Disambiguation in Recent Editions of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*: The Silent Tradition[1]

John W. Velz

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when transmitting the text of Shakespeare quite simply meant marking up a copy of the edition published by a precursor (usually an immediate precursor) and sending it to the printer,[2] the unnoticed survival of certain kinds of readings was commonplace. Everyone who has worked on the textual history of Shakespeare has a few favorite instances. In *Julius Caesar* TLN 1282, for instance, a typographical error in a speech heading *(Cim.* for *Cin.)* in ROWE2 (1709-10) passed unnoticed except by Hanmer through 12 succeeding editions down through JOHNSON (1765). Significantly, Capell (1768) averted the error by printing from his transcription of the First Folio. And, ironically, it was the much-maligned Charles Jennens whose careful collation (edn. of 1774) first revealed the source of the error. For well over half a century, without thinking about it, editors had assigned Cinna's speech to Metellus Cimber, and this false inference from an uncorrected typographical error found its way into the theater, if we are to judge from the reading Francis Gentleman gives in Bell's acting edition (1773).

Another instance will suggest that the operation of the silent tradition in TLN 1282 was not a fluke. An omitted line (TLN 1845) in the Cinna-the-Poet scene in the Variorum of 1803 was caught a little more promptly than the error in TLN 1282—but not by v1813, which claimed to have eliminated the errors in v1803. The respected v1821 mechanically reprinted its copy-text and passed the error of omission along to four other editions, including SINGER1 (1826), until 1841, when Charles Knight finally restored the line in his first edition.

We might expect in the age of the New Bibliography, with its solemn insistence on the rationale of copy-text,[3] that such docile acceptance of the tradition would be rare indeed. Capell, in his respect for the untampered-with Folio text, is said to be the father of our editorial practice. Yet Stanley Wells has complained that "the traditionally heavy style of punctuation . . . has often been unthinkingly retained [in recent texts] as a result of the deplorable but common practice of basing an allegedly 'new' edition on a marked-up copy of an earlier one."[4] It would appear that "the old way" of transmitting the text of Shakespeare is still with us.

In many editorial disambiguations, the silent tradition is entirely unbroken; it is not a matter of Wells's *often* but of *always*. Where genuine ambiguity exists in the text of a Folio play, modern editors—even those like Evans, Bevington, and the OXFORD Shakespeare group who make solemn announcements of their textual

independence—follow the tradition which has been undeviatingly true to the first disambiguator of an ambiguous reading (usually a players' quarto or Rowe). What is more, the modern editor seems never to have noticed the ambiguity, because the disambiguation does not appear in his textual notes, nor is it discussed, normally, in his commentary.[5] The omission is pernicious, because the ambiguity in the Folio reading may in some cases have been deliberate, as ambiguity is deliberate in a pun. Fredson Bowers' complaint against editorial practice a quarter century ago is still apt: "It is a truism too often neglected by editors that the reader of a definitive critical edition should (a) be able to reconstruct from the data the significant details of the copy text; (b) be in possession of the whole number of facts from which the editor constructed his text."[6] We need not go so far as Bowers would go in the treatment of accidentals, perhaps; but surely silence about substantive ambiguity in the copy-text abdicates a responsibility. At about the same time, E. A. J. Honigmann pointed out the potential fallacy in an editorial quest for a single and fixed reading which is "right."[7] Bowers' and Honigmann's Shakespeare is multiple, and rightly so.[8]

In what follows a number of instances of unquestioning and unquestioned disambiguation in *Julius Caesar* will be pointed out, not to make a plea in most cases for an alternative reading, but to emphasize that even in the most up-to-date editions the reader is left to infer that a reading silently and arbitrarily introduced by Alexander Pope or Nicholas Rowe or even by the compositor of a Restoration quarto is canonical, and that no potential alternative to it exists. The accompanying observations are based on historical collation of a core of 81 editions, F1-OXF4; for some readings the list of editions checked is considerably longer. Special attention is given here to three prominent editions of recent time: *The Riverside Shakespeare,* ed. G. Blakemore Evans et al. (1974, EVNS); David Bevington's *Complete Works* (1980, 3rd edn., re-edited from Hardin Craig's 1951 text, BEV); and Arthur Humphreys' Oxford Shakespeare *Julius Caesar* (1984, OXF4).[9] The examples chosen from *JC*—several of them doubtful possessives—vary somewhat in the extent of their ambiguity. Yet all are sufficiently provocative, it would seem, to justify comment in an editor's notes. Most of them have never been commented on.

TLN	F1	Edit. Trad.	Following	Alternative
58	*Pompeyes*	Pompey's	F2	Pompeys'
155	Ages	Age's	Q1691	Ages'
197	Winters	winter's	ROWE3	F1
223	I	Ay	ROWE1	F1
590	Pretors	Prætor's	Q1691	Prætors'
746	times	Time's	ROWE1	times'

1118	too blame	to blame	F3	F1
1286	Speake hands	Speak, hands,	CAP	F1
1396	Brothers	brothers'	THEO1	brother's
1460	vtter.	~ ?	Q1684	F1
1501	Cry hauocke	Cry "havock"	CAP	F1
1580	Ancestors	F1	—	ancestor's
2064	his Friends	his friend's	CAP (Q1691)	his friends'

58 I know of no exceptions to the reading *That comes in triumph over Pompey's blood.* And yet there is ambiguity in the phrase. *Pompeys' blood* is quite possible grammatically, though Shakespeare does not often use a proper noun as plural possessive in pre-position; one might compare *Cym.* 2987: *Romanes bane; Tro.* 2623: *The Troians Trumpet . . . Yonder comes the troop; Tro.* 2944: *the Greeks general.* S.F. Johnson's understanding of the wordplay in the *JC* passage—*"blood* i.e., sons (also the blood of Pompey and his followers)"[10]—comes close to seeing that Caesar's triumph is (in one interpretation of F1 ad loc.) over the blood of the sons of Pompey, shed at the battle of Munda.[11] BEV's "(1) Pompey's offspring (2) the blood of the Pompeys" seizes on both of the two potential meanings in the F1 reading, but ignores the fact that disambiguation to a singular possessive has obviated one of them. OXF4's commentary note might lead us to the incorrect inference that the triumph is over Pompey: *"Pompey's blood* Pompey's sons; with the secondary, literal, implication of Pompey's own life-blood."

155 *groaning vnderneath this Ages yoake,* There have been no departures from the Q1691, ROWE1 reading *Age's,* which most probably was Shakespeare's intention, though it would be possible to take Cassius as saying that the yoke under which the Romans are groaning is the superlative yoke of all the ages of the world. This alternative has never, to my knowledge, been advanced in a conjecture or in any way discussed.

197 *we can both | Endure the Winters cold, as well as hee.* The F1 text—in which *Winters cold* can be taken as pl. sb. + adj.—might well be left untouched, though no editor has ever read with F1.[12] In light of literary evidence for the F1 reading, the silent unanimity is quite surprising. Compare Sonnet 104 lines 3-4: *Three Winters colde | Haue from the forrests shooke three summers pride.* It is true that *colde* is a rhyme-word in Sonn. 104, and that "noun-adjective inversion for the sake of rhyme was more tolerated than in other circumstances"[13]; moreover, Shakespeare's other uses of *winters* as a substantive with adjective all show the adjective in pre-position. For these reasons an editor might prefer to give Cassius the more colloquial locution *winter's cold,* though Cassius is being deliberately orotund and eloquent in this context. But the alternatives have never been debated.[14] There is a rough analogue to TLN 197 at

teenth century to early twentieth, "weakens the effect." The assertion might be applied to 1286 and 1288 equally.

1396 *our Hearts | Of Brothers temper, do receive you in,* The ambiguity here, such as it is, pales beside the famous neighboring crux, *Our Armes in strength of malice,* so it is not surprising that the tradition has been silent about the choice between *brother's,* the reading of POPE and v1773, and *brothers',* universally adopted by others from the time of THEOBALD. A case can be made for the singular, which would have Brutus say (in modern parlance) "our hearts, that love you as a brother would, . . ." One thinks of the intimate relationship between Brutus and Cassius, who call one another "brother" six times in the fourth act; it is tempting to prefer the personal touch of the singular as Brutus makes his sincere (if naive) appeal to the Antony. In a less likely analogue, one might argue for a singular possessive in TLN 1722, from Antony's oration: *Ingratitude, more strong than Traitors armes | Quite vanquish'd him* . . . It was probably the plural *armes* that caused Theobald to extrapolate a plural possessive when he disambiguated *Traitors* in his second Shakespeare edition (1740). And probably he was right to think as he did; but the emphasis in the preceding nine lines has been entirely on Brutus, not on the conspirators generally, and one might justify reading *traitor's* to convey a contrast between Brutus' treachery and his ingratitude rather than a contrast between the swords of the traitorous conspirators and Brutus' personal ingratitude. If one took the former course, *armes* would be the multiple swords that the traitor Brutus had gathered to support his treachery. About this ambiguity, too, the tradition has been silent.

1460 *Know you how much the people may be mou'd | By that which he will vtter.* Here the punctuation of F1, assumed to be ambiguous (or rather erroneous), was altered in a players' quarto to make Cassius put a question to Brutus, when the quite acceptable F1 punctuation has him making an imperative admonition, appropriate to his anxious attempt to keep his waning authority over the conspiracy. When in Act I Cassius was at the peak of his power in that conspiracy, imperatives were a natural mode of speech for him;[21] one of them (TLN 563) sounds much like the untampered-with 1460: *Now know you, Caska,* . . . Only two editions, RIDLEY and PENGUIN1, the two most conservative of all editions where F1 punctuation is the issue, have read with the Folio since the late seventeenth century, and neither of them comments on the F1 text here. EVNS, BEV, and OXF4 are in the silent tradition. One can, no doubt, make arguments for emending to *utter?* as strong as or stronger than those advanced here for retaining F1, but surely F1 deserves a consideration it has never been given.

1501 Less blameworthy is the acceptance by EVNS, BEV, AND OXF4 of the silent tradition's *Cry "havoc"* (universal since JOHNSON, following HANMER). Direct address is at the historical root of the expression, but long before Shakespeare's time a formulaic phrase had been made from the dead quotation. The idiom asks quotation marks no more in *JC* 1501 than Fortinbras's variation on it asks them in *Hamlet* 3857: *this quarry cries on hauocke.* There are perhaps five or six other places in *JC* where a simple locution has been converted by some editors into a direct address or a quotation. Of these the most interesting is TLN 667 *(Brutus, thou sleep'st: awake),* where F1 is ambiguous: Is the line part of the letter as composed by Cassius for Cinna to throw into Brutus' window or is it Brutus' musing quotation (or re-reading) of the beginning of the letter? Some fifty editors since the late eighteenth century divide almost equally on the question. BEV is among those editions that make 667 part of the letter; OXF4 has it the other way. BEV, like most editions, does not acknowledge the ambiguity; OXF4 does so, in this case.

1580 *Giue him a Statue with his Ancestors.* Apparently no editor has ever printed *ancestor's,* through Nicolaus Delius conjectured that reading in his seven-volume *Shakspere's Werke* 1854-61. A nominalized possessive adjective may well be what Shakespeare intended; Delius' note calls attention to *old Brutus statue* (593) and to the first sentence in Sir Thomas North's translation of Plutarch's "Brutus": "Marcus Brutus came of that Junius Brutus, for whome the auncient Romanes made his statue of brasse to be set up in the Capitoll. . . ."[22] Cf. also TLN 258 *(There was a Brutus once . . .).* On the other hand, see TLN 672 *(My Ancestors did from the streetes of Rome | The Tarquin driue . . .).* In a critical edition, I would probably print the singular possessive, crediting DELIUS2.

2064 *A Friend should beare his Friends infirmities;* In this case, as in four other disambiguations discussed in this article, the tradition has never considered a plural possessive. One supposes that the subliminal impulse of the original disambiguator was to keep such a locution as this one at the most personal and intimate level, as somehow more dramatic. Such a response to ambiguity might well have been applied in TLN 1396 where it was not; here, it would seem, it was wrongly applied where it should not have been. No one has ever read *friends'* since Q1691 introduced the apostrophe. Interestingly, however, the accepted reading between ROWE2 and JOHNSON2 (with scattered vestigia, one of them as late as E. K. Chambers' RED LETTER EDITION, 1906) was *a Friend's*—an abstract plural, compromising, as it were, between singular and plural. I have not encountered any editor who makes his reading in light of the source in Romans 15:1—"We which are strong, ought to beare the infirmities of the weake."[23]

TLN 481: *Who euer knew the Heauens menace so?* F1 offers quite plausible grammer (sb. + v.i.), and the tradition has accepted it, rejecting the alternative disambiguation of WARBURTON and BLAIR, *heaven's menace.* No one has printed the somewhat more satisfying third alternative, *heavens' menace,* though the phrase *impatience of the Heauens* (TLN 500), alluding specifically to TLN 481, might have invited Warburton to the plural reading—if he was to touch the text at all.

223 *I did heare him grone:* | *I,* Were the strong punctuation not there at the end of line 222, I should be inclined to read the *I* at the beginning of 223 as a personal pronoun, rather than as the affirmative expletive which all editors since Rowe have seen in the F1 reading. The evidence is literary—when vehement in the Quarrel Scene, Cassius uses just this (putative) locution: *I am a Souldier, I,* | *Older in practice, Abler then your selfe* | *To make Conditions* (TLN 2001-3). Reinforcing evidence comes at TLN 2610, where it is universally agreed that Lucilius, posing insistently as Brutus, uses a personal pronoun, not an affirmative, at the end of the line: *And I am Brutus, Marcus Brutus, I,* | *Brutus my Countries Friend: Know me for Brutus.* Recognizing that *I* appeared for both the pronoun and the expletive in Shakespeare's orthography, and that (on the basis of the punctuation in Addition IIc of *Sir Thomas More*) Shakespearian punctuation was very light, we might reason that what we have in the F1 punctuation of TLN 223 is the compositor's disambiguation of an ambiguous locution in his copy—perhaps the copy stood without punctuation at all: *I did heare him grone* | *I and that Tongue of his* . . . The very thought of tracing a disambiguation all the way to Compositor B of F1 is cause for trepidation.[15] Perhaps it suffices to say that no one has explored the ambiguity. Oddly enough, where disambiguating another *I* to an affirmative expletive clarifies some difficult syntax 13 lines earlier, in 210, George Lillie Craik's hint that this might be done[16] passed unheeded for more than a century until BEV printed *Ay,* a reading that was unique in 1980: "Ay [F1 *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."

590 *And looke you lay it in the Pretors Chayre,* | *Where Brutus may but finde it.* It is conceivable that Shakespeare intended a plural possessive here. Cf. TLN 1186 (the only other reference to the institution of Prætors in the canon), where Shakespeare shows awareness of multiple Praetors in Rome. The number fluctuated in Gaius Julius Cæsar's time from 8 to 18; Cinna and Cassius were both Prætors. On the other hand, Shakespeare was impressed by Plutarch's allusion in "Brutus" to the *sella curulis,* the ivory seat in which the Prætor Urbanus (chief justice of the state) heard disputes between

Roman citizens. The passage in North's Plutarch would have conveyed to Shakespeare the idea that Brutus alone used the *sella:* "His tribunall (or chaire) where he gave audience during the time he was Prætor was full of suche billes."[17] Though he suppressed the circumstances of Brutus' elevation to Prætor Urbanus,[18] Shakespeare could not have overlooked this position of public trust with its implication of singularity and pre-eminence. On balance, there is no reason to depart from the tradition, unbroken since POPE 1 (following Q1691 and QU4), that holds this word a singular possessive adjective. But on the face of it there is clearly enough evidence on the other side to warrant a discussion that has never taken place.

746 *The sufferance of our Soules, the Times Abuse.* Few of the ambiguous locutions in F1 *Julius Caesar* are spoken to by literary evidence so equally balanced on both sides. Here the opposed bits of evidence are only a few lines apart in the same speech in 1.2: *How I haue thought of this and of these times* | *I shall recount hereafter* (TLN 263-4); *Vnder these hard Conditions, as this time* | *Is like to lay vpon vs* (TLN 273-4). No comment is necessary here, except the observation that no one since Rowe has deviated from his disambiguation to a singular possessive or discussed the reading.

1118 *I am too blame to be thus waited for.* The disambiguation *cum* modernization in F3 to *to blame* has been universally adopted by editors. Yet the locution (adv. + adj.) was common in the Jacobean period (it appears four times in the first act of Middleton's *Women Beware Women;* cf. Webster's *The White Devil* 5.3.85). George Walton Williams' note on *The Changeling* 2.2.41 makes such usages misconstruings of the dative infinitive;[19] but this, nevertheless, may well be what Shakespeare wrote in *JC* 1118. We may compare the Folio reading at *Tim.* TLN 369; there the grammatical and logical context makes it apparent that the reading *too blame* is authorial, not compositorial. Arthur Humphreys' note in OXF4 accepts the tradition, but this time not its silence: "the metre needs a light stress, and Caesar has no cause to emphasize his fault, if any."

1286 *Speake hands for me.* All editors from Capell to the early twentieth century punctuated this phrase to make *hands* vocative, and several recent editions, including BEV and OXF4, follow the tradition—BEV without comment, and OXF4 writing a note that does not recognize what I take to be the grammar of F1—a third person imperative of the kind Caesar employs a moment later in his dying words, *then fall Caesar* (1288). BEV and OXF4 punctuate 1288 also as a vocative locution, following a tradition that originates in Q1691 and was nearly universal from BLAIR (1753) to RIDLEY (1935).[20] Yet BEV and OXF4 both decline to insert vocative punctuation in TLN 896 *(I should not know you Brutus),* OXF4 opining in a commentary note that a comma, in the tradition from late seven-

The list of disambiguations in *Julius Caesar* could be extended somewhat, but little would be gained, since the instances discussed here are sufficient evidence that there is work to do on the text of this play that has never been undertaken. Richard Proudfoot has spoken well to the underlying issue:

> the current state of editing is one in which there is some risk of loss of editorial responsibility and alertness . . . it can never be assumed that an unthinking conservatism is the right editorial position, nor even a particularly safe one. . . . It falls short of paying the authors of plays the compliment of assuming that they knew their own language and their chosen profession. . . .[24]

Thinking conservatism may be implied in taking one's editorial responsibility toward copy-text ambiguities seriously—it is notable that in six of the thirteen readings listed in the table on p. 000 one option is the return for the first time to a Folio reading. Arising from Proudfoot's advice about responsibility and alertness is a commendable policy articulated for the Oxford Shakespeare by Stanley Wells: "my colleagues and I have had new thoughts about some of the recognized cruces, and have raised questions about certain readings that have not been previously doubted."[25] In "certain readings" as noted in this article, OXF4 *JC* has indeed taken a new look at what others have always ignored. But it is noteworthy that in the great majority of the disambiguations discussed here, OXF4 is as docile and as silent as every other edition deriving from the first disambiguators. In ways and to extents that ought, perhaps, to give us pause, we editors are still in the tradition about which we have been from time to time so patronizing.

University of Texas, Austin

Notes

1. This article is a revision of a paper contributed to the seminar on Current Images of Shakespeare's Text at the International Shakespeare Congress, Berlin, April 1986; my colleagues in the seminar have contributed helpful suggestions toward the revision. Both the paper and the article I regard as extended footnotes to Marga Munkelt's more comprehensive study, "Disambiguation and Conjecture: Modes of Editorial Decision in Shakespeare's Early Plays," *AEB,* [Vol. date, pp.]. I wish to thank Dr. Munkelt for learned advice and to acknowledge also with thanks Dr. Mary Blockley's constructive criticism from a linguistic point of view.

2. In a letter to William Aldis Wright, written (8 May 1870) after the bulk of the work had been done for his first New Variorum volume, H. H. Furness showed that he understood the practice thoroughly: "I find that I can *lump* many of them. E.g. Harness, Singer (Ed. 1), Campbell, Cornwall, Hazlitt & Hudson ↑ almost ↓ implicitly followed the Variorum of '21, Verplanck follows Collier (Ed. 1), Clarke follows Dyce (ed. 1). I think from internal evidence that you used Dyce (ed. 1) to print [CAMBRIDGE1 (1865)] from. Am I right? And I think that he used Capell in the same way." (Trinity Coll. Cambr. Add. MS. b. 59.[15]—[one accidental silently altered for clarity]).

3. Though he does not deal directly with disambiguation, Greg is emphatic (following McKerrow's *Prolegomena to the Oxford Shakespeare*) about the editor's obligation "to select as the basis of his own edition (as his copy-text, that is) the most 'authoritative' of the early prints. . . . *"The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare* (1942), 3rd edn. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954), Rule 2, p. xii. Cf. John Crow, "Editing and Emending," *Essays and Studies* n.s. 8 (1955), 1-20 (pp. 1-3 esp.); F. P. Wilson, "Principles of Textual Criticism," *Shakespeare and the New Bibliography* (1945, revised 1948), ed. Helen Gardner (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970), pp. 96-123.

4. "Modernizing Shakespeare's Spelling," in Wells and Gary Taylor, *Modernizing Shakespeare's Spelling with Three Studies in the Text of HENRY V* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), pp. 1-36 (p. 33).

5. I first sketched the misleading practices of modern editorial disambiguation in my 1971 review of Maurice Charney's Bobbs-Merrill edn. of *JC, Shakespeare Quarterly* 22 (1971), 73-4.

6. "Established Texts and Definitive Editions," *Philological Quarterly* 41 (1962), 1-17 (p. 10n).

7. *The Stability of Shakespeare's Text* (London: Arnold, 1965), pp. 1-3; cf. Bowers, p. 1.

8. Honigmann traces the fallacy of the one true Shakespeare text to eighteenth-century practice, itself modelled on the contemporary treatment of classical texts (p. 1; cf McKerrow, as discussed by Wilson, op. cit., pp. 97-8; and cf. Bowers, op. cit. pp. 1-2). Honigmann and Bowers, it should be observed, are not concerned with ambiguous locutions in a single text, but with multiple texts of the same work. It may be guessed, however, that *(mutatis mutandis)* they would accept the analogy between the fallacy of the true text and the fallacy of disambiguation. Both fallacies, significantly, surface for the first time in the eighteenth century.

9. I acknowledge a degree of responsibility for what appears in BEV *JC,* as I was advisory editor for the play in BEV.

10. Ed. *JC* (1960) in *The Complete Pelican Shakespeare* (1969).

11. Hardin Craig, on the other hand, in an article on Pompeius Magnus in the English Renaissance, takes the traditional view that *Pompeyes blood* means Pompey's sons, Gnaeus and Sextus; see "The Shadow of Pompey the Great," *Topic: A Journal of the Liberal Arts* (Washington and Jefferson College) No. 7 [i.e., Vol. 4] (1964), 5-11 (p. 7).

12. This disambiguation, like those to be discussed at TLN 746 and 2064, was briefly commented on in the review of Charney—see note 5 above.

13. Private communication from Mary Blockley.

14. In a number of the *JC* readings dealt with here, literary evidence could be mustered for both sides of the debate if it were to be held. Marga Munkelt (see note 1 above) has commented on some similar cases from early in the Shakespeare canon. Marvin Spevack discusses desiderata for editorial commentary analogous to my desiderata. See "Shakespeare Synchronic and Diachronic: Annotating Elizabethan Texts." *Festscrift für* Karl Schneider zum 70. Geburtstag am 18 April 1982, ed. Ernst S. Dick and Kurt R. Jankowsky (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1982): pp. 441-53.

15. On the other hand, Barry Gaines has courageously pointed out that "too often preferred substantive readings are present in uncorrected states and garbled when changes are made by correcting compositors." See "Textual Apparatus—Rationale and Audience." *Play-Texts in Old Spelling: Papers from the Glendon Conference,* ed. G. B. Shand with Raymond C. Shady (New York: AMS Press, 1984), pp. 65-71 (67). Cf. Robert Kean Turner, "Accidental Evils," ibid., pp. 27-33: "one profits by coming at a text as the compositors did" (p. 32).

16. *The English of Shakespeare; Illustrated in a Philological Commentary on his JULIUS CAESAR* (1857), ed. from 3rd edn. by W. J. Rolfe (Boston: Ginn, 1871), p. 159.

17. Geoffrey Bullough, ed. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare,* Vol. 5: *The Roman Plays* (London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul and Columbia Univ. Press, 1964), p. 95. An allusion in Julius Caesar's *De Bello Civili* (which Shakespeare quite probably knew) makes it seem that only the Praetor Urbanus used this seat: "tribunal suum iuxta praetoris urbani sellam collocavit" (III.20).

18. It was the competition for the post between Brutus and Cassius that caused the coolness between them which Cassius had to overcome in order to get Brutus into the conspiracy. Caesar had awarded the post to Brutus, though as he recognized, Cassius had the better claim to it. Shakespeare suppressed this set of facts as part of a systematic suppression of details about Brutus' relation to Caesar that would make Brutus look ungrateful in the assassination.

19. Lincoln Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1966, Appendix A, p. 102.

20. In my judgment ". . . it is entirely characteristic that [Caesar] should die with an imperative on his lips.. . . . This last imperative is directed inward, but the dying voice is recognizably the voice Caesar has lived by" (e.g., the first six sentences Caesar speaks in the play are all imperatives and of the first 18 sentences he speaks, eleven are imperatives). See "*Orator* and

Imperator in *Julius Caesar:* Style and the Process of History," *Shakespeare Studies* 15 (1982), 55-75 (pp. 67, 65).

21. Ibid., p. 67.

22. Bullough, p. 90.

23. Richmond Noble is, so far as I know, the only scholar to notice that the Geneva Bible is the source for this passage. See *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer as Exemplified in the Plays of the First Folio* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1935), p. 191. The Bishops' Bible and the Douay-Rheims are less close to TLN 2064, the former reading *frailenesse* for *infirmities* and the latter reading *susteine* for *beare.* Noble was able to show (ibid., pp. 65-7) that the Geneva was Shakespeare's preferred Bible at the time of writing *JC.* Noble, however, shows no interest in the textual question in TLN 2064.

24. "Dramatic Manuscripts and the Editor," *Editing Renaissance Dramatic Texts* . . . Eleventh Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, Univ. of Toronto (1975), ed. Anne Lancashire (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1976), as quoted in Stanley Wells, *Re-Editing Shakespeare for the Modern Reader,* Oxford Shakespeare Studies (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), p. 32.

25. Wells, *Re-Editing,* p. 33.