

**VERBAL POWER DUEL: VERBAL COMBAT STRATEGIES  
IN SHAKESPEARE'S *JULIUS CAESAR*:  
BRUTUS VERSUS ANTONY**

AYDIN BEHNAM  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
aydinbehnam@yahoo.com

**Abstract.** In *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*, Jeremy Hawthorn refers to Cultural Materialism as an "umbrella term" that allows itself the opulence to utilise a wide range of tools and theories from many different disciplines. This allows us to justify the nature of both commonly acknowledged and abstruse socio-cultural episteme and discourse, one of the most prominent of which is the issue of power and power relations.

This paper, which was originally part of a larger body of work on Cultural Materialism, tries to draw upon a few different theories to examine the confrontational relationship that exists between the two prominent characters of Shakespeare's (1953) *Julius Caesar* (namely Antony and Brutus), as represented by the duel-like orations of the two characters. The main goal of the paper is to demonstrate how Antony is able to manipulate the words of Brutus against him and thus succeed in captivating the crowd.

The theoretical discussions drawn upon in this article will include Austin's (1999) ideas on language as action, Bourdieu's (1999) argument of dialogue as contest and Hutchby's (1999) findings on turn-taking strategies. This paper will also incorporate Paul Grice's Cooperative Principle, introduced in his "Logic and Conversation" (1999). This principle argues that the flouting of any of Grice's four maxims by the characters is meaningful and effective because it introduces an "implicature" in the political and social context in which the pieces of discourse take place.

**Keywords and phrases:** Cooperative Principle, Language and Power, Oration, H.P. Grice

**INTRODUCTION**

As Foucault has said, discourse is a vehicle for power (Burns 1994). Power does not necessarily manifest itself in the form of political dictatorship or violence, as it can exist in all spheres of daily life as well. However, even Foucault himself

could not list all the constituents of what he termed "discourse". Nevertheless, what is clear and what has been clearly stated is that the institutions in a society are important parts of the prevalent discourse in society (Burns 1994). These institutions utilise the tools at their disposal (be they images, words, merchandise, money, art, music etc.) to turn their discourse into social "common sense" (Fairclough 1989). Newspapers, magazines, television, radio stations, books etc. all need to use language in order to communicate their discourse to their public. Therefore, it is clear that in order for the holders of power (or for discourse) to exercise power and control over the "people", language is *not* to be ignored.

There have undoubtedly been many cases of research or thought into the nature of language, and there have been attempts to demonstrate how language is shaped into a tool for control of power. This has been true from the time of classics like Plato and Aristotle, through to Nietzsche (1998), who asserts in *The Will to Power* that the members of society have to obey the laws of the flock, and by doing so their pride shatters and language is used to hide that loss of pride. This continues up to well-known contemporaries like Fairclough (2003), who adds some spice to his analyses with his (as he confesses) socialist/capitalist tendencies. He believes that social practices gradually sieve through into discourse and help formulate and shape it. In the same way, discourse induces certain social beliefs and consequently leads to discursively shaped actions.

What makes the issue of language important to this paper is knowing that language is one of the most influential tools in this mutual relationship between discourse and society. And when one studies the discourse of power, language will no doubt be the centre of attention. The holders of power are those who know how to manipulate it, and when language is one of the tools of a power feud, those who can manipulate it will be the victors. This is exactly what this paper will focus on: a duel of words in the form of orations where one party (Brutus) tries to use language to justify a political coup, and the other part (Antony) strives to stir the crowd into a mutiny.

One point must be made clear before further discussion begins. Throughout this paper, one important question may arise: why are some of the ideas stated by the author related to communication or dialogue while the topic seems to centre around *language* as a whole? Is this paper claiming to analyse language or dialogue? Is language the same as dialogue? To prevent such misunderstandings, the researcher would like to draw on Bakhtin's notion of Dialogism. Kershner (2001: 22) states that Bakhtin uses the term "heteroglossia" to refer to the fact that speech insofar as it is embodied in a particular situation is "always multiple and is always a mixture of languages". He also points out that "language is always double voiced, embodying both the language of the speaker [...] and any immediate or anticipated addressee". Every utterance is aimed at someone. It is a

response to some other utterance and anticipates a response. Thus, it may be concluded that in any instance of language usage, a sentence uttered in a certain context or even an oration (which in fact has been mentioned by Bakhtin) may be seen and analysed not as merely a long disjointed passage for its own sake, but as a dialogue. Thus, when a sentence is analysed on its own one may consider the context, the amalgam out of which the sentence arises - namely the mind of the speaker (which is a warehouse of previous memories, feelings, beliefs etc.) - and the addressee(s) or the anticipated addressee(s) of the sentence.

### **LANGUAGE, ACTION AND VALUE**

Bourdieu (1999) believes that language (or dialogue between two people) is not merely a simple conversation but a contest. He argues that conversation is seldom carried out for mere communication and that speakers on both sides of the conversation are in pursuit of symbolic profit. He is not alone in thinking so. Austin (1999) states that "...the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action - it is not normally thought of as just saying something" (65). To Bourdieu (1999), utterances possess value. The value of the utterances of any one of the speakers in a dialogue depends on the relation of power established between the speakers. In a conversation, both sides try to increase the value of their words or utterances by dwelling on their linguistic competence. In the long run, however, the value of the words in this market of utterances is defined by a complex mixture of all the variables related to the speakers, the groups that speak, the competence of the speakers, the social structure and the shared background of the interlocutors.

Bourdieu (1999) points out a detail in his statements that further demonstrates how problematic it can be to face the issues of language with an objective, "scientific" approach. He claims that maximisation of the symbolic profit people gain in a conversation does not take place by calculation, but by expectation. By this he means that the listeners (including the interlocutors themselves) will have an expectation of the impact of the sentences uttered in a certain context and in certain circumstances. They will also have expectations about the effect that the sentences uttered may or may not have on the dialogic "opponent". What is expected of the speaker's potential linguistic and even meta-linguistic (to use Bakhtin's words) competence is a part of what determines whether someone's words will be deemed acceptably trenchant by other members of this particular society (Bourdieu 1999).

Going deeper into the issue of power control in language, Hutchby's (1999) "Power in Discourse: The Case of Arguments on a British Talk Radio Show", puts the power strategies employed by the speakers on some radio talk shows

under the microscope. In such shows where the main aim of the caller is to start and pursue a discussion on a chosen topic, the presenter and the caller become entangled in a wrestle for control over the conversation. In Hutchby's (1999) opinion, turn-taking in such cases is a significant power-handling strategy with which the speakers grasp the situation and hold power. In his analyses of recorded tapes he found that, in a debate, the one who starts the conversation or gives an opinion is more susceptible to attacks from the opposite side, whereas the person who waits for the other side to speak is usually more successful in turning the conversation in his/her own favour. This is because he/she will be sitting in the safety of his/her shelter of silence and will be able to contemplate how to oppose the facts or opinions being stated by the opponent. However, even if the speaker makes the mistake of providing his/her opponent in dialogue with an Achilles heel, there are still ways to compensate and regain power in a dialogue.

Even if a speaker initially loses his/her control by starting the debate, he/she may gain it back by inviting the opponent to give his/her opinion on the matter. He/she can pose an unexpected question in the midst of the debate and thus invite the other speaker to issue an opinion.

It is also interesting to note that in the concluding pages of his paper, Hutchby (1999) highlights connections between his study and the Foucauldian concept of power. He finds manifestations of two of Foucault's most important ideas on power: first, that discursive power exists in all layers of social life, from the mundane to the highly elite politics, and second that wherever there is authoritative power, there is always some type of resistance against that power that tries to challenge it. This is what New Historicists call "subversion" and the Cultural Materialists refer to as "dissidence". Hutchby (1999) believes that his paper is proof enough that Foucault's ideas were at least proven to be correct in his study. The two points he proves with his article are the following. First, power does not have to be on a large scale. It does not have to be exercised on a national or worldwide scale to be considered "power" proper, and it does not have to be imposed with force by a certain group in order for it to be effective. It can exist among everyday people in the most trivial aspects of everyday life (such as the conversation between two normal people on the radio or a chat with your friend at the marketplace). The second position is that power begets resistance. It is somewhat vague where this resistance comes from, but the paradoxical fact is that in order for power to exist and have meaning, resistance must also be present. In fact, not only does resistance often not weaken power, but it also strengthens the grip of power and justifies its presence (Burns 1994).

## GRICE AND THE COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE

One other useful work is Grice's (1999) paper on the four maxims at work in any sound conversation. The group of maxims needed for a smooth conversation to start and continue is called the "Cooperative Principle". These maxims are basically the principles the participants in a conversation are expected to observe if they intend the conversation to run smoothly and continue without flaw or failure. The maxims are as follows:

1. Quantity
2. Quality
3. Relation
4. Manner

**Quantity** means that you are supposed to say what you are supposed to say, no more and no less. If you continue and go on *over*-explaining the topics you intend to address, the addressee will sense the unnecessarily high quantity of verbal contribution to the dialogue. Therefore, you should make sure your contribution is as informative as possible and without making your contribution more informative than required.

**Quality** means that one is to say what one believes to be true. If the speaker intends the addressee to accept what he/she is saying, it would be wise to choose an appropriate method of expression—one that would indicate what he/she is saying contains nothing that is contrary to fact. Also, do not say something for which you lack adequate evidence. Quite simply, do not lie and if you do, do not lie in a way that can be sensed by the other person. Otherwise, the course of the conversation will cease to go as you intended.

**Relation** means that what the speaker says must be related to the topic of discussion. In simpler terms, one is not supposed to beat around the bush. The speaker is expected to stay attached to the topic in question and say only what will contribute to the eventual conclusion of the dialogue (if it is to occur).

**Manner** means one is to avoid obscurity or an unusual degree of ambiguity by being brief and orderly. Simply put, the speaker must not drag the conversation into boredom in any way. He/she must be organised in his/her thoughts and utterances in order to be successful in reaching this goal (i.e., in giving maximum value to his words by way of proving his competence).

Having elaborated on the above "maxims" for a successful dialogue, it must be noted that there is always a possibility that one or both of the parties in a

conversation might not keep with these rules. If such a possibility exists, what could be the reason for this breach of conversational rules? One possibility is that the speaker does not have the linguistic competence to continue the conversation in a healthy manner. The other reason may be that one of the parties does not wish to continue and so he/she deliberately stops the conversation either by stating that he/she wishes to discontinue or by deliberately faltering in one of the foretasted maxims and waiting for the conversation to die out. The important case is when both sides are aware that their opponent is aware of these maxims (unconsciously of course) and also has the linguistic competence to carry out a conversation. The difficulty arises when, under these circumstances, there is still a problem keeping in line with one or more maxims. An example may be that during a conversation between two mature adults, one of the adults fails to obey the maxim of quality by way of irony or metaphor. The other party may then conclude that there is no linguistic incompetence, but rather "implicature" (83), a situation in which one tries to imply something without explicitly stating it. Wherever one, some or all of the maxims are breached in any way and where there is no problem in the linguistic competence of the two sides, it may be concluded that the speaker intends to make an implicature and/or condense his/her intended meaning by stating it implicitly. An implicature is an attempt on the part of the speaker to imply a hidden meaning; these implications may be in the form of speaking ironically or sarcastically or hinting at an important issue that has been overlooked. In this context of power relations, however, the reason a speaker may resort to implicature is the fear of authority. Implicature can act as a self-censoring mechanism to protect the speaker against the consequences of an otherwise directly stated attack, criticism or sacrilege.

In Shakespeare's (1953) *Julius Caesar*, there is a scene in which Brutus (one of the conspirators against Caesar) and Antony (a friend to Caesar) engage in a verbal battle to win the crowd. Parts of their orations were re-read in an attempt to uncover the relations of power and to spot the manifestations of these power struggles in the language and linguistic strategies of the orators.

## **WAR OF THE WORDS: ANALYSIS**

In an attempt to go through the play to look at its language, a combination of the theories described above will be applied for an analysis of a sample text.

There is a potential question that could come to the reader's mind: which part of the play should one choose to scrutinise, or why has this particular section of the play – the oration of Antony – been chosen for a reading? Because of the nature of theories discussed in this paper and the fact that they are mainly based on the fact that language can be a tool for power control, there seems to be one instance

in this play, among others, that brings out the challenging and power-related quality of language (Act III, Scene 2). In this act, Brutus and Antony take turns addressing the public after Caesar's assassination. Even Shakespeare indicated that his characters and possibly he himself make connections between "words" and "blows" or "words" and "stroke[s]" (Act V, Sc 1), where the two parties speak before battle and try to show their understanding of the "sting" of Antony the Orator.

In the speeches of Brutus and Antony, the characters both have a chance to express their ideas and opinions. However, it can hardly be said that they have an *equal* chance of expressing themselves freely, for Brutus is on a point of power and Antony has only been given permission by Brutus, which at first seems to put Antony in a weaker and more vulnerable position.

### **BEFORE THE VERBAL DUEL**

The first point, regardless of the words these men speak, is the order of appearance. Brutus speaks first to give his reasons as to why he and his accomplices murdered Caesar and to prepare people for any dangerous statements Antony might make. He no doubt believes that his appearance prior to Antony's speech would vaccinate the public ear and make them deaf to his rival's words. However, what he does not know is the fact that in such a situation, where each speech is more a part of an interrelated, conversational, dialogical debate than a single, separate unit, as Hutchby (1999) states, there are techniques and rules at play that will eventually jeopardise his plans. As mentioned before, Hutchby (1999) believes that in a debate or an argument, the side that starts the act of speech is the one more prone to attack and criticism. Therefore, Brutus places himself at risk by approaching the public first. It is as if he places his cards on the table first. There is no turning back once he descends the pulpit; he has nothing else to offer. Antony is free to dismantle what Brutus built on the pulpit and build his own case, which is exactly what Antony does. In fact, the beauty and eloquence of his speech rely on this very fact. Antony has two famous and well-known cases of verbal weaponry (in the form of refrains) that he uses abundantly in his speech. One is the poetic refrain saying that Brutus is an "honourable man", and the other is the repetition of Brutus' slander that Caesar was "ambitious". What is fascinating is that he has taken both of these words from Brutus's speech. Brutus uses the words "ambitious" (36)<sup>1</sup> and "ambition" (39) to refer to Caesar. He also uses the word "honour" several times (fifteen to be exact) in an attempt to increase the value of his word in this market of words (as Bourdieu said) by pointing to his honour and the reputation he has among the

---

<sup>1</sup> Refer to Appendix 1 for all line numbers.

people. He is unaware that Antony will use these words against him. Antony has little to offer of himself; all he does is to react to what Brutus says, manipulate his words and play with the crowd's emotions.

### **THE DUEL BEGINS**

Antony starts his speech by getting help from his opponent's speech. In Act III, Scene 2, Brutus tells the people that Antony's intention in speaking will be to mourn, honour and glorify Caesar, and what Antony says in some of the beginning sentences of his oration is that he comes "to bury Caesar, not to praise him" (118). This serves as a resistance tactic against Brutus and the choice of his words. Antony tries to mock Brutus' words. He repeats those words, making them the object of the crowd's attention and opening them up for possible public scorn. Antony could also be implying that he is not there to honour or glorify Caesar because there is no need for Caesar to be honoured, for everyone knows that he is worthy of honour and glory.

In addition, the word "bury" is used by Antony (118) to reduce the occasion to a very catastrophic one in which a man like Caesar cannot even have an appropriate ceremony or a funeral. He is merely to be "buried". This may serve as an initial invitation to sympathy.

If one is even more precise, it is easy to see that the opening lines of both speakers have the same structure. Both lines start by addressing the crowd with three endearing terms. The very fact that Antony uses the exact same (parallel) structure to open his speech could be an indication of his resistance against the power holder. He seems to be demonstrating that he can speak in the same way as Brutus and yet emerge as the winner. On the other hand, he could merely be parodying Brutus's sentence structure by parrot-like repetition. Their beginning words are as follows.

Brutus starts out with "Romans, countrymen and lovers" (22). Antony begins with "Friends, Romans, and countrymen" (117). The words seem very similar with slight changes in order. Two of the three words in both cases – "Romans" and "countrymen"—appeal to the nationalist sentiments and to personal emotions, i.e. "lovers" and "friends". Brutus' words may seem stronger because the word "love" might be seen as a stronger emotion compared with friendship, but the fact is that according to the notes of the play itself, the word "lover" is not the same as the romantic love between two people who have a strong emotion or passion towards each other. It may simply mean "the people who like me" or "the people who are my friends", which merely goes to show how much more vain Brutus has made himself seem compared to Antony. Hence, if the two words

"lovers" and "friends" are to be considered more or less synonymous, the only difference is in the order of the three words mentioned above. Antony chooses to speak to people's emotions first by calling the Romans "friends", but Brutus, being the more logical one, prefers to keep the emotion-conveying word – "lovers" – to the end. Vickers (1980) believes that Brutus' mistake is in appealing to the people's logic – a crowd of people who have neither the readiness nor the understanding for logical explanations at this turbulent time. He believes that at that certain instant, the people were in need of emotional justifications for the next step they should take. With his sharp wit, Antony satisfies this need by addressing the people as "friends". He also gets them to sympathise with him throughout the speech. His speech turns into a ritual ceremony with the people circling around him, and he finally wins people's hearts. Brutus, meanwhile, intended to win people's minds from the pulpit, keeping his distance from the common folk. There is also additional evidence that demonstrates that Brutus was trying to make contact with people's logic, while Antony attempted to connect with their emotions.

Brutus asks people to hear him for his "cause" (23) – to be the "judge" (26) of what is true and what is not. A judge must reason to be able to see what is right and what is wrong, but the people are incapable of reasoning at that particular moment.

Another significant issue is the tone of the speakers. Brutus tends to utilise imperative verbs that address the people directly and hold them responsible for the comprehension of the speech, while Antony tries to use the word "I" in his speech to create more of a soliloquy that does not hold anyone responsible. He tries to conceal the fact that he expects the people to react to his words.

The way the two rival orators ask people to listen is of importance as well. Brutus asks people to "hear" him and to "be silent" (23), and Antony asks the crowd to "lend me your ears" (117). Although in meaning both orators are basically asking the people to listen to them, the nature of their diction reveals many things. First of all, Antony is careful not to sound like a dictator as he gives the people a choice (or appears as if he were giving people a choice). This is effective because he wants to avoid sounding like dictator (i.e., Caesar). Therefore, he uses the word "lend". This word, in essence, contains the element of choice. One has the choice to lend something to someone whereas one would "hear" a sound or a voice whether he wanted to or not. If Brutus had used the word "listen", it would have at least been more "democratic", for one chooses to listen. Instead, Brutus seems to be saying that you will hear me whether you want to or not. This puts him in a weaker position. What is more, he adds to the dictator-like tone by asking people to "be silent". Afterwards, he continues with other imperative verbs such as "believe me", "have respect", "censure me" and "awake".

Adding to his pattern of speech, Brutus uses a very coercive technique to wring from the crowd the answer he is looking for and the approval he seeks. He says:

Who is here so base that would be a bondman? If any, speak, for him have I offended. Who is here so rude that would not be a Roman? If any, speak; for him have I offended. Who is here so vile that will not love his country? If any, speak, for him have I offended (40).

In asking the crowd whether a person with such qualities exists among the people, he wisely places three adjectives ("base", "rude" and "vile") in the sentences in order to achieve another effect. His aim is to create a situation in which someone in the crowd who is brave enough to accept that he is a "bondman", a non-Roman or that he is not in love with Rome, will automatically have accepted the double shame of being "base", "rude" and "vile".

Going back to the point where Antony draws the words "honourable" and "ambitious" out of Brutus's speech and uses them against him, it is striking to see the number of times Antony uses the word "honourable" to refer to Brutus and all the conspirators. He uses it nine times. The high frequency of the usage of the word is a breach of the maxim of Quantity proposed by Grice (1999). This breaking of the rule, as stated before, results in implicature, meaning that the people in the crowd will realise that Antony is trying to imply something. His hidden irony reinforces the fact that Brutus may not be such an honourable man in Antony's eyes after all. The same is applicable for the word ambitious, which is repeated six times in his speech. He gives reasons as to why Caesar was generous and then he claims that because Brutus believes Caesar to be ambitious then it must be so. This too is a definite breach of the maxim of Quantity. Furthermore, this frequent breach of the maxim of Quantity eventually leads to the breaking of another maxim and, as a result, another implication is felt. When one increases the quantity of the repetition of a word above normal and creates doubts in the listeners' minds, people start to doubt the truth of the things and thus the Quality falls under question. In other words, the listeners no longer believe the honour of Brutus to be a fact. If the speaker does not believe in Brutus's honour but keeps saying it and keeps lying (and implies to everyone that he is lying), one starts to wonder and doubt the truth of the fact under discussion, hence the breach of the maxim of Quality.

Any ambiguities or obscurities used in the speeches of the two orators would mean a breach of the maxim of Manner. This point is demonstrated in the beginning of Antony's speech where in a famous sentence he says, "for Brutus' sake I am beholding to you" (96). This sentence seems to be an honouring of Brutus at first, but on closer inspection it becomes clear that he may not be

thanking Brutus at all. He may be saying firstly that Brutus is the reason why he (Antony) has to get permission to speak in public. Brutus is the one who has debased him so. Also, he implies that Brutus may be degrading the people as well. He might be trying to imply that the masses are low and base and it is only for Brutus's sake and for his name's sake that he has debased himself to the point of addressing the public.

It also seems that Antony anticipates what the conspirators or the people will be thinking of him and his words. By giving voice to the thoughts in people's minds, he eliminates any chance of a future disagreement with his words and ideas. For example in Act III, Scene 2, he says: "I speak not to disprove what Brutus spoke..." (144). In other cases, as in line 299, he claims that he is no orator like Brutus, and that he does not intend to make people rise into mutiny (whereas that is his exact intention). He proves that he is an eloquent, intelligent speaker.

## CONCLUSION

This is merely a brief look at some oratorical tactics and techniques and how they contribute to the war of words. One may conclude that the seemingly separate and at times monologue-like orations of both Brutus and Antony (indeed Antony more than Brutus) are not only words uttered in an attempt to show inner emotions, but are of a somewhat different nature. The orations seem to be attacks and counter-attacks, so to speak. They are palpable conversations that are devised cunningly to control the logic (in the case of Brutus) and the emotions (in the case of Antony) of the people who are only tools in their political game.

This brief analysis of the utterances of only two of the characters in the play demonstrates how revealing such an analysis could be if one were to apply this to the rest of the play. It is almost like a mathematical proof for the victory or failure of two people who are to have a verbal duel for control. By taking into account the parameters related to the particular condition, one would be able to predict who might win the duel. Such analysis would allow one to explain and prove with tangible facts why one person is victorious and the other is defeated.

## REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. 1999. How to do things with words. In *The Discourse Reader*, edited by Jaworski and Coupland, 63–75. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. 1999. Language and symbolic power. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. In *The Discourse Reader*, edited by Jaworski and Coupland, 502–513. London and New York: Routledge.

- Burns, E. 1994. *Michael Foucault*. Trans. Babak Ahmadi. Tehran: Kahkeshan.
- Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. Critical discourse analysis in researching language in the new capitalism: Overdetermination, transdisciplinary and textual analysis. In Young, L. *Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis*. Continuum: London. <http://www.ling.lanc.ac.uk/groups/clsl/home.html> (accessed December 2003).
- Grice, H. P. 1999. Logic and conversation, edited by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan. In *Syntax and semantics: Speech arts*. Vol. 3. New York: Academic Press. Reprinted in *The Discourse Reader*, edited by Jaworski and Coupland, 41–58. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hawthorn, J. 1992. *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*. New York: Edward Arnold.
- Hutchby, I. 1999. Power in discourse: The case of arguments on a British talk radio show. In *The Discourse Reader*, edited by Jaworski and Coupland, 481–489. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kershner, B. 2001. Mikhail Bakhtin and Bakhtinian criticism. Notes towards a reading of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. In *Introducing Literary Theories: A Guide and Glossary*, edited by Wolfreys, 19–31. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. W. 1998. *The Will to Power*. Trans. Rowya Monajjem. Tehran: Mes.
- Shakespeare, W. 1953. *Julius Caesar*. London: Macmillan.
- Vickers, B. 1980. On Julius Caesar. *The Critical Heritage*, edited by Vickers. 6, 500–505. London & New York: Routledge.

**APPENDIX 1*****Julius Caesar*****Act 3. Scene II**

Enter BRUTUS and CASSIUS, and a throng of Citizens  
Citizens

We will be satisfied; let us be satisfied. 1

BRUTUS

Then follow me, and give me audience, friends. 5

Cassius, go you into the other street,

And part the numbers.

Those that will hear me speak, let 'em stay here;

Those that will follow Cassius, go with him;

And public reasons shall be rendered 10

Of Caesar's death.

First Citizen

I will hear Brutus speak.

Second Citizen

I will hear Cassius; and compare their reasons, 15

When severally we hear them rendered.

Exit CASSIUS, with some of the Citizens. BRUTUS goes into the pulpit

Third Citizen

The noble Brutus is ascended: silence!

BRUTUS 20

Be patient till the last.

Romans, countrymen, and lovers! hear me for my

cause, and be silent, that you may hear: believe me

for mine honour, and have respect to mine honour, that

you may believe: censure me in your wisdom, and 25

awake your senses, that you may the better judge.

If there be any in this assembly, any dear friend of

Caesar's, to him I say, that Brutus' love to Caesar

was no less than his. If then that friend demand

why Brutus rose against Caesar, this is my answer: 30

–Not that I loved Caesar less, but that I loved

Rome more. Had you rather Caesar were living and

die all slaves, than that Caesar were dead, to live

all free men? As Caesar loved me, I weep for him;

as he was fortunate, I rejoice at it; as he was

valiant, I honour him: but, as he was ambitious, I 35

slew him. There is tears for his love; joy for his  
 fortune; honour for his valour; and death for his  
 ambition. Who is here so base that would be a  
 bondman? If any, speak; for him have I offended. 40  
 Who is here so rude that would not be a Roman? If  
 any, speak; for him have I offended. Who is here so  
 vile that will not love his country? If any, speak;  
 for him have I offended. I pause for a reply.

All 45  
 None, Brutus, none.

BRUTUS  
 Then none have I offended. I have done no more to  
 Caesar than you shall do to Brutus. The question of  
 his death is enrolled in the Capitol; his glory not 50  
 extenuated, wherein he was worthy, nor his offences  
 enforced, for which he suffered death.

Enter ANTONY and others, with CAESAR's body

Here comes his body, mourned by Mark Antony: who,  
 though he had no hand in his death, shall receive  
 the benefit of his dying, a place in the 55  
 commonwealth; as which of you shall not? With this  
 I depart,--that, as I slew my best lover for the  
 good of Rome, I have the same dagger for myself,  
 when it shall please my country to need my death. 60

All  
 Live, Brutus! live, live!

First Citizen  
 Bring him with triumph home unto his house.

Second Citizen  
 Give him a statue with his ancestors. 65

Third Citizen  
 Let him be Caesar.

Fourth Citizen  
 Caesar's better parts 70  
 Shall be crown'd in Brutus.

First Citizen  
 We'll bring him to his house  
 With shouts and clamours.

BRUTUS  
 My countrymen, –

75

Second Citizen  
 Peace, silence! Brutus speaks.

First Citizen  
 Peace, ho!

80

BRUTUS  
 Good countrymen, let me depart alone,  
 And, for my sake, stay here with Antony:  
 Do grace to Caesar's corpse, and grace his speech  
 Tending to Caesar's glories; which Mark Antony,  
 By our permission, is allow'd to make.  
 I do entreat you, not a man depart,  
 Save I alone, till Antony have spoke.

85

Exit

First Citizen  
 Stay, ho! and let us hear Mark Antony.

90

Third Citizen  
 Let him go up into the public chair;  
 We'll hear him. Noble Antony, go up.

ANTONY  
 For Brutus' sake, I am beholding to you.

95

*Goes into the pulpit*

Fourth Citizen  
 What does he say of Brutus?

Third Citizen  
 He says, for Brutus' sake,  
 He finds himself beholding to us all.

100

Fourth Citizen  
 Twere best he speak no harm of Brutus here.

First Citizen This Caesar was a tyrant.	105
Third Citizen Nay, that's certain: We are blest that Rome is rid of him.	
Second Citizen Peace! let us hear what Antony can say.	110
ANTONY You gentle Romans, –	
Citizens Peace, ho! let us hear him.	115
ANTONY Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears; I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him. The evil that men do lives after them; The good is oft interred with their bones; So let it be with Caesar. The noble Brutus Hath told you Caesar was ambitious: If it were so, it was a grievous fault, And grievously hath Caesar answer'd it. Here, under leave of Brutus and the rest– For Brutus is an honourable man; So are they all, all honourable men– Come I to speak in Caesar's funeral. He was my friend, faithful and just to me: But Brutus says he was ambitious; And Brutus is an honourable man. He hath brought many captives home to Rome Whose ransoms did the general coffers fill:	125
Did this in Caesar seem ambitious? When that the poor have cried, Caesar hath wept: Ambition should be made of sterner stuff: Yet Brutus says he was ambitious; And Brutus is an honourable man.	130
You all did see that on the Lupercal I thrice presented him a kingly crown, Which he did thrice refuse: was this ambition? Yet Brutus says he was ambitious; And, sure, he is an honourable man.	140
I speak not to disprove what Brutus spoke, But here I am to speak what I do know.	145

You all did love him once, not without cause:  
 What cause withholds you then, to mourn for him?  
 O judgment! thou art fled to brutish beasts,  
 And men have lost their reason. Bear with me; 150  
 My heart is in the coffin there with Caesar,  
 And I must pause till it come back to me.

First Citizen  
 Methinks there is much reason in his sayings.

Second Citizen  
 If thou consider rightly of the matter, 155  
 Caesar has had great wrong.

Third Citizen  
 Has he, masters?  
 I fear there will a worse come in his place.

Fourth Citizen  
 Mark'd ye his words? He would not take the crown; 160  
 Therefore 'tis certain he was not ambitious.

First Citizen  
 If it be found so, some will dear abide it.

Second Citizen 165  
 Poor soul! his eyes are red as fire with weeping.

Third Citizen  
 There's not a nobler man in Rome than Antony.

Fourth Citizen 170  
 Now mark him, he begins again to speak.

ANTONY  
 But yesterday the word of Caesar might  
 Have stood against the world; now lies he there.  
 And none so poor to do him reverence. 175  
 O masters, if I were disposed to stir  
 Your hearts and minds to mutiny and rage,  
 I should do Brutus wrong, and Cassius wrong,  
 Who, you all know, are honourable men:  
 I will not do them wrong; I rather choose  
 To wrong the dead, to wrong myself and you, 180  
 Than I will wrong such honourable men.  
 But here's a parchment with the seal of Caesar;  
 I found it in his closet, 'tis his will:

Let but the commons hear this testament –  
 Which, pardon me, I do not mean to read – 185  
 And they would go and kiss dead Caesar's wounds  
 And dip their napkins in his sacred blood,  
 Yea, beg a hair of him for memory,  
 And, dying, mention it within their wills, 190  
 Bequeathing it as a rich legacy  
 Unto their issue.

Fourth Citizen  
 We'll hear the will: read it, Mark Antony.

All  
 The will, the will! we will hear Caesar's will. 195

ANTONY  
 Have patience, gentle friends, I must not read it;  
 It is not meet you know how Caesar loved you.  
 You are not wood, you are not stones, but men;  
 And, being men, bearing the will of Caesar, 200  
 It will inflame you, it will make you mad:  
 'Tis good you know not that you are his heirs;  
 For, if you should, O, what would come of it!

Fourth Citizen  
 Read the will; we'll hear it, Antony; 205  
 You shall read us the will, Caesar's will.

ANTONY  
 Will you be patient? will you stay awhile?  
 I have o'ershot myself to tell you of it: 210  
 I fear I wrong the honourable men  
 Whose daggers have stabb'd Caesar;  
 I do fear it. 2

Fourth Citizen  
 They were traitors: honourable men!

All  
 The will! the testament! 215

Second Citizen  
 They were villains, murderers: the will! read the will.

ANTONY

You will compel me, then, to read the will?  
Then make a ring about the corpse of Caesar, 220  
And let me show you him that made the will.  
Shall I descend? and will you give me leave?

Several Citizens Come down.

Second Citizen  
Descend. 225

Third Citizen You shall have leave.

ANTONY comes down

Fourth Citizen  
A ring; stand round. 230

First Citizen  
Stand from the hearse, stand from the body.

Second Citizen  
Room for Antony, most noble Antony. 235

ANTONY  
Nay, press not so upon me; stand far off.

Several Citizens  
Stand back; room; bear back.

ANTONY 240

If you have tears, prepare to shed them now.  
You all do know this mantle: I remember  
The first time ever Caesar put it on;  
'Twas on a summer's evening, in his tent,  
That day he overcame the Nervii: 245

Look, in this place ran Cassius' dagger through:  
See what a rent the envious Casca made:  
Through this the well-beloved Brutus stabb'd;  
And as he pluck'd his cursed steel away,  
Mark how the blood of Caesar follow'd it, 250

As rushing out of doors, to be resolved  
If Brutus so unkindly knock'd, or no;  
For Brutus, as you know, was Caesar's angel:  
Judge, O you gods, how dearly Caesar loved him!  
This was the most unkindest cut of all; 255

For when the noble Caesar saw him stab,

Ingratitude, more strong than traitors' arms,  
 Quite vanquish'd him: then burst his mighty heart;  
 And, in his mantle muffling up his face,  
 Even at the base of Pompey's statua, 260  
 Which all the while ran blood, great Caesar fell.  
 O, what a fall was there, my countrymen!  
 Then I, and you, and all of us fell down,  
 Whilst bloody treason flourish'd over us.  
 O, now you weep; and, I perceive, you feel 265  
 The dint of pity: these are gracious drops.  
 Kind souls, what, weep you when you but behold  
 Our Caesar's vesture wounded? Look you here,  
 Here is himself, marr'd, as you see, with traitors.

First Citizen 270  
 O piteous spectacle!

Second Citizen  
 O noble Caesar!

Third Citizen  
 O woful day! 275

Fourth Citizen  
 O traitors, villains!

First Citizen  
 O most bloody sight!

Second Citizen 280  
 We will be revenged.  
 All Revenge! About! Seek! Burn! Fire! Kill! Slay!  
 Let not a traitor live!

ANTONY 285  
 Stay, countrymen.

First Citizen  
 Peace there! hear the noble Antony.

Second Citizen 290  
 We'll hear him, we'll follow him, we'll die with him.

ANTONY  
 Good friends, sweet friends,  
 let me not stir you up To such a sudden flood of mutiny.  
 They that have done this deed are honourable:

What private griefs they have, alas, I know not, That made them do it: they are wise and honourable, And will, no doubt, with reasons answer you. I come not, friends, to steal away your hearts: I am no orator, as Brutus is;	295
But, as you know me all, a plain blunt man, That love my friend; and that they know full well That gave me public leave to speak of him: For I have neither wit, nor words, nor worth, Action, nor utterance, nor the power of speech,	300
To stir men's blood: I only speak right on; I tell you that which you yourselves do know; Show you sweet Caesar's wounds, poor poor dumb mouths, And bid them speak for me: but were I Brutus, And Brutus Antony, there were an Antony Would ruffle up your spirits and put a tongue	305
In every wound of Caesar that should move The stones of Rome to rise and mutiny.	310
All We'll mutiny.	
First Citizen We'll burn the house of Brutus.	315
Third Citizen Away, then! come, seek the conspirators.	
ANTONY Yet hear me, countrymen; yet hear me speak.	320
All Peace, ho! Hear Antony. Most noble Antony!	
ANTONY Why, friends, you go to do you know not what: Wherein hath Caesar thus deserved your loves? Alas, you know not: I must tell you then: You have forgot the will I told you of. All Most true. The will! Let's stay and hear the will.	325
ANTONY Here is the will, and under Caesar's seal. To every Roman citizen he gives, To every several man, seventy-five drachmas.	330

Second Citizen Most noble Caesar! We'll revenge his death.	335
Third Citizen O royal Caesar!	
ANTONY Hear me with patience.	
All Peace, ho!	340
ANTONY Moreover, he hath left you all his walks, His private arbours and new-planted orchards, On this side Tiber; he hath left them you, And to your heirs for ever, common pleasures, To walk abroad, and recreate yourselves. Here was a Caesar! when comes such another?	345
First Citizen Never, never. Come, away, away! We'll burn his body in the holy place, And with the brands fire the traitors' houses. Take up the body.	350
Second Citizen Go fetch fire.	355
Third Citizen Pluck down benches.	
Fourth Citizen Pluck down forms, windows, any thing.	
<i>Exeunt Citizens with the body</i>	360
ANTONY Now let it work. Mischief, thou art afoot, Take thou what course thou wilt!	
<i>Enter a Servant</i>	
How now, fellow!	365
Servant Sir, Octavius is already come to Rome.	

ANTONY  
Where is he?

Servant  
He and Lepidus are at Caesar's house. 370

ANTONY  
And thither will I straight to visit him:  
He comes upon a wish. Fortune is merry,  
And in this mood will give us any thing. 375

Servant  
I heard him say, Brutus and Cassius  
Are rid like madmen through the gates of Rome.

ANTONY  
Belike they had some notice of the people,  
How I had moved them. Bring me to Octavius. 380

*Exeunt*