, having taken off their masks at the end of some emotional scene, leave the stage still in tears. And if the mere delivery of the written words of another can so kindle them with imagined emotions, what shall *we* [orators] be capable of doing, we who have to imagine the facts in such a way that we can feel vicariously the emotions of our endangered clients? (Quintilian 6.2.34-5)

The purpose of ekphrasis and *enargeia* in oratory is therefore to generate shared cultural values; listeners get the impression they are ‘seeing’ the same vision as the speaker, and are thereby encouraged to feel the same emotional response.[[7]](#endnote-7) But Shakespeare’s plays bring a variety of characters before our eyes with different values set up in opposition—as befits drama. They recount events which are clearly of varying truth, or which are greeted with varying degrees of emotion and different interpretations by those on stage. And like real people these characters exhibit inconsistency.

Thus the same Cassius who strikes fear into Caesar, retells the occasion when he had to rescue Caesar from the Tiber—or perhaps invents it since it is not found in Plutarch. His story is laced with multiple visual elements that lend it verisimilitude, including the following emotive comparison with an image of Aeneas rescuing his father from the ruins of Troy:

I, as Aeneas, our great ancestor,

Did from the flames of Troy upon his shoulder

The old Anchises bear, so from the waves of Tiber

Did I the tired Caesar: (1.2.112-115)

That event lends itself to actual pictorial representation and can be found as a woodcut in Geffrey Whitney’s *A Choice of Emblemes* (1586) ‘moralised’ as an exemplum of filial piety.[[8]](#endnote-8) But as a dramatist, Shakespeare is aware that meaning depends on context, and in Cassius’s mouth the image is yoked with scorn for Caesar’s supposed physical weakness in a rhetorical ploy to persuade Brutus that Caesar is unfit to rule Rome.

Cassius is, nevertheless, also the person whose shocked reaction to the appalling and graphic news of Portia’s death by swallowing burning coals allows us to see that Brutus’s stoic acceptance of her (excessively) Roman sense of honour is not the only possible Roman reaction.

Brutus: [. . .] with this she fell distract,

And, her attendants absent, swallowed fire.

Cassius: And died so?

Brutus: Even so.

Cassius: O ye immortal gods!

*Enter* Lucius *with wine and tapers.*

Brutus: Speak no more of her: (4.3.153-6)

Perhaps it simply cannot be spoken of in front of the servants, but this moment is recapitulated some 40 lines later when Brutus and Messala compare what their letters tell them of terrible events in Rome: the proscription and deaths of 100 (or is it 70?) senators, including Cicero. Brutus there feigns ignorance of Portia’s fate, thus forcing Messala to tell him what he knows. This is something Messala is loath to do, but he admits, ‘For certain she is dead, and by strange manner’. Brutus’s claim that having once meditated on her death, he has ‘the patience to endure it now’, is then greeted by Messala apothegmatically (perhaps with relief, perhaps puzzlement, perhaps awe): ‘Even so great men great losses should endure’. Cassius, however, observes that although he has as much ‘art’ as Brutus ‘yet my nature could not bear it so’ (4.3.179-93).

Such highly charged, contradictory moments, in which what one person sees is at odds with what another understands provide a rhetorical structure that allows space to us as audiences or readers to engage our own imaginations in dialectical reflection on what is spoken. This in turn goes a long way to answer traditional criticism that the construction of the play is problematic, even confused.[[9]](#endnote-9) The play’s subject matter—assassination; deposition; civil war— is inherently both emotionally charged and divisive. It is only appropriate that its structure and content should reflect that.

**Theories of sight**

By transferring the description of Cassius’s physical appearance to the nature of his look, Shakespeare has introduced a glancing reference to the extramission theory of sight—the idea expressed by Empedocles and promulgated by Plato and others that the eye sees by throwing out a small beam of light. Despite early contradiction by Aristotle (who argues that rays of light from an object penetrate the watery, translucent medium of the inner eye where they somehow mingle with the translucent soul to produce vision),[[10]](#endnote-10) the theory of extramission has been long lived, particularly with regard to the sight of beloved objects.

The idea of a lover’s ‘eye-beam’, sometimes tangling with eye-beams emanating from the beloved, features in countless medieval and early modern love poems; but it has recently been reported that as many as 50% of US college students believe extramission to be an accurate account of the process of seeing.[[11]](#endnote-11) Perhaps we should not really be surprised by this (although I confess I am). The concept supplies an externalizing, physicalized image of the familiar yearning desire of those in love to connect with their beloved, and the irresistible compulsion to gaze on him or her. It is a powerful metaphor for what is felt, and therefore possesses a certain psychological or emotional truth, even though it has been known to be physiologically impossible for almost as long as it has been believed to be actually true. After all, the influence we have on others through ‘oversight’, or ‘looking after’ is preserved in the language, and we must all, from time to time, have had the powerful sense that we can actually feel other people looking at us. This is one of the many paradoxes of sight.

The word ‘eye’ is one of Shakespeare’s most frequently used nouns. It runs to nearly six double-column pages in Bartlett’s *Concordance*, slightly more than ‘hand’, and even than ‘heart’, and nearly three times the incidence of ‘ear’. But Shakespeare uses the expression ‘eyebeam’ only once—suitably enough in *Loves Labours Lost*, in the very bad poem written by the King of Navarre, which is stuffed with over-worn, conventional, and slightly nonsensical tropes:

So sweet a kiss the golden sun gives not

To those fresh morning drops upon the rose

As thy eyebeams when their fresh rays have smote

The night of dew that on my cheeks down flows. (4.3.24-7).

Another early play, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, has a couple of instances of active looking which have their roots in extramission: ‘borrows his wit from your ladyship’s looks, and spends what he borrows’ and ‘His mistress/ Did hold his eyes lock’d in her crystal looks’ (2.4.37-8 and 86-7). Yet in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, we’re told ‘Love looks not with the eyes but with the mind, / And therefore is winged Cupid painted blind’ (1.1.234-5). That it is not the eye that sees but the brain is another counter-intuitive paradox of sight, an insight dating from classical times, though one that would only find its demonstration in western science at about the time Shakespeare was writing.[[12]](#endnote-12) In *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare thus makes metaphorical use of the idea of extramission without necessarily believing in it as a scientific explanation. In this play, ideas about sight bounce around, encompassing myth, superstition, report, and hearsay, and influenced by off-stage sounds and internal imaginings. This is perhaps another reason why the play has attracted such long-standing critical disagreement.

French scientist André du Laurens in *A Discourse of the Preseruation of the Sight* translated into English in 1599, the year that *Julius Caesar* was probably first performed, carefully rehearses all of the arguments for the extramission theory of sight before coming down, little by little, firmly on the side of intromission—sight by means of light, reflected from external objects, entering the eye. As part of his extramission theory argument, he states ‘Plinie hath obserued that Tyberius Cesar did make afraid many souldiers with his onely looke, it was so quicke and full of light’.[[13]](#endnote-13) The importance of the military commander’s ‘look’, inspiring and urging his men to victory through a cheerful look, a fierce look, or flashing, energetic eyes is common in classical and 16th-century texts on war, both handbooks and literary.[[14]](#endnote-14) Cassius's ‘lean and hungry look’, however, denotes narrower, personal ambition. It is not so much his physical appearance that, in Shakespeare’s version, is disquieting to Caesar, but what the quality of his gaze reveals about his mind and his political aspiration: ‘Yon Cassius has a lean and hungry look: / He thinks too much: such men are dangerous’ (1.2.193-4).

Cassius later turns out to be a rather unsuccessful general, snatching total defeat from the jaws of possible victory. Firstly, he bows to Brutus’s rhetoric and agrees to press on to meet Octavius’s army rather than force Octavius to come to them. This potential error will later surprise the latter, although Mark Antony will claim to have insider knowledge that it is but a ruse to make the conspirators’ forces appear stronger than they are (4.3.197-223; 5.1.1-12). Again, multiple views of the same set of actions. Secondly, Cassius is falling prey to superstitious fears: it is his birthday, ‘where I did begin, there shall I end’ (5.3.24); and he has seen ominous sights ‘ravens, crows and kites / Fly o’er our heads and downward look on us’ (5.1.84-5). Most disastrously, and ironically given the previous rhetoric about his gaze and his physical superiority to Caesar (who of course is deaf in one ear), his own eyesight is in fact rather ‘thick’. As a result, he asks Titinius to ride off to observe the events of the battle more closely, while asking his bondman, Pindarus, to climb a nearby hill to ‘regard Titinius’ from a distance.[[15]](#endnote-15) Pindarus catastrophically misinterprets the sight and sound of Titinius meeting a group of fast-riding horsemen as him being pursued and captured by Antony’s troops, whereas in fact he is learning news of Brutus’s unexpected victory against Caesar. Cassius, in despair, stops Pindarus from observing long enough to understand properly. He has predicted and now sees disaster in his mind, and he commits suicide by compelling Pindarus to stab him (5.3.15-46).

**Points of view in Shakespeare’s historical plays**

Is *Julius Caesar* a history, a tragedy? And if the latter, whose? Caesar's? Brutus's, even Cassius’s? Rome's? And what of the Roman rabble? What construction and opinion of ‘the people’ do their scenes represent? These are significant ethical questions, which the play lays before its spectators from multiple points of view.

Andrew Hadfield has shown how important the debate about the nature and virtues of republicanism was to Elizabethans, and demonstrates that Shakespeare himself returned to the topic repeatedly from the beginning to the end of his career. *The Rape of Lucrece* records the moment that marks the beginning of Rome’s Republican period with the banishment of Tarquinius; *Titus Andronicus* deals with the corruption of a Roman emperor; *Antony and Cleopatra* is concerned with the rivalry between the three triumvirs of the post-Republican period.[[16]](#endnote-16) Conversely, the struggle for British empery and independence from Caesar’s Roman empire forms the backdrop to *Cymbeline*, while English attempts to resist both tyranny at home and subjection to foreign empire are the subject of history plays from *King John* to *Richard III*.  Of course, calls for good government and ethical justifications for resisting tyranny—with arguments justifying tyrannicide if necessary—long predate the Elizabethan period. With slightly different forms of justification depending on broader cultural and religious belief systems, they can be found in works of classical, medieval, early modern, and modern political philosophy as well as in the long and honorable tradition of the poet-counsellor.[[17]](#endnote-17)

At the end of the 16th century the need for discursive analysis of such issues was pressing. Just four years after *Julius Caesar* was probably first performed, James I’s accession medal would show him dressed in Roman clothes, and presented as Emperor of the whole Island of Britain as well as King of France and Ireland, while his coronation medal the following year goes a step further with its legend ‘James I, Caesar Augustus of Britain, Caesar the heir of the Caesars, presents this medal’. Indeed, James was to cause disquiet amongst some at least of his auditors when he told his assembled parliament that kings sat on the right hand of god and in many respects *were* gods.[[18]](#endnote-18) We can presume therefore that when Elizabethans watched *Julius Caesar*, they were also to an extent watching, and wondering about, themselves.

Dramatic writing is both the very embodiment of ekphrasis and its strange obverse; it is the raw material out of which actors lay living images (stage pictures) before the eyes of spectators, and does not itself need to be descriptive. But in plays on historical subjects, we are aware that the characters depicted in their corporeal stage presences had a previous actual existence, and may have ongoing contemporary significance. The words and their embodiment by actors can therefore conjure up images that are subtly different from those already present in individual memories or imaginations.

Conversely, while the need to telescope long tracts of historical time and great events into the purview of a play, can encourage description of things happening offstage, it is often more dramatically effective to encapsulate huge historical processes in a single scene, even a single gesture or stage image. The scene in which the representatives of the houses of York and Lancaster confront each other in a garden, and respectively pluck white and red roses to represent their cause (*1 Henry VI*, 2.4) probably never happened, but it sums up 30 years of turbulent history in one ekphrastic image. It has influenced the way in which that history has been told ever since.

The power of ekphrastic imagination is overtly exploited in another play written at about the same time as *Julius Caesar*, and which has likewise acquired critical notoriety as ‘ambivalent’: *Henry V*. [[19]](#endnote-19)The Chorus opens that play half humorously denying the capacity of mere actors, their words, and assorted odd props to present the actuality of a great military campaign, and famously uses that lack as a prompt to audiences to engage. He instructs us to imagine the historic scene by visualising detailed actions: ‘*Think*, when we talk of horses, that you *see* them, / *Printing* their proud hoofs i’th’*receiving* earth’ (*Henry V*, 1.0.26, my emphasis). He intends us to collude in seeing the churning and compaction of the soil by invading cavalry as something that the very land of France is eager to embrace.

The play is also indebted to borrowings from classical *ekphraseis*. The Duke of Burgundy’s lament for the terrible effects of the war on the agriculture and economy of the French countryside is a textbook ekphrastic exercise, the origin of which seems to be Demosthenes’s much cited description of the sack of Phocis, in which ‘a few details . . . stand for the whole event and bring to mind a vivid scene of devastation’.[[20]](#endnote-20) Burgundy’s lament is rather more drawn out, lasting more than twenty lines. France lies in ruins:

. . .

Her vine, the merry cheerer of the heart,

Unprunèd dies; her hedges even-plashed

Like prisoners wildly overgrown with hair,

Put forth disordered twigs . . . (5.2.38-62)

It is an elegiac, emotive picture, but if the rhetorical purpose of ekphrasis is to make the listener share the speaker’s perspective, it can only miss its mark. The principle listener, Henry, has his own rather different memories of the war, its purposes, and its hardships. This, added to the length, may account for Henry’s impatient response. If, he says, the Duke really wants the peace ‘Whose want gives growth to th’imperfections / Which you have cited’, then Burgundy and the French

must buy that peace

With full accord to all our just demands,

Whose tenors and particular effects

You have enscheduled briefly in your hands. (5.2.68-73)

An ekphrastic literary trope thus gives way to a concrete stage picture with a rather different agenda. We now realise that Burgundy is holding, but not looking at, a written copy of Henry’s demands; he is not simply lamenting, but stalling because the King of France wants further talks (5.2.68-82).

The Chorus’s description of Henry’s embarkation for France is similarly more complex than it at first appears. Holinshed simply states that the King and his army embarked for France in a thousand ships, but Chorus instructs us to ‘suppose’ that we have ‘seen’ Henry embark at Southampton, but in such a way that we ‘play with’ our ‘fancies’. The scene has an antique and epic quality in its choice of language. The ships’ ropes are ‘hempen tackle’ and their sails are ‘threaden’. Rather than merely waving in the wind, their flags are ‘silken streamers’, ‘fanning’ Henry’s face in the persona of the sun-god ‘Phoebus’ himself. The ships’ bottoms are ‘huge’, the ‘surge’ is ‘lofty’. There is scarcely a noun that is not graced with an adjective, but more important is the lively sense of movement in which we too, in imagination, are invited to be physically involved: we are to ‘grapple’ our minds ‘to sternage of this navy’, so vast that as we simultaneously stand watching from the ‘rivage’ (sea shore), we see an entire ‘city on th’inconstant billows dancing’ (3.0.1-18). This use of the odd and poetic term ‘rivage’, which occurs nowhere else in Shakespeare’s plays or poems, and the particular combination of curiously antique words and images in this passage indicate that something more is going on than a simple recounting of an event in medieval history. Indeed many of its individual words can be found (in almost the same order) in the famous ekphrastic description in North’s Plutarch of Cleopatra’s barge on the river Cydnus when she first beguiles Mark Antony:

on either hand of her, pretie faire boyes . . . fanned wind upon her. Her ladies . . . tending the tackle and ropes of the barge, out of which there came a wonderfull passing sweete savor of perfumes, that perfumed the wharfes side, pestered with innumerable multitudes of people. Some of them followed the barge all alongest the rivers side: others also ranne out of the citie to see her comming in.[[21]](#endnote-21)

Shakespeare’s ‘rivage’ echoes North’s ‘rivers side’, but is also a curiously redolent term for the topography of the scene, since the Solent, where it takes place, is not only sea but a confluence of rivers. Yet it may seem strange that a description of a military expedition should be inspired by one of the most extravagant seduction events in recorded history. Shakespeare’s hallmark as a dramatist, however, is the way in which he introduces images near the beginning of a work that he can transform or undercut towards the end. This invasion will be ratified, excused (call it what you will) by a love affair:

for I love France so well that I will not part with a village of it, I will have it all mine; and Kate, when France is mine, and I am yours, then yours is France and you are mine. (5.2.173-6)

He is only partly joking.

The *Henry V* Chorus is notoriously unreliable: the things he describes or tells us to expect never happen in quite the way he says they will. This is an almost inevitable pitfall of ekphrastic description because of the speaker’s presumption of a shared cultural outlook with his listener, which may not in fact be shared, and his desire to persuade that listener to a particular point of view. Peter Wagner describes it thus: ‘Ekphrasis, then, has a Janus face: as a form of mimesis, it stages a paradoxical performance, promising to give voice to the allegedly silent image even while attempting to overcome the power of the image by transforming and inscribing it.’[[22]](#endnote-22) In a play where successive characters with different outlooks make such assumptions, it becomes a powerful device for evoking turmoil.

**Ekphrasis and intermediality**

By its very nature, ekphrasis is intermedial (from event or image into words, via memory of similar events or images, to a reconstructed image of the event or image in the mind of the listener); it is also often intertextual, and can thus, intentionally or not, come to signify more than is overtly set down.[[23]](#endnote-23) In *A Choice of Emblemes*, Geffrey Whitney had used the death of Brutus as illustration for the motto *Fortuna virtutem superans*—Fortune conquers the valiant. Whitney’s moral hope for the collection as a whole is expressed on its title page: that through ‘the office of the eie, and the eare, the minde maye reape dooble delighte throughe holsome preceptes, shadowed with pleasant deuises: both fit for the vertuous, to their incoraging: and for the wicked, for their admonishing and amendment’. In this case, the woodcut shows a figure in Roman armour, bent over, his bared breast resting on the tip of an upright, naked sword. The verse tells how Brutus ‘sawe his friendes, lie bleeding on the grounde’, and how his remaining friends have urged him ‘to flee’, but he refuses ‘with courage great’, stating ‘my flight with hands shalbe’. He concludes:

Oh Prowes vaine, I longe did loue thee beste,

But nowe, I see, thou doest on fortune waite.

Wherefore with paine, I nowe doe prooue it true,

That fortunes force, maie valiant hartes subdue.[[24]](#endnote-24)

The message seems straightforward: Brutus’s suicide is the action of an honorable and valiant man in the face of overwhelming fortune. But Brutus is an ambivalent figure: on the one hand stoic defender of liberty and the republic; on the other, conspirator and murderer. In an attempt, presumably, to clinch the heroic aspects, a lengthy marginal note refers us, in Latin, to the dispute between Ajax and Ulysses over which of them should inherit the armour of Achilles. It first directs us to an emblem earlier in the book in which a ‘doleful dame’, Prowess herself, is shown sitting on Ajax’s tomb. She is tearing her hair because Agamemnon’s judgement in favour of the ‘filed tongue’ of Ulysses, caused Ajax, the ‘onelie man of warre’, to fall insane and kill himself.[[25]](#endnote-25) It then selectively quotes from the story as retold by Ovid in *Metamorphoses* 13, concluding ‘*Ne quisquam Aiacem possit superare, nisi Aiax*’; no-one but Ajax can conquer Ajax. Those familiar with Ovid’s story, however, will also remember that Ajax had attempted to take revenge for Agamemnon’s judgement, but the gods rendered him insane so that he merely slaughtered a flock of sheep, stabbing himself when he came to his senses. Ovid also tells how Ajax’ blood caused a hyacinth to spring from the ground—the same flower that had sprung up after the accidental death of the boy Hyacinth during a game of discus with Apollo. The flower, Ovid says, bears on its petals the letters AI, denoting both the boy’s pain, and the first two letters of Ajax’ name. The marginal annotation thus gives intertextual references (both within the *Emblemes* and external to it) that supply both visual and aural stimuli—the doleful dame, the anguished cry of a boy, the ranting of Ajax, the springing to life of a flower—that are emotive but also potentially ambiguous, even incompatibile with the proposed meaning of the emblem.

Whitney was a client of the Earl of Leicester and was in his retinue during his military expedition to Holland; the *Emblemes* had started as a manuscript gift to the Earl and had been published at the behest of various leading Dutch humanist scholars. The tenor of the Brutus poem suggests that any Christian anxiety Whitney may have had about the sinfulness of suicide has disappeared in the attempt to reinforce Leicester’s heroic credentials. But the marginal gloss to other images and their verbal descriptions only serve to muddy this message—something that would be intensified for later readers familiar with Ajax the ‘beef-witted lord’ of Shakespeare’s *Troilus and Cressida*, or Harington’s *Anatomy . . . of Ajax* (1596), a satire on the Elizabethan court, including a specific reference to Leicester. In explicating and contextualising, Whitney has rather undermined himself, despite his attempts to control and limit his references.

**Complexity**

The complexity of vision in *Julius Caesar,* however, usefully takes doubt not just about the morality of the conspirators’ actions but about their political efficacy to a new level of ethical debate. It presents us with a situation in which one bad government, which is afraid of its own shadow, impotent and subject to superstition, is replaced not by the revolutionaries (who in fact have no political manifesto other than the removal of the tyrant) but by more of the same. Old-fashioned augury is replaced by new-fangled spin—and continuing civil war. Tellingly, for a work of poetic literature, this all too familiar nightmare process has no space for poets or public intellectuals. The various poets who make brief appearances are each noted for their ‘bad verses’. And Cicero, the most commonly read legal thinker in 16th-century English schoolrooms, who in *The Laws* defends tyrannicide according to the principle of natural law, and who wrote an entire oration in favour of the poet Archias, stressing the public and private value of the arts, is curiously peripheral. This must be deliberate. Shakespeare cannot have been ignorant of Cicero’s political and legal importance—whether from his school studies, his reading of Plutarch’s *Lives*, which includes a Life of Cicero, or through the good offices of his Stratford contemporary, the printer Richard Field, who through marriage to Vautrollier’s widow had acquired the rights to print not only the *Lives*, but also Cicero’s works in England. Quentin Skinner has exhaustively catalogued Shakespeare’s familiarity with Cicero, and the technical accuracy of the rhetorical speeches in *Julius Caesar* and other plays from the same period of Shakespeare’s career. He also notes the emotional uses of *enargeia*. But while recounting the disposition of elements within single speeches, he largely ignores Shakespeare’s juxtaposition of characters, speeches and events through an entire play, and therefore the dialectic that is set up by this selection and arrangement in the mind of the reader/spectator.[[26]](#endnote-26)

When Shakespeare makes Brutus describe Cicero’s entrance in Caesar’s train after the failed crowning at the Lupercal games it is with a glancing and uncomplimentary reference to extramission, which balances Caesar’s earlier description of Cassius:

and Cicero

Looks with such ferret and such fiery eyes

As we have seen him in the Capitol

Being crossed in conference by some senators. (1.2.184-7)

The ferret’s ‘look’ may be fierce, but it is a tiny animal, and Caesar is no rabbit. This Cicero has already lost all influence, and Caska will shortly joke about his ineffective intervention at the games: ‘Ay, he spoke Greek. [. . .] those that understood him smiled at one another, and shook their heads; but for mine own part, it was Greek to me’ (1.2.278-84). [[27]](#endnote-27)

We see Cicero just once more in the following scene, in talk with Caska in a thunder storm, clearly not believing Caska’s ekphrastic tales of strange sights within sights: the man he ‘saw’ with the hand that flamed ‘Like twenty torches joined; and yet . . . remained unscorched’; the lion that ‘glazed’ upon him, yet forbore to attack him; and the ‘hundred ghastly women . . . who swore they saw / Men, all in fire, walk up and down the streets’ (1.3.16-25). But he sees no point in disagreeing:

Indeed it is a strange-disposed time.

But men may construe things after their fashion

Clean from the purpose of the things themselves. (1.3.33-5)

It is the kind of sardonic put down for which, Plutarch says, he was famous. He cannot bother himself to engage with the misconceived rumour mill that is public discourse. Or perhaps more fairly, he realizes that the wild rumour, which has resulted in people seeing what they have been conditioned by the times to see, is not susceptible to reasoned argument.

Later, Brutus will veto the other conspirators’ suggestion that Cicero should be invited to join them, on the grounds that ‘he will never follow anything / That other men begin’ (2.1.150-1). But like Cicero, Cassius and Brutus have also bowed out of the social, political process. They decided not to accompany Caesar’s train to the games, but they, and we, hear the roars from the crowd and the flourish of trumpets, punctuating Cassius’s attempts to encourage Brutus to thoughts of tyrannicide. These sounds enabled them (and us) to imagine the scene in which the crown is offered to Caesar. Their own relationship is not easy. Brutus, Cassius says, has appeared unfriendly of late. The language used mixes sight expressed as a metaphor of extramission with words connoting troubled, interrupted, or false sight to create an image of disrupted friendship:

Cassius. Brutus, I do observe you now of late.

I have not from your eyes that gentleness

And show of love as I was wont to have.

You bear too stubborn and too strange a hand

Over your friend, that loves you.

Brutus acknowledges the truth of this:

If I have veiled my look,

I turn the trouble of my countenance

Merely upon myself. . . .

He asks that Cassius should not

construe any further my neglect

Than that poor Brutus, with himself at war,

Forgets the shows of love to other men.

And in response to Cassius’s desire that he look at his own face, he notes a further paradox of sight, that ‘the eye sees not itself / But by reflection, by some other things’. (1.2.32-53)

Having imagined the scene in the capitol through sound effects and as something to ‘fear’ (and after both the return of Caesar and his train in some disarray, and then their exit), we are invited to see it again in more graphic detail, but this time as something to laugh at.

Caska: I saw Mark Antony offer him a crown—yet ‘twas not a crown neither, ’twas one of these coronets—and, as I told you, he put it by once; but for all that, to my thinking, he would fain have had it. Then he offered it to him again; then he put it by again; but to my thinking, he was very loth to lay his fingers off it. And then he offered it the third time; he put it the third time by; and still as he refused it the rabblement hooted, and clapped their choped hands, and threw up their sweaty nightcaps, and uttered such a deal of stinking breath because Caesar refused the crown that it had almost choked Caesar; for he swooned and fell down at it. And for mine own part, I durst not laugh, for fear of opening my lips and receiving the bad air. (1.2.236-49)

This speech supplies us with multiple points of view and emotional responses—from Mark Antony, from Caesar, from the crowd—all mediated through Caska’s irony. The informality and colloquialism of ‘ ’twas not a crown neither, ’twas one of those coronets’ betrays the tawdryness of the occasion and the failure to stage-manage it properly. It is also ironic that Caesar’s desire for the crown cannot be satisfied because the crowd greets his show of refusal with such rapture. He wants to be a tyrant by the consent of the people! Conversely and even more ironically, by killing him, the conspirators will actually hasten the end of the republic they claim to be defending.

In Shakespeare’s play, community, allegiance, friendship, and marriage are all stretched to breaking point. The people are at odds with their tribunes; Cassius deceives Brutus into taking the action that *he* wants him to take by throwing counterfeit messages in at windows; Brutus and Cassius argue before Phillipi; and there is no companionateness between husbands and wives. Brutus cannot bring himself to communicate with Portia, while Caesar publicly announces that Calphurnia is barren and orders Antony to touch her during the race on the Lupercal.[[28]](#endnote-28) Expressed as a series of commands to both Calphurnia and Antony as to what each should do, it becomes a highly visual verbal image, which at least to modern and presumably to Elizabethan eyes is humiliating. Mark Antony even draws attention to Caesar’s autocracy, and to the strangeness of the ritual, abrogating his own responsibility: ‘When Caesar says “Do this”, it is performed’ (1.2.10). As Colin Burrow observes, ‘when Shakespeare represents a religious ritual, he, like Plutarch before him, will tend to emphasize the alienness of Roman custom’.[[29]](#endnote-29)

With such dislocation of social relations, it is inevitable that the revolution only serves to breed violence; the rabble on the streets tear an innocent person to pieces because they cannot distinguish between people with identical names— ‘I am Cinna *the poet*’ (3.3.29 my emphasis)—while Caesar’s successors sit down and coldly trade close relatives to death, reducing individuals to no more than a ‘prick’ or mark, ‘Look, with a spot, I damn him’ (4.1.6).

Cassius has asserted the classical defence against a charge of tyrannicide: i.e. self defence against the enslaving behaviour of the tyrant, and which, in the aim to reassert natural justice, thereby enacts god’s will:

Cassius from bondage will deliver Cassius.

Therein, ye gods, ye make the weak most strong;

Therein, ye gods, you tyrants do defeat. (1.3.90-2)

He acknowledges that in doing so, he too is acting the part of tyrant but claims to be able to shake this off:

If I know this, know all the world besides,

That part of tyranny that I do bear

I can shake off at pleasure. *Thunder still*. (1.3.98-100)

But the thunder sound-effect is ominous, even blackly satirical. Cassius’s readiness to ‘make a mighty fire’, and his denigration of Rome itself as ‘trash’, ‘rubbish’, ‘offal’ (1.3.107-9), that can now, logically, be burned on that fire is chilling, especially so, perhaps, to us who have heard similar sentiments from countless 20th- and 21st- century demogogues, dictators, and terrorist fanatics.

Cassius is not alone. Mark Antony, the man who is about to woo the people with promise of bequests made in Caesar’s will, not only has no intention of delivering those bequests, but privately vows to revenge Caesar in the bloodiest of civil wars:

Blood and destruction shall be so in use,

And dreadful objects so familiar,

That mothers shall but smile when they behold

Their infants quartered with the hands of war: (3.1.265-8)

Criticism has tended to ignore this horror. Like the plebs in the play, it has been beguiled by Antony’s subsequent rhetoric and also perhaps by Shakespeare’s later manifestation of him as the great but flawed lover—or perhaps just by the Richard Burtons and other gorgeous actors who have played the role. This Antony is rather the dangerous would-be tyrant described by Cicero in the *Philippics.* The only faint hope is, as Erasmus also observed, that Cicero did not retract or burn his books; we still have his speeches, replete as they are with powerful ekphrastic images, interlaced with ironic remarks.

**Juxtaposition and irony**

Colin Burrow states that *Julius Caesar* lacks ‘obtrusive imagery’; he observes the ‘relative absence from it of puns or lexical innovations, its tendency to rely heavily on monosyllables’, which gives it a sense of an alien culture far removed from Elizabethan England, and suggests that it was this alienness that kept Shakespeare safe from accusations of sedition. He notes the conspirators’ rhetorical identification of themselves with the ‘thews and sinews’ of early Romans, and reiterates an oft-noted feature: that Shakespeare rephrases Plutarch in terse often monosyllabic language that speaks ‘marmoreal’ Romanness.[[30]](#endnote-30) All this is true, and in first drafting this article I rather surprised myself by the number of times I began to reach for the word ‘irony’ to describe the play and its techniques. Burrow himself makes the briefest passing reference to irony, while Gary Wills, commenting on Brutus’s funeral oration remarks: ‘Brutus layers his figures, interlaces them, piles them up, runs one through another, violating the teaching of Quintilian, reducing the crowd to cowed silence. Its rhetoric is so overdone that it approaches what is comic elsewhere in Shakespeare’.[[31]](#endnote-31) Yet as Quintilian himself remarks, ‘Irony too: is not this even in its severest form almost a kind of joke?’ (Quintilian, 6.3.68).

In the mouths of individual characters, the play demonstrates the truth of Plato’s *Gorgias* that most oratory is mere sophistry. Whether Antony’s ironic ‘For Brutus is an honourable man’ or Brutus’s ‘Believe me for mine honour and have respect to mine honour, that you may believe’, they are all variously deluding themselves, each other, and the people, but always for their own individual self interest. The power and value of the *play*, however, lie in its juxtapositions, which prevent the rhetoric of language and image from exerting the meanings that the character-speakers intend.

We are not the audience for Antony’s and Brutus’s funeral orations (despite the attempts of so many modern productions to turn us into a crowd of Roman citizens), because we are also watching, and marvelling at the way the crowd gets turned:

Look, in this place ran Cassius’ dagger through:

See what a rent the envious Caska made:

Through this, the well-beloved Brutus stabbed,

And as he plucked his cursed steel away

Mark how the blood of Caesar followed it,

As rushing out of doors, to be resolved

If Brutus so unkindly knocked or no; (3.2.172-8)

Who knows which of the holes in that bloody cloak were actually made by Cassius, Caska, or Brutus? We can see how the rhetoric achieves its effects—with verbs and actions—and we can make our own meanings.

In other words, though Roman approaches to honour and militarism have often been valorised in Western European culture, this play does not force us to accept them without question. In it, Shakespeare sets up a pervasive pattern of different ways of seeing and understanding. This structure expresses the ethical complexity of the political situation, which strangely, in its very alienness, makes it a play for our time, as well as for his own; Nigerian-born Theo Ogundipe, soothsayer in the 2012 RSC production which was set in modern Africa, describes the play as ‘Perfect for Africa, because of the way Africa is run’.[[32]](#endnote-32)

We are still nonplussed in the face of tyranny; our legal structures and international organisations are incapable of acting to alleviate the acknowledged suffering of innocent people under tyrannous regimes.

Instances of politically motivated murder seem not to have diminished since the conspiratorial designs of Brutus or the revolutionary speeches of Robespierre that proclaimed ‘death to tyrants’ (Robespierre 1794). In the recent Iraq war the question of tyrannicide was raised once again; should Saddam Hussein be killed to free the Iraqi people (Hoffman 2003)? It was a contemporary manifestation of an ancient quandary which demonstrates that international societal norms governing tyrannicide warrant serious investigation.[[33]](#endnote-33)

We should therefore not expect the play to be straightforward in its expression of a problem that has not, after all, gone away; its strangeness is useful to us, since it offers space for reflection. It is not that Shakespeare is sitting on the fence, playing safe with political ambiguity. Rather that he is painting a picture of a bleak world that has gone beyond the operation of normal politics. Shakespeare’s use of ekphrasis, *enargeia,* and irony is not simply an ornamental way of speaking. The dramaturgy of competing emotional images creates an argument about the ethical and practical problems associated with both resistance to tyranny and internecine war, which are as relevant today as they have ever been. If we find the play’s language ‘marmoreal’, alien, and ungiving, it is perhaps a prompt that its characters’ solutions to the problems in which they find themselves should not be ours.
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