CHARACTER IN THE CUE SPACE: AN ANALYSIS OF PART SCRIPTS IN SHAKESPEARE'S *CORIOLANUS* AND *JULIUS CAESAR*

by

ALEX PIESCHEL

SHARON O'DAIR, COMMITTEE CHAIR
STEVE BURCH
JENNIFER DROUIN

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of English
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2014

Copyright Alex Pieschel 2014
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

This paper aspires to perform an analysis of Early Modern character by thinking of character as a formative process, spanning playwriting to part-learning to dramatic performance. My analysis, which will focus on Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* and *Julius Caesar,* dismisses any notion of the Shakespeare play as holistic or complete text. I draw from Tiffany Stern and Simon Palfrey's *Shakespeare in Parts*, which establishes a methodology for the analysis of "part" or "cue" scripts, texts that feature a single character's lines amputated from the larger play.

In the Early Modern period, an actor's "part" or "side" would have included his own lines and the cues he needed to know to enter the scene or begin speaking. The part would have been learned in isolation, so the actor would have relied on cues to understand how his role fit into the larger play. I argue that the function of isolated parts and cues, or the last three to five words of any character's lines, is currently underestimated in critical analysis of Shakespeare texts, especially in literary close readings that focus on "character."

The textual space that Palfrey and Stern label the "cue space" continues to be underestimated, I imagine, because critics still view this space as an overly speculative construct. It is true that we cannot speak concretely about what an Early Modern actor would or would not have done, but we can highlight the implications of a potential performance decision. Cues, sites of stability surrounded by malleability, are ripe with potential performance decisions. By drawing from a methodology grounded in an understanding of parts and cues, we may more clearly contextualize the combative collaboration between actor and playwright through which character is formed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I must first thank the members of my committee who generously offered their time and expertise for the sake of my education and intellectual development. Dr. Jennifer Drouin and Dr. Steve Burch set aside time out of their busy summers to offer feedback that helped sharpen my thinking on this project. The genesis of this thesis occurred in Dr. Sharon O'Dair's Shakespeare and Performance course. The class traveled to Staunton, Virginia to watch actors, who had learned their lines from part scripts, rehearse and perform during the American Shakespeare Center's Actor's Renaissance Season. This was a fantastic opportunity which I am fortunate to have been afforded. Dr. O'Dair's course and the performances I witnessed at ASC were equally inspiring to me. In addition, Dr. O'Dair gave me honest critique and warm encouragement throughout multiple draft stages, both of which were invaluable to me.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT....................ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS....................iii

I. PHANTOM CHARACTER....................1

II. WHY “CAESAR” IS MORE DANGEROUS THAN CAESAR....................16

III. WHAT CORIOLANUS LACKS....................34

IV. A PROPOSED PEDAGOGY OF PART SCRIPTS....................44

CONCLUSION....................47

WORKS CITED....................48

I. Phantom Character

Character is a timeless anxiety. Another timeless anxiety is character's non-fictional counterpart "identity." In an essay published in the *New Inquiry*, Nathan Jurgenson examines a particular twenty-first century cultural response to ubiquitous digital connectivity that can be summed up as an obsession with taking vacations from the internet. Jurgenson labels the promoters of analogue vacations "Disconnectionists," who view the self as internal and argue that healthiness should glow with an analogue simplicity. Disconnectionists believe that social performance tools, such as Twitter and Facebook, distract from authentic, human relationships and distance us from *real* selfhood. Jurgenson's piece re-examines old issues of agency and authority as he argues that the Disconnectionists are simply "a new type of organization and regulation of pleasure" (13). Jurgenson goes on to point out that the cultural anxiety over digital connection is packaged and sold by the self-help industry because scapegoating always provides an easy solution to a difficult problem. His analysis suggests that the notion of authentic, internal self-hood is a product of nostalgia and devotion to the status quo. Though it is true that social performance is more complicated and visible than ever, the anxiety of public identity construction dates back to, perhaps even predates, the formation of the modern world.

The Disconnectionists are ringing the same bell as Early Modern moralizing authorities who once described theater as dangerous and debasing. Both brands of moralizing betray a conservative anxiety about social performance, a hasty defense of the source of identity, yet a nagging fear that identity is always being shaped by performance, observation, and interaction.

The Western status quo dislikes the notion that identity is socially performed and constructed because ideologies grounded in 'inherent' or 'natural' humanism become problematized if identity can be shaped by powerful external forces. The Early Modern theater simulated this tension between public and private identity with every rehearsal and performance. The Early Modern actor would have learned his part in isolation, attempting to construct a private identity for his character. Yet the actor cannot escape the fact that his part is always grafted to the larger play by his cues. Amputated from the 'complete' script, the anonymous cues affect the character in a way that the actor cannot yet fully comprehend. Unmarked cues, diplomats for the rest of the play, shape the character's 'private' identity before he ventures out and interacts with the rest of his simulated society. In this sense, private, internal, or "natural" identity is rendered mythological because the external forces of power are always there, even when they hover in the margins.

Shakespeare′s characters are agents, but the constraints for their agency are pre-determined by formal, hierarchical structures. Like language itself, Shakespearean character is a collaborative, combative, and meticulously crafted performance, constructed by an individual's interpretation of a larger dramatic system. A set of isolated parts and cues allow the actor room to construct character as an act of interpretation, even as the playwright sets boundaries for that interpretation, presents opportunities for interpretive decisions, and subtly encourages and predicts certain kinds of interpretations that the actor may either embrace or push against. Drama, or the appropriation of textual performance into a simulated social performance, embodied an Early Modern tension between text and audience. Character, then, is a product (or what Judith Butler might call a "production" of part scripts and dramatic cues. All of the moving

parts in a Shakespeare play allow us to imagine a set of cued words and actions as real people capable of abstract, self-aware thought.

Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern's *Shakespeare in Parts* is an important, exhaustive work of performance criticism which endorses the constraints under which early modern actors would have worked as essential components of drama's meaning-making process. They draw from "a handful of extant parts in English both from the Renaissance period and earlier" in order to present Shakespearean characterization as a function of divided "parts" (15). The actor's part would have included only his own lines and a list of anonymous cues he needed in order to know when to begin speaking those lines. The part would have been primarily learned in isolation in anticipation of one or two group rehearsals that would precede the first public performance (62, 70). The actor's cues were written in the margins between the actor's own lines, and, most importantly, the speakers of the cues were not named. Palfrey and Stern argue that this combination of anonymous cues and isolated part-learning would have encouraged each actor to feel as if his character were at the play's center, and that the discovery of how this character fit into the larger play would have developed organically through performance (92). In this sense, the individualized part scripts functioned as a kind of "practice" for a more public, simulated, performance of identity. The actor would privately interpret his character, then test his interpretation in rehearsal as he learned the context for his actions in real time. The actor would then revise his interpretation further in a first public performance, then further in subsequent performances if the play was successful. The character's identity was shaped through layers of private and public interpretation. We underestimate part scripts and cues, then, if we consider them as constraints of a fledgling technology. The cue script was essential to the process through which Shakespearean character was produced (34-35).

In the theater, we find a complicated hierarchy of authorship that begins with the playwright, is mediated by the actor, and ends with the audience. The performance of drama, then, becomes a production representing the construction and interpretation of performed social identity. New parts in new plays were especially desirable to actors because the first performance of a play was an important, formative experience; the identities of the characters portrayed in these parts had yet to be determined. New plays were added and discarded often, and successful plays were awarded repeat performances. Coveted parts were eventually inherited from veteran actors. The actor who played a new part in a new play would *decide* "the way the part was meant to be" (69). If we elect to think of Shakespearean character as a process, instead of a product, then the actor's part, "always written for the first performance," becomes the most important catalyst for what later becomes a more established 'character' through subsequent, successful performances (79).

It is worth noting that Palfrey and Stern's historical evidence is limited, so some of their arguments are speculative. When they say they have a "handful of extant parts," they really mean a handful, which does not include any parts from Shakespeare's company. Their evidence is, however, used consistently to support plausible claims, and the methodology they have developed allows for a provocative, and I would argue useful, reading. One of the most exciting implications of Palfrey and Stern's analysis is that the last few words of any given speech become important for constructing both the character of the speaker and the character to whom that speech is directed because "actors must know their cue as thoroughly as they do their subsequent speech" (84). The reading of cues allows for certain phrases to belong to multiple characters, which encourages a deeper consideration of dramatic context and dismantles the

notions that language can be fully controlled or that characters should be analyzed solely on the basis of their own lines:

> Shakespeare repeatedly exploits the potential opened up by the 'shared' cue for pressing upon that tender and sometimes explosive point where two minds meet—or fail to meet. Furthermore, we will see how the cue does not necessarily retain a fixed meaning for the cued actor: the cue can suggest one thing in private rehearsal, but reveal something quite different in public performance. In all of these ways the cue is a fundamental tool of Shakespearean characterization, as well as a vehicle and epitome of the dynamic 'dramatic moment'. (94)

For Shakespeare, this transition from implication to revelation is crucial. In cues, we should look for meaning that is both fluid and "fixed": *fluid* in the sense that the cue belongs to more than one character and *fixed* in the sense that cues cannot be altered by improvisation. Shared by two actors, the cue is a "main conduit between one part and the rest of the play" (94), and it offers potential clues for ambiguous or complex parts:

> The cue is in some senses the most 'fixed' bit of a part. An actor can change the middle of a speech, and only the prompter who follows from a copy of the full text will even notice that he has done so. The cue by contrast, is inviolable. So we have to consider a system in which not just contextual information for the actor but also anything of permanent importance to the play is put towards the bottom of speeches and into the cue, the playwright all the time acutely aware of the cue's pivotal position in his 'score'. Shakespeare accepts this and exploits it. Time and again he makes the cue-sign and cue-space resonate with information, instructions, and power. (93)

The cue, then, is a phrase that carries a latent energy necessary for the dramatic development of meaning, but also a phrase that shapes meaning at every stage in its development. In reconstructing part scripts for their close readings, Palfrey and Stern assume a range of one to three-word cues with one-word cues as normative. In this paper, I will refer to this one to three-word range as the "cue space," as do Palfrey and Stern (89, 94-95).

Part scripts complicate the notion of dramatic irony because actors are kept deliberately in the dark, at least until the first group rehearsal. Shakespeare would have known that actors

might improvise between cues, but the cues themselves would remain fixed. The playwright has the luxury of thinking of the play as a cohesive whole long before the actors perform. In fact, it is in the playwright's best interest to allow the play to remain incomplete in the minds of the actors. The character's gestation period prior to group rehearsal lends to an honest, organic performance. The process trains actors to shape characters according to a play's environment, blurs the line between fictional and real society, and simulates social politics and identity construction. An Early Modern audience would have cheered or jeered in order to encourage certain types of character performance, and performances that drew wide approval would have been reproduced. The point is that each aspect of the performance depends on every other component part. The disparate figures that we now think of as "Shakespeare's characters" originally began to take shape in this mess of interaction.

Palfrey and Stern show that character stems from a collection of part scripts, but also from the series of planned, yet never completely predictable, interruptions that make up live performance. Shakespeare essentially wrote character types for specific types of actors. Many of Shakespeare's characters are not so far removed from the stock characters of medieval morality plays with names like "Pride." What makes Shakespeare such an effective playwright is his knowledge of both the predictable and unpredictable forces that create character. The Early Modern playwright does not so much write a character as he creates circumstances in which characters can become themselves organically. In their introduction to *Shakespeare and Character*, Yachnin and Slights offer a useful context for character criticism, which in part originated in a seventeenth-century "psychological approach" to interpretation that considers Shakespeare's characters as "mimetic representations of imagined persons" (1-2). This approach

eventually invited a backlash and would be deemed by one critic as nothing more than "irresponsible speculation." Yachnin and Slights' summary is worth quoting at length:

> The first major statement rejecting this psychological approach was L.C. Knights's famous essay 'How Many Children Had Lady Macbeth?' (1933), which directs the reader away from what Knights constructs as irresponsible speculation about the psychological mechanics of fictional characters, and toward an emphasis on a play's theme, form, and literary language. Knights' vehement attack on Bradley's characterological approach ushered in the era of New Criticism in Shakespeare studies, and until the latter half of the twentieth century studies of stagecraft, imagery, theme, and intellectual history dominated the critical field. As the interpretive priorities of Knights and the New Critics began to give way to critical approaches influenced by poststructuralism, however, references to Bradleian character criticism began to spring up again, this time as a convenient critical shorthand for a particular set of naive assumptions about universality and transhistoricity. For critics eager to differentiate their New Historicist, cultural materialist, materialist feminist, and postcolonialist projects from what they saw as the pernicious influence of a hegemonic New Criticism, distinctions between Bradley's psychological approach to plot and character and Cleanth Brooks's focus on figurative language and imagery were of less concern than their shared tendency to assume the existence of a timeless, universal, unified self by whom, for whom, and about whom literacy texts might be written. The poststructuralist case against character has two major strains. The first *theoretical* challenge argues for the impossibility of inward, agential personhood altogether on the grounds that subjects are merely the effects of the social, linguistic, and ideological determinations of individual identity. The second *historical* challenge argues that inwardness as we understand and experience it did not exist in the early modern period. On both of these accounts, readings of Shakespeare that presuppose an inward, agential personhood are certainly anachronistic and probably also politically retrograde. (2-3)

Before I accidentally sign up for the Knights of Formalism, I must clearly state that in my own view, one strain of academic criticism is no more speculative than the next. The practice of calling someone else's criticism "speculative" is more about jockeying for influence than it is about reading Shakespeare plays. All criticism is speculative. The history of academic literary criticism is a political history, not a history of progress in the search for meaning or truth. That said, I must grudgingly admit that my own project is more formalist than not, since I aspire to consider how character becomes itself through formal dramatic elements. And I must also

acknowledge that my own criticism is speculative. One cannot discuss constructions of selfhood or interiority in fictional characters without reinforcing one's own personal construction of self. In other words, when we write about Shakespeare's characters, we are really writing about ourselves. As Christy Desmet points out, "the critic of Shakespearean character can never be disinterested. For this reason, reading Shakespearean character and writing character criticism are inseparable as activities" (35). One might offer potential methodological solutions to the problem of subjective response. One could, for example, pursue the goal of a more concrete reading of audience response by surveying current audiences of productions that attempt to recreate Early Modern performance practices. But, of course, surveys are limited and authored, and the conditions of Early Modern England cannot be reproduced. Furthermore, a preference for this kind of methodology stems from a problematic privileging of more systemic analytical approaches that carry the trappings of 'science' over more personal, text-focused, approaches. Both are flawed, and their competition has a long political history. The imperfections of character criticism, or any another kind of criticism, are unavoidable. Performance is exciting because it is ephemeral, and attempting to document performance simply turns performance into something else. As Peggy Phelan writes, "To attempt to write about the undocumentable event of performance is to invoke the rules of the written document and thereby alter the event itself" (148). In the attempt to reclaim Shakespearean performance through fixed objects of documentation, dubious or not, we have already failed. This is problematic, but it is no reason to stop writing Shakespeare criticism, lest we halt all other projects of intellectual pursuit in the name of practical, scientific, or economic utility.

As for the two poststructuralist cases against character (as portrayed by Yachnin and Slights), I sympathize more with the former than the latter. The latter indulges in an *other*ing of

the past that is just as problematic as a universalizing of the past. As for the former, I fail to understand the implied separation of inward and external manifestations of personhood. An inward self is not mythological, nor can it be separated from an outward, performed self. Subjects are both cause and effect. Agency exists, but it is limited, and the constraints within which an agent may operate are largely pre-determined by powerful systems. We make choices that shape a self that is not always on display for everyone, but this self, which we often refer to as "character" in fiction, is still always being shaped by external or systemic forces. A central argument of the volume is "that much greater attention needs to be paid to the contributions made by the theater and the performance environment as we attempt to re-articulate a notion of character in the twenty-first century" (3). I would second their call and point to critics such as Tiffany Stern and Simon Palfrey as useful and necessary to the business of performing a "new character criticism."

In her characterization of the motives of eighteenth and nineteenth-century readings of character, Christy Desmet writes,

> The Character is usually discussed in terms of its verisimilitude, as a paradoxical fusion of universal qualities and flesh-and-blood individuality. But, as Benjamin Boyce's survey notes, the Character is generically anomalous. Situated somewhere between dialogue and drama, it is less a self-sufficient description of a social, moral, or psychological type than a rhetorical exemplum that calls for active readers. (37)

This call for active readers can be traced back to Early Modern authors, who viewed interpretation as a social performance and were usually looking for a "correct" reading. The "Preface to the Reader" in Holinshed's *Chronicles*, and its early rehearsals of the rhetorical tone that we now think of as "historical," is emblematic of this tendency. In its fledgling state, the chronicler's tonal performance of history is messy and imperfect. Addressing the reader directly, the chronicler ardently denies his use of subjective framing devices. He insists that all agency has

been forfeited to the reader. He claims to reject the use of manipulative rhetoric, "My speech is plaine, without any rhetoricall shew of eloquence, hauing rather a regard to simple truth, than to decking words," privileging an objective, neutral truth that he imagines can be separated from rhetoric (4). Of course, the chronicler's denial of rhetoric is a clever, calculated rhetorical move that allows him to couch his play for authority under the guise of objectivity and humility. The performance allows the chronicler to exercise authorial control while claiming to forfeit this very control. Implying that there is a "correct" way to read his text, the chronicler states, "My labour may shew mine vttermost good will, of the more learned I require their further enlargement, and of fault-finders dispensati|on till they be more fullie informed" (4). For the chronicler, the "learned" can find concrete solutions to textual imperfections, while the misinformed simply point out imperfections. The assertion (that those who are less competent are more likely to find faults) encourages the reader to adopt a passive relationship to the text, to play the pupil waiting patiently for the teacher to provide important content knowledge. The chronicler's rhetoric is meticulously crafted to resemble humility, but the implied thesis of his preface is that the author has already located all of his own faults, and any outside locations of faults must be malicious, deliberate, rhetorical misinterpretation: "if I cannot sufficientlie content my selfe (as in deed I cannot) I know not how I should satisfie others." The chronicler pretends to present a text that is open to interpretation even as he encourages a certain type of interpretation. This is not to say that the chronicler was acting maliciously or that he was an incompetent historian. Every text carries embedded rhetoric in its formal construction, and every text sets boundaries for a reader's experience.

Similarly, modern character criticism sometimes uses cultural memory as a rhetorical move designed to justify a personal idealized reflection of character. I am thinking here,

especially, of Harold Bloom's reading of Kate and Petruchio's relationship in *The Taming of the Shrew*, when he insists, "One would have to be tone deaf (or ideologically crazed) not to hear in this a subtly exquisite music of marriage at its happiest" (33). Bloom's reading here probably does not stem from the play, but from a cocktail of memories that claim the play as their point of origin. Character originates from a series of performance decisions that were offered to an actor by a written play text, yet our image of any given character in any given play has been shaped by countless performances and will be re-imagined upon repeat performances. Julia Kristeva's theory of intertextuality, which refers to how texts shape meaning across other texts, applies here to performance as well. When we think of a character such as Kate or Petruchio, we construct an image that relies on countless performances and adaptations that are both consciously and unconsciously connected. The fact that we have not personally witnessed all of these performances is irrelevant. In this sense, readings of Shakespeare characters have already been shaped by powerful, and potentially phantasmagoric external forces. Unpacking where this memory of character originate requires thinking of fictional characters as dramatic constructs designed to manipulate an audience and be manipulated by a dramatic simulacrum of society. As a potential point of origin, we can look to the Early Modern actor's part, "always written for the first performance" (Palfrey and Stern 79). One of the most compelling ideas that Palfrey and Stern offer is that speculation on the genesis of character can be grounded in particular, decisive phrases; we can look to cues for that which is not explicitly stated. One pithy phrase can suggest a performance decision with many different outcomes, and highlighting performance decisions is a useful way to think about the origin and construction of character.

In "Moral Agency and its Problems in *Julius Caesar*," Hugh Grady suggests that 'character' is somewhere between product and agent. He argues that "agency for major

Shakespearean characters is 'mixed' or mediated. The characters' will and even sense of self turn out on examination to come from elsewhere, not from within a transparent self" (16). I will argue that this "elsewhere" to which Grady refers is the formal construct of the cue space, which contains lines that belong to multiple actors. The actor playing the character is always cueing someone else, but is also always acting on the terms of someone else's cue, which allows for the sense of "mixed or mediated" agency which Grady highlights. In "Conduct (Un)becoming or, Playing the Warrior in *Macbeth*," Sharon O'Dair, citing Robert Weimann, argues that the self and those circumstances surrounding the self cannot be separated (71-72). In Shakespearean drama, the cue space suggests an always performed selfhood, publicly defined and interactive. The Early Modern actor prepares his role in isolation, but he prepares in anticipation of an interaction with other actors in rehearsal and, eventually, a more public interaction with an audience. In other words, private identity is constructed only so that it may be "'tested in public'" (71). Palfrey and Stern show that public performance is always being anticipated or enacted. Actors learn their parts in isolation only to find that their discovery or formation of 'character' is always an interactive process, a sort of inevitable power politics between characters and other characters, playwright and actors, actors and audience. Meanwhile, the figure of the playwright is always looming, mapping out the boundaries for every performance decision. There is a strange hierarchy at play here, in which the playwright, through cue scripts, can trick actors into behaving in certain ways. Even though the Early Modern actor's behaviors are to some extent improvised, their improvisation is predicted and controlled.

O'Dair argues that "the personal or individual is also social, emerges from and always engages with the social" (71). The written character allows an actor to "test" an identity, but 'character', as an audience experiences it, is achieved through performance. O'Dair writes, "most

of us seem unable to acknowledge a reciprocal or dialectical relationship between self and society, the extent to which selfhood is neither constructed nor determined, neither free nor fixed but both—and both simultaneously" (72), and it is exactly this simultaneous identity construction that the practice of part scripts and execution of cues is designed to simulate. In Shakespearean characters, there exists a self for which the playwright has determined boundaries and circumstances, but also a self which an actor shapes and lends some impression of permanence. The conning and execution of a part script, then, is a simulated version of the "meaning-making" (73) that occurs in everyday social interactions. As O'Dair points out, "Shakespeare does not offer competing philosophies to choose between but an image, a representation, of the ways individuals and societies construct, negotiate and test the roles and behaviors that make us are who we are. " Shakespeare plays, then, are proving grounds for the dramatic constructs which we refer to as characters. Social systems of interaction and negotiation are replicated in an actor's navigation of the cue space. The very human experience that is a progression from individual, isolated parts to live, complex, social negotiation is condensed and enacted through fictional drama. Through the performance of individual parts, "a new role become[s] an internalized part of the self," or we might say that a collection of predicted performance acts become characters (77). What Katherine Maus describes as "inwardness" is simply the product of successful characterization. Inwardness requires an audience. One does not typically consider one's own inwardness beyond what is necessary to perform one's role or function in society. Inwardness is perceived and shaped by external forces, and an interior requires witnesses, imagined or otherwise. At the same time, every person is audience for her own inwardness. Our imagined inwardness is a response to external reactions to our performance of social roles.

In this sense, for the Shakespearean actor learning his part, cues function metonymically. They are the most significant tools the actor has to speculate on "the rest of" the play. Cues must represent the world's reaction to one specific character even as they become part of that character's language. Peggy Phelan endorses metonymy as a more useful critical tool than metaphor because the former "works to secure a horizontal axis of contiguity and displacement," while the latter "works to secure a vertical hierarchy of value and is reproductive" (150). For Phelan, metonymy is full of possibility because it embraces the disappearance that is inherently a part of performance, while metaphor is reproductive and stifling; metaphor "works by erasing dissimilarity and negating difference; it turns two into one." Performance, however, "employs the body metonymically" and thus "is capable of resisting the reproduction of metaphor" (151).

A linguistic fabrication occurs in the usage of the term "character." Though character can never be anything fixed or permanent, "character" has, at its root, a paradoxical, implied sense of permanence. Spoken language is flexible, unpredictable, but an engraved or written character is something more tangible and concrete. Like a name, a character is an imitation of or reference to something that is perpetually elusive. Judith Butler uses the term "performativity" to describe an imitation of something that has no origin: "Such acts, gestures, enactments, generally construed, are *performative* in the sense that the essence or identity that they otherwise purport to express are *fabrications* manufactured and sustained through corporeal signs and other discursive means" (185). Gender is a "production" which masquerades as an "imitation" because the origin, or truth, that is being imitated is mythological. Similarly, language that imagines fictional characters as "real people" presumes that "real people" are the origin of character. But real people, like characters, are performances that have no true origin. The idea of "real persons" masks the performative nature of identity and character. It is important to recognize that

constructions like gender and character are structured performances. Eliding the formal structures of these performances conceals the fact that they are performances and perpetuates the problematic fantasy that these performances are imitating something "natural" or "true" or "universal." Character, then, is a phantom, a ghost with no true origin beyond the rehearsals and constraints that comprise its construction.

II. Why "Caesar" is More Dangerous than Caesar

Julius Caesar is a play obsessed with a character that hardly exists. Shakespeare's Caesar is neither dangerous tyrant nor sympathetic hero. The secret to *Caesar's* ambivalence is Caesar's emptiness. The protagonist's death evokes *pathos* because of the overwhelming absence it promises, an absence predicted and remembered through the repetition of a name. Caesar's lines contain little substance, but his name affects every scene and character. Caesar is frequently cued by his own name, so an Early Modern actor first learning the part of Caesar would have sounded this name repeatedly, aloud and in his head, in isolation prior to rehearsal. Such an exercise in characterological narcissism would have forced the actor to consider Caesar as the center of this play, despite the brevity of the part and the sparseness of his lines. While Caesar enjoys hearing his own name, he combats cues that would foreshadow his death or influence his decisions. These cues would have affected the way an original Caesar was constructed, and early performances would have affected the characterization of subsequent Caesars, eventually contributing to a Caesar that inspires Earnest Schanzer to describe Shakespeare's first tragedy as a "problem."

When Schanzer uses the phrase "problem play," he refers to a moral problem faced by both characters and audience, but one might just as effectively use the term to describe a performance problem (5). How does one perform an "ethical" Caesar anyway? Perhaps the "problem" comes down to one of interpretation: This play is a problem because I cannot neatly resolve its contradictions. One of Schanzer's implied arguments is that a problem play is born out of critical divide. But is it really a problem when a play makes an audience feel ambivalent?

Perhaps ambivalence is a problem for the performer to solve. How does one play ambivalence, or elicit an ambivalent reaction from an audience? Is it possible that the "problem" in Shakespeare's Roman plays is a kind of narcissism of character encouraged by the repetition of names? If Caesar is repeatedly cued by his own name, then is he even paying attention to the play's moral dilemma?

In this section, I will focus on Caesar and Cassius. I omit Brutus and Antony not because they are inconsequential, but because Palfrey and Stern offer readings of their characters, and I believe that Caesar and Cassius (and their respective cues) remain relatively neglected. Palfrey and Stern argue that the play "uses repeated cues in two distinct but characteristic ways: to evoke popular turbulence, particularly in the scene when Mark Antony inflames the Roman crowd (see pp. 166-71); and to evoke subjective loneliness, when the hero Brutus prepares to die" (219). They also note that repeated cues play into the characterization of the crowd throughout the play: "The crowd's repetitions seem to be clearly designed to echo through, cut across, or comment upon the speeches that the speakers are assembled to hear" (165). Finally, they argue that a shift from verse to prose, which occurs when Brutus explains Caesar's murder to the crowd, exposes the audience to the vulnerability of Brutus' character even as it allows the Brutus-actor to connect to the audience (336-337). In summary, Palfrey and Stern illuminate the way that cues characterize the crowd, Antony, and Brutus, which I hope to compliment with character studies (based on cue scripts) of Caesar and Cassius, who are both crucial to the play's dramatic architecture.

After Caesar's death, what is supposed to be tragic about the play feels as if it has already happened, yet Caesar is preserved through a number of dramatic devises, one of which is the

repetition and placement in the cue space of the word "will." In the following quotation, I have bolded the relevant instances of the word in order to emphasize its resonance in the cue space:

> 4 PLEBEIAN
> We'll hear the **will**. Read it, Mark Antony.
> ALL
> The **will**, the **will.** We **will** hear Caesar's **will.**
> 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,
> 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?
> 4 PLEBEIAN
> Read the **will**, we'll hear it, Antony.
> 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.
> I fear I wrong the honourable men
> Whose daggers have stabbed Caesar: I do fear it.
> 4 PLEBEIAN
> They were traitors: honourable men?
> ALL
> The **will,** the testament.
> 2 PLEBEIAN
> 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,
> And let me show you him that made the will.
> Shall I descend? And will you give me leave? (3.2.139-160)

The exchange is littered with repetitions of what is left of Caesar—his will. In this short excerpt, Antony is cued by the same word, "will, " three times in a row, and the word is repeated many times outside of the cue space. In his explication of the word, Bill Delaney notes, "Evidently what Shakespeare had in mind was to suggest that the spirit or will of Caesar was so potent that it remained alive and shaped subsequent events. Shakespeare seems to have utilized an

unprecedented device of repeating a word that would not be consciously noted by his audience but would have the subliminal effect of reminding them of Caesar's haunting presence" (127). Similarly, in their reading of Antony's famous mourning scene, Palfrey and Stern argue, "The obsessive recurrence of 'Will' as [Antony's] cue" informs the Early Modern actor that Antony "continually reminds the crowd that Caesar's last will and testament are in danger of not being effected because of the new regime; *and* that, in general, the great man's 'will' (wish) has been stopped following his death" (169). Palfrey and Stern go on to unpack how the cue word, "Will" is "man-handled to the very edge of permission, being bounced and shared and split about so much that the single word begins to take into itself the entire momentum of the 'world-historical' moment" (170). Furthermore, near the end of the play, both Brutus and Cassius cue their own deaths with references to Caesar, as if his ghost has penetrated the cue space in order to participate in the deaths of his enemies. Brutus cues his own death with Caesar's "will," and he mentions Caesar's name in the previous line (5.5.49-50). Cassius' last word, "thee," also refers to Caesar, the antecedent recited in the previous line (5.3.45-46). The parallel scenes remind us of Caesar, even as we are supposed to be paying attention to the deaths of his survivors.

In an analysis of the first German production of *Julius Caesar*, Lawrence McNamee offers a succinct overview of the kinds of responses that the play has traditionally produced: 1) Caesar is a tyrant and Brutus a tragic hero.[1] 2) Caesar is admirable and his murderers

1. This view is espoused by John Dover Wilson in the 1949 Cambridge edition of the play, and by the translator (A. W. Schlegel) of the German production that McNamee analyzes, and by the poet Goethe (409). In addition, Myron Taylor implies that Caesar is a "tyrant," though he argues that the play does not attempt to distance itself from the political figures of Early Modern England and that Shakespeare's History plays present the same message: "not that killing a tyrant was wrong, but that men are not the masters of their own fates. A greater power than man's controls the events of history. What man actually accomplishes by his deeds is rarely what he had hoped to achieve" (301).

deplorable.[2] 3) Caesar is deliberately ambiguous (409-410).[3] McNamee oversimplifies for rhetorical purposes, but his phrase, "titular hero," is apt. Caesar does not make it past the middle of the play, and sympathizing with him is problematic. In addition, the phrase forces Caesar to shoulder the title of "hero," though only in name. His death feels more important than others even though the audience is given little chance to empathize with him. Caesar owes his status as "titular hero" to his name, which hovers in the air long after the tyrant-hero's body has been dragged offstage. In "*Julius Caesar* and the Tyrannicide Debate," Robert S. Miola argues that the ambivalence of Caesar's character stems from a fervent debate over what constitutes a tyrant (and who is allowed to kill one) that was taking place in Early Modern England: "Unlike Nero, Dominitian, and Caligula—all universally reviled as hateful tyrants—Caesar evoked the full spectrum of Renaissance opinion and so did his assassination" (272). The embodiment of such a full spectrum inevitably makes for a character with a confusing number of personas. Earnest Schanzer reminds us that *Caesar* presents multiple, though not mutually exclusive, Caesars:

> There are the two Caesar's of Cassius, there is Caska's Caesar, Brutus' Caesar, Artemidorus' Caesar, and finally Antony's Caesar. But doubt is thrown in one

---

2. McNamee's note lists the following: Mark Hunter, *Transactions of Royal Society of Literature* (London, 1931), pp. 136-137: W. W. Fowler, *Roman Essays and Interpretations* (Oxford, 1920), p. 273 (409). In addition, Row Walker praises a Glen Byam Shaw production (1948) for its treatment of Caesar: "The main interest of this production lay in its bold centralization of Caesar who became the real as well as the nominal protagonist, and in the means employed to keep this presence dramatically alive on the stage after the actual murder." Walker also notes two additional Caesar supporters: Virgil K. Whitaker, *Shakespeare's Use of Learning* (1953), p. 234 and T.S. Dorsch (ed.), *Julius Caesar* (1955), p. xxxviii (132).

3. This, of course, is the view adopted by Schanzer, who sets up the critical continuum from which McNamee borrows with Dover Wilson on one end and Mark Hunter on the other. The Wilson-Hunter continuum is apparently a well-worn rhetorical trope. Like McNamee, Jeffrey Yu draws from Schanzer (and the same two sources) in "Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, Erasmus's De Copia, and Sentential Ambiguity. " Yu goes on to argue that "Shakespeare made the very ambiguity of Caesar and his assassination the focus of his play" (80). In another 'ambivalent' reading of Caesar, Robert S. Miola argues that "Shakespeare transformed a confused welter of historical fact and legend into taut, balanced, and supremely ambivalent drama" (273). Similarly, Anne Paolucci argues that Caesar, though crucial to the play's drama, does not fulfill the prerequisites of tragic heroism: "The real Caesar—that is, the Caesar who appears in the first three acts of the play and who is described by Cassius and Caska—is a curious unresolved mixture of superstition, vanity, physical weakness, cunning, insight, and political acumen" (329-330).

> way or another on the validity of most of these images. And to these Shakespeare adds his own presentation of Caesar, a presentation so enigmatic and ambiguous that none of the other images are really dispelled by it. (305)

Schanzer goes on to observe that even Shakespeare's other plays are divided on the issue of Caesar's assassination. Shakespearean allusions to Caesar range from celebrations of his valor and wit to jokes at his expense to condemnations of his hopelessly swollen ambition (300, 305).

The ambivalence embodied in Caesar allows for strikingly disparate performances. For example, here is Carol Chillington Rutter's take on Caesar, as performed in Deborah Warner's production at the Barbican Theatre in 2005:

> At his arrival, John Shrapnel's Caesar was a man in an Armani suit, surrounded by minders, working the crowd, flashing a dazzling smile, making political capital out of political liability—Calpurnia's sterility. And he was positively enjoying the "quick spirit" of Fiennes's "gamesome" Antony who dressed in designer athletic gear as if for celebrity gymnastics, revved himself up for the Lupercal's "holy chase" by offering his groin to the ritual worship of overheated young women. (72)

Michael Greenwald's description of Caesar from a 1996 production at the Alley Theatre, falls on the opposite end of the spectrum:

> Corin Redgrave's Caesar was but a dotty shell of the man who once bestrode the narrow world like a Colossus. Redgrave showed us a limping Caesar who got about with a cane. At times he seemed on the verge of senility, more grumpy old man than tyrant and hardly a menace to Rome. (89)

The two Caesars could not be more different. Though neither comes across as particularly admirable, the latter feels more sympathetic. Redgrave's performance emphasizes Caesar in the past tense: a "shell of a man" who *was* Caesar but is no longer. This interpretation of Caesar seems more loyal to the text, but still somewhat exaggerated or oversimplified. One does not need to be "dotty" or feeble to be perceived as a "shell of a man."

The Caesar performed by Benjamin Curns in a 2013 performance in Staunton, Virginia falls somewhere in between Rutter and Greenwald's accounts. The American Shakespeare

Center performed *Caesar* during its "Actor's Renaissance Season." In an attempt to recreate some of the conditions of Early Modern stage practice, ASC actors directed the production, worked from cue scripts with limited rehearsal time, selected their own costumes, and played multiple roles. The performance that emerged from these constraints was organic and affecting. Curns' Caesar wore a cream-colored politician's suit, implying more oblivious buffoon than powerful tyrant. Curns played Caesar as if he were uncertain of his place in this play, and Caesar's mishandlings of trust and skepticism were effectively exaggerated. Curns' Caesar was a man left out of the loop, another of Shakespeare's flat, washed up military heroes who failed to operate in the domestic sphere. As an audience member, I felt a bit sorry for Curns' Caesar, not just because I knew he would be murdered in the middle of his own play, but because his own play was not about him and seemed to happen despite him.

Because the play focuses on a historical character at his weakest and most vulnerable, the Caesar-actor must avoid over-emphasizing the positive angles of Caesar's mythos—charisma, cunning, resilience—but he must also avoid turning Caesar into a caricature. In other words, it must be plausible that Caesar used to be formidable. In his first scene Caesar barrels on stage, bellowing his wife's name, bombarding the cue space with her sterility. Meanwhile, Caesar is cued repeatedly by his own name. The play overwhelms Caesar with curt, mechanical repetition. Here is a full list of Caesar's cues in his first scene, as well as his entrance cue from the end of the previous scene: [4]

[in] [servile] fearfulness (*Enter*)
[ho!] [Caesar] speaks
[Here,] [my] lord
[Caesar,] [my] lord

4. I have mimicked Palfrey and Stern's practice of approximating one to three-word cues, placing the first two words in brackets, emphasizing that our understanding of cues is limited to a range, rather than an exact number of words. Cues less than three words correspond to lines less than three words. For more on Palfrey and Stern's methods for recreating parts, see pages 94-95.

[it] [is] performed
Caesar!
[Peace] [yet] again!
[Ides] [of] March
[Ides] [of] March
[Look] [upon] Caesar
[Ides] [of] March
[fire] [from] Brutus (Enter)
[the] [matter] is
Caesar
[and] [well] given (1.2.1-215)

A handful of terse phrases dart at Caesar from multiple angles. In this first scene, he is surrounded by nearly every other character in the play, even those who have no effect on the immediate drama that unfolds. The cues are like daggers; their performance predicts the assassination. While Caesar is on stage, lines are abrupt and delivered by many different characters. Caesar is surrounded by recurring cues from the moment he enters.[5] He is cued by his own name three times, each time by a different character, the same number of times he is cued by the ominous "ides of March." It is important to remember that the Caesar-actor would not have been aware of the speakers of these cues until he had already learned his part in isolation. These short lines and shifting refrains would have demanded that the actor act reflexively and redirect his attention between different characters quickly. This would have made for a taxing first performance and encouraged a vulnerability to seep into the developing characterization of the play's tyrant-hero. The first scene quickly, efficiently pushes Caesar's performance towards confusion, anxiety, and paranoia. The performative implication is that Caesar is slightly slower than everything that is happening around him, and the play forces the actor to experience this sensation directly:

---

5. Palfrey and Stern use the term "recurring cue" to refer to a singular cue phrase that keeps cropping up throughout the play (113). They use the term "repeated cue" to refer to a cue phrase that is "said more than once within a short space of time: usually within a single speech, but not necessarily so, " so that an actor must hear his

SOOTHSAYER
    Beware the **Ides of March**.
CAESAR   What man is that?
BRUTUS   A soothsayer bids you beware the **Ides of March**.
CAESAR
    Set him before me. Let me see his face.
CASSIUS   Fellow, come from the throng. Look upon Caesar.
CAESAR
    What say'st thou to me now? Speak once again.
SOOTHSAYER   Beware the **Ides of March**.
CAESAR
    He is a dreamer. Let us leave him. Pass. (1.2.18-24)

The "Ides of March" cue is spoken twice by the Soothsayer and once by Brutus because Caesar has to ask "What man is that?" (19). Caesar, confused, demands his foreshadowed death be repeated so that he can dismiss it. In addition, Caesar needs Brutus (in one of their few interactions in the entire play) to explain the soothsayer's role. The repetition of cues augments the scene's dramatic irony and alienates Caesar from the audience and from the other characters. In this sense, Caesar's first scene establishes his character's two most important traits: 1) His character is weaker than the name "Caesar." 2) His name will control how the drama unfolds.

The word "Caesar" drives the action of the play and governs its structure, but Caesar's character is consistently marginalized. The play is uninterested in portraying a fearsome or even competent tyrant; Shakespeare's Caesar is a man who is at the end of his cultural moment, simultaneously oblivious and paranoid, whose name carries more weight than his diminishing wit and charisma. If we assume one-word cues, then Caesar is cued by his own name three times by three different characters in the first scene. If we allow for three-word cues, then he is cued by his name five times by four different characters. Though a consul should be used to the sound of his name, a shout of "Caesar" from the crowd immediately gets his attention (12). He stops the

---

cue multiple times before speaking (157). The key difference is that the repeated cue carries the potential to bait an actor into a kind of premature interruption.

action in order to discover the source. Caesar's response is deliberately awkward and jarring, predicting the rhythm of his role for the rest of the performance. The exchange informs the audience that Caesar is most interested in speaking and hearing about himself. It is not particularly provocative to suggest that the most powerful man in the world would have an exaggerated ego. However, Caesar is not the only character obsessed with the sound, weight, and tenor of "Caesar:"

> Caesar with nineteen uses of his own name is not alone in his use of this device (see 1.2.17n.) with an added seventy-one pronouns of self. Cassius calls himself 'Cassius' fourteen times (and says 'he' of himself thirty times, out of a total of 201 pronouns referring to himself). Brutus calls himself 'Brutus' thirteen times (with 296 self-referring pronouns). Caska calls himself 'Caska' once (and has forty-six pronouns of self). All the characters use each other's names a great deal: for example, Cassius says 'Brutus' forty-two times (though Caesar says 'Brutus' only four times). 'Caesar' is spoken by all characters more than any other name. (Daniell 41-42)

The Caesar-actor, upon rehearsing the full play for the first time, might have been alarmed at the number of times his name is spoken out loud and how disproportionate this number is to the number of lines he speaks. His cue script would have only revealed a fraction of this number. In Scene 1.2, nearly every character on stage speaks his name, and most of the ones who do not are silent observers. In terms of Caesar's characterization, the scene feels quite bare, but his name is as important as any other word or phrase. In *Lives*, Plutarch says that Caesar's name alone was enough to strike fear into the hearts of men and that Caesar's name alone would eventually raise his nephew, Octavius, who had "no meanes nor power of him selfe," to be "one of the greatest men in Rome" (366).

Cassius is more obsessed with Caesar than Caesar is. In an exchange with Brutus, Cassius meticulously weighs Caesar's name against Brutus' name and proclaims the two equal:

> 'Brutus' and 'Caesar': what should be in that 'Caesar'?
> Why should that name be sounded more than yours?

> Write them together: yours is as fair a name:
> Sound them, it doth become the mouth as well.
> Weigh them, it is as heavy: conjure with 'em,
> 'Brutus' will start a spirit as soon as 'Caesar'. (141-146)

While Caesar is offstage, Cassius imagines the process of writing, practicing, and performing Caesar's role. He implies that the play could just as well belong to Brutus because both names have two syllables; they roll off the tongue at the same speed. Cassius' formal analysis of names suggests that the sound, weight, and performance of identity labels must always trump the fantasy of any interior manifestation of identity. By this point, Cassius has cued with and has been cued by "Caesar" (21, 133), so he is looking for a replacement for this word that is "as heavy" (137). Cassius feels suffocated by the overwhelming presence of Caesar's name, so he weighs it on his own tongue in order to discover if it is as heavy as Caesar thinks. This theoretical weighing of names is then put into practice when Caesar re-enters, cued by "Brutus" (176). In all this talk of names, our impression of Caesar becomes hollow. His character is made of the sound of a name, which will lead to his death and cue the deaths of others. Cassius and Caesar interact infrequently, but their characters hinge upon one another because Cassius understands how Caesar's name operates. Caesar's only substantial lines in the scene are spent picking apart Cassius, and the converse is true as well. For the Early Modern actor working from cue scripts, Cassius is one of the most important components of Caesar's early characterization. To know Caesar, the actor must look to Cassius, but the Caesar-actor would not truly know Cassius until he had already conned the part of Caesar. This would have made the Caesar-actor especially alert to Cassius' moves in rehearsal, which would have contributed to a dissonance in Caesar's character: hyper-alert, yet dismissive; oblivious, yet paranoid.

With the word "dangerous" (80), Cassius cues a "Flourish and shout [within]" as Brutus worries that the people will "choose Caesar for their king" (81). These shouts from the crowd

probably would have been performed offstage as chants of “Caesar.” Consequently, Cassius’ “dangerous” simultaneously cues Brutus’ fear and the familiar refrain of Caesar’s name. When Caesar re-enters the scene, he cues Antony with “dangerous,” the same cue with which Cassius had just signaled shouts of Caesar’s name. The two men unknowingly mimic one another, engaging in a blind debate about what it means to be “dangerous.” This exchange of cues prompts a question about which character is truly dangerous as each character constructs danger differently. Caesar insists that Cassius is dangerous because he looks “lean and “hungry” (193), which is why he prefers men who are “fat” (191). At his most perceptive, Caesar remarks that Cassius is a “great observer” (201). Cassius’ “hold me dangerous” is facetiously self-referential but directed at Caesar. The phrase begs context:

> Were I a common laughter, or did use
> To stale with ordinary oaths my love
> To every new protestor; if you know
> That I do fawn on men, and hug them hard,
> And after scandal them; or if you know
> That I profess myself in banqueting
> To all the rout, then hold me dangerous. (72-78)

Cassius argues that “dangerous” is the politician who charms the masses, who flatters everyone and admires no one. Cassius is not dangerous because he is not like Caesar. Caesar, however, insists that Cassius is dangerous because he is not like Antony, who smiles and enjoys plays. Both characters use “dangerous” to cue their auditors and both characterizations rely on descriptions of those whom they do not resemble. Caesar and Cassius use the cue space to mirror one another and establish an early rivalry that leaves Brutus sidelined. Later, in his room, away from the public gaze, Caesar calls himself dangerous:

> The gods do this in shame of cowardice.
> Caesar should be a beast without a heart
> If he should stay at home today for fear.
> No, Caesar shall not. Danger knows full well

That Caesar is more dangerous than he.
We are two lions littered in one day,
And I the elder and more terrible,
And Caesar shall go forth. (2.2.41-48)

Here, danger is the better alternative to cowardice, the disease which everyone in this play is mortally afraid of catching, but Caesar appears to be trying to convince himself. Ironically, multiple meanings of "dangerous" trick Caesar into describing himself as "difficult or awkward to deal with; haughty, arrogant; rigorous, hard, severe: the opposite of affable" (def. 1.a). Caesar's *dangerous* also allows for weakness: "difficult to please; particular, ticklish; fastidious, nice, dainty, delicate" (def. 1.b). Caesar likely means "Fraught with danger or risk; causing or occasioning danger; perilous, hazardous, risky, unsafe" (def. 2), but the term also allows for the inverse: "In danger, as from illness; dangerously ill" (def. 4). *Danger's* multiplicity functions at Caesar's expense and taps into the ambivalence he embodies.

Caesar's second scene offers the actor three distinct performance choices: 1) Play Caesar as fearful, wearing a front of brash fearlessness. 2) Play a Caesar who genuinely does not fear his own death, either because he believes it impossible or because he thinks it inevitable. 3) Play an ambiguous Caesar, both paranoid and oblivious. A list of one-word cues is fairly opaque, but longer cues allow the Caesar-actor more information:

[My] lord?
[your] [house] today
[do] [fear] them
[death] [of] princes
[within] [the] beast
[prevail] [in] this
[the] [Senate] House
[he] [is] sick
[tell] [them] so
[dream] [is] signified
[love] [is] liable
[Good] [morrow,] Caesar
['tis] [strucken] eight

[most] [noble] Caesar
[had] [been] further (2.2.1-125)

The phrases "death of princes," "within the beast," "dream is signified," and "love is liable" are full of ominous prophecy (31, 40, 90, 104), as is Caesar's entrance cue, "*Thunder and Lightning*." Some of the cues are empty, functional formalities, but most are significant. The first few map out the trajectory of Caesar's downfall, moving from Caesar and Calpurnia's house to the Senate House, where Calpurnia's dream will be "signified" (9, 59). "Love" is labeled as "liable" (104), which means "legally subject or amenable to" (def. 1.a); an alternate meaning is "exposed or subject to, or likely to suffer from" (def. 3.a). It is possible, though unlikely, that the Caesar-actor would have received the full line, "reason to my love is liable," as his cue. The full line possesses a double meaning: Either love is likely to suffer from reason, or reason is subject to love. The abbreviated cue, however, places love in an ambiguous position of subjectivity, marginalized by some unknown entity. There is another significant discrepancy between cue and full speech in "dream is signified" (90). As ambiguous cue, the words simply suggest that Calpurnia's dream, the dominant subject of this scene, is a sign of something significant. The full speech, uttered by Decius, insists that Calpurnia has misinterpreted her dream. In this case, there is more truth in the cue than in the lines that would have remained mysterious to the Caesar-actor until rehearsal. Juxtaposed with the ominous, early cues, the cheerful "Good morrow, Caesar" and "most noble Caesar" ring with an irony that may have affected the delivery of Caesar's only benevolent lines in the entire play (108, 117). The Caesar-actor may have chosen to push against this confrontational set of cues with fearlessness or submit with fearfulness, but he likely would have incorporated some of both into his performance. To further emphasize the ambivalence of this play and how it continues to be haunted by Caesar's name, I will conclude this section with a cue analysis of Cassius, Caesar's most significant antagonist.

Cassius' early cues are practical and full of motion. More externally focused, they lack the reflective qualities of Caesar's cues. In the first act, a sequence of "king," then "death," then "Caesar" predicts the trajectory of the entire play (1.2.79, 89, 133). Cassius' other cues often denote specific actions: "Pass," "returning," "shouted", and "eating" (24, 177, 230, 291). Most importantly, Cassius' name is notably absent from his early cues. Though Cassius is arguably at the center of the play (he has many more lines than Caesar), his cues suggest otherwise. Cassius' character, like Caesar's, suggests ambivalence. An actor might play a sympathetic Cassius who displays genuine affection for Brutus, or he might play a sinister Cassius who determines that Brutus must be "seduced" (311). The Act Four Quarrel Scene between Brutus and Cassius encourages the former characterization, while Cassius' aside in Act One suggests the latter. Most of Cassius' characterization as villain comes from Caesar's whisperings with Antony as well as the singular aforementioned aside. The cutting of this aside leaves a production of *Caesar* with an entirely different Cassius. Such a cut would emphasize Cassius' sympathetic qualities; he would conclude the first act with the democratic phrase, "think of the world."

The Early Modern actor would have realized from his own part that if he were to portray Cassius as thoroughly sinister, conniving, and manipulative, then Cassius and Brutus' Quarrel Scene would have been jarring. In this scene, Cassius displays what must be genuine affection for Brutus, and he foreshadows the quarrel scene's anxious affection early in the play: "I have not from your eyes that gentleness / And show of love as I was wont to have" (1.2.33-34). Another point to consider is Cassius' insecurity, a trait uncharacteristic of the caricatured villain. Before Caesar's assassination, Cassius requires reassurance from Brutus (3.1.19-24). Cassius' self-consciousness is interesting to consider with respect to the performative function of names

as cues. The incessant repetition of Caesar's name in the cue space encourages other actors, including the Cassius-actor, to feel sidelined.

Throughout the play, Cassius uses repeated and recurring cues to his advantage. Early in the play, he is cued by Caesar's "falling sickness;" he then cues Caska with this exact phrase, potentially baiting the Caska-actor into an interruption with the repeated cue and taking the opportunity to transform Caesar's literal sickness into the conspirators' figurative sickness (1.2.253, 255). In a display of skillful rhetoric, Cassius shifts the focus away from Caesar and onto his own justification for the conspirators' plot. Later, Cassius captures Brutus' attention in the Quarrel Scene with a repeated cue and a rare deployment of his own name in the cue space:

> Come, Antony, and young Octavius, come,
> Revenge yourselves alone on **Cassius**,
> For **Cassius** is a-weary of the world:
> Hated by one he loves, braved by his brother,
> Checked like a bondman; all his faults observed,
> Set in a notebook, learned and conned by rote
> To cast into my teeth. O I could weep
> My spirit from mine eyes! There is my dagger,
> And here my naked breast: within, a heart
> Dearer than Pluto's mine, richer than gold.
> If that thou beest a Roman, take it forth.
> I that denied thee gold will give my heart.
> Strike as thou didst at Caesar: for I know,
> When thou didst hate him worst, thou lov'dst him better
> Than ever thou lov'dst **Cassius**. (4.3.92-106)

Cassius' use of the repeated cue is focused and pre-meditated, pitched at his most vulnerable moment. As the conversation becomes tense, Cassius repeats his name three times. Since the Brutus-actor's cue would have only read "Cassius" or "thou lov'dst Cassius," the repeated cue offers the potential for Brutus to deliver his next lines prematurely. The repetition of Cassius, coupled with the implication of Brutus' preference for Caesar, suggests that Cassius is invoking his own death early in order to solicit Brutus' sympathy. This is an act of either genuine or

manipulative vulnerability. With the repetition of his own name, Cassius fights back against the repetition of "Caesar" which has consumed the entire play. In addition, Cassius reintroduces the conversation about performance that he began in his earlier denigration of *dangerous* Caesar. He imagines now that Brutus has "set in a notebook, learned and conned by rote" all of his faults (97). "By rote" has performance connotations: "Mechanical practice or performance; regular procedure; routine" (def. 4) The phrase is evocative of mastering the part which an actor would "pore over, peruse, commit to memory; to inspect, scan, examine" (def. II.3.a). Cassius, the most self-conscious performer, is suggesting that Brutus has practiced and mastered, through repetition, Cassius' shortcomings, and is now performing them in a brutal act of humiliation. The speech includes an embedded stage direction that suggests Cassius should present Brutus with an unsheathed dagger (99). To increase tension, the Cassius-actor might choose to unsheathe the dagger at the first "Cassius," baiting the Brutus-actor into an interruption.

Stephen Greenblatt, anecdotally quoting former president Bill Clinton, argues that characters like Macbeth and Brutus fail because their ambitions lack an "ethically adequate object" (5). If Caesar can be considered *Caesar's* protagonist, then he has a similar problem. In the context of the play, he no longer has any sort of object, ethical or not, towards which to direct his ambitions. His performance of character can only be passive. His role *is* the object towards which everyone else's ambitions are directed. He trudges towards death, dogged by the jealous glares of "lean" and "hungry" men, surrounded by the weight of his name. Greenblatt notes that Brutus kills Caesar because "[Caesar] was ambitious," and Antony commends Brutus as the only conspirator who killed Caesar for reasons other than ambition (25). Shakespeare's Caesar is placed in an awkward position; he begins the play in the highest position of power, which makes him difficult to characterize as anything other than greatness in the past tense. What becomes

tragic about the play, then, is that Brutus' name is the appropriate weight to replace Caesar's, but Brutus resists the replacement. His resistance becomes the play's tragedy. Furthermore, the fact that Caesar is nothing more than a name that needs replacing suggests that Brutus and Cassius' republic is already dead, which renders Caesar's death meaningless. Not only do the conspirators lack an "ethically adequate object," they fail to replace the stability they destroy. In the following section, I will consider another protagonist that lacks an "ethically adequate object" and perhaps even lacks ambition. Unlike Caesar, Coriolanus is introduced prior to his character's attachment to the honorific that is his name.

III. What Coriolanus Lacks

In "Wound-man: Coriolanus, Gender, and the Theatrical Construction of Interiority," Cynthia Marshall highlights and unpacks the "rhetoric of absence" that critics adopt when approaching *Coriolanus*.[6] Marshall writes, "In Coriolanus we glimpse the emergence of the heroic masculinity that has become our culture's dominant ideal of male identity, but it appears here in a form that seems, with historical hindsight, flawed and incomplete" (94). According to Marshall, Coriolanus' wounds, and his refusal to show them, frequently signify for critics a lack of inwardness, emotional depth, or masculinity. But for Marshall, Coriolanus suggests a 'lack' not because his character fails to portray a "ready-made" subjectivity or interiority (though Marshall notes that psychological depth and motives are often projected onto his character by critics so that interiority may be read), but because Coriolanus performs the violent birth of "subjective identity." Furthermore, Coriolanus' character "emphasizes the part played by the audience in the formation of character, by underscoring conflicts between verbal and embodied forms of meaning and by withholding the usual means (soliloquy and direct address) of establishing intimacy between characters and audience" (95). In *Coriolanus*, then, absence (or lack) is a production, or what Marshall calls a "theatrical effect," and I will argue that this theatrical effect is prominently displayed in the cue space.

The cues that Coriolanus delivers to other characters move from an early emphasis on

6. Marshall cites Jonathan Goldberg, Michael Goldman, Paul Cantor, Stanley Cavell, and Janet Adelman (115).

difference to a later emphasis on absence. In the first scene of the play, before he has become Coriolanus, Caius Martius begins to establish class difference by delivering multi-syllabic, mouthful cues, such as “shouting their emulation” and “for insurrection’s arguing” (1.1.209, 216), and creative insults, such as “Make yourselves scabs?” and “home you fragments” (161, 217). In contrast, most of the cues Martius receives in the first scene of the play are curt and monosyllabic: “word,” “stored,” “troop,” “them,” “strange,” “arms,” “arms,” “gone” (161, 184, 198, 209, 216, 219, 223, 243). After Martius is renamed Coriolanus at the end of the first act, he more frequently deploys cues that emphasize his own “lack.” In the second scene of Act Two, Coriolanus cues his own exit with a sequence of cues that emphasize absence: “I got them,” “as they weigh,” and “my nothings monstered” (69-74). The first phrase includes two pronouns and an ambiguous verb. The second features a contrast between an empty pronoun and a weighty verb. The third explicitly imagines absence, or “nothings,” becoming exaggerated and grotesque. The deeds for which Martius would have others admire him are undermined for the sake of *nothings*. For Coriolanus, “nothings” are both wounds and names, identity markers that are important only for a public’s desire to see them. By “monstered,” Coriolanus means “To make a monster of; to make monstrous; (also) to transform (something) *into* a monstrous version of itself” (def. 1); he also means “To exhibit as a ‘monster’; to point out as something remarkable” (def. 2), but he also means “To assume the appearance of greatness” (def. 3).The necessity and inevitability of performance exaggerates and monsters those parts of Coriolanus that he would prefer to keep hidden; performance augments and mutates his shortcomings.

In the next scene, Coriolanus initiates a call-and-response cue that almost repeats itself in a kind of slant reverberation as he addresses three citizens:

> CORIOLANUS Bid them wash their faces
> And keep their teeth clean. So, here comes a brace.

You know the cause, sir, of my standing here.
3 CITIZEN We do, sir. Tell us what hath brought you to't.
CORIOLANUS Mine own **desert**.
2 CITIZEN Your own **desert.**
CORIOLANUS Ay, but not mine own **desire.**
3 CITIZEN How not your own **desire?**
CORIOLANUS No, sir, 'twas never my desire yet to trouble the
poor with begging. (2.3.60-69)

Here, Coriolanus uses the cue space to explain to the citizens that his "desert" is what brings him before the public (not his desire). Coriolanus delivers "Mine own desert" then the almost identical "Mine own desire," as he is cued with "your own desert" and then "your own desire" (2.3.64-67). The desert/desire pairing emphasizes Coriolanus' confused motivation. Coriolanus puns on the notion that his desire, desert-like, is performed with no immediately apparent motive. Coriolanus' desire is incidental because he is subject to demands that he perform a political role. The pairing also puns on the global trajectory of the narrative. Coriolanus will soon desert his republic, even as his republic deserts him. He will desire titles before he deserts them, and his public will desire him before it deserts him. In this way, the cue space allows a brief interaction to represent, metonymically, the larger action of the play, just as interpersonal interactions often mimic the larger interactions of collective political bodies. All of this is cued through an image that emphasizes lack: a desert of desire. As Marshall notes, "Shakespeare did not come upon a ready-made concept of interior self-hood, but participated in its creation; here, we see a step in the process of that creation" (104). The step Marshall refers to is that Coriolanus begins to recognize that he is being forced to perform and that performance is inseparable from his identity. "Between the body and language," the cue space encourages the Coriolanus-actor to perform in a way that emphasizes contrast and dissonance.

Similarly, the names "Martius" and "Coriolanus" operate in the cue space in a way that highlights the performative nature of identity. In the play's first scene, before the protagonist is

Coriolanus and while he is still Martius, he is cued by his original name twice (158, 217). These early name cues are obligatory because the re-naming that will occur towards the end of this first act must be anticipated as publicly significant. Upon being renamed, Coriolanus is quickly cued by his new name, and "my Lord," the cue that immediately follows, is appropriately reverent (1.9.66-67). Coriolanus' final cue in the scene, "name," cements the transformation (88). The emphasis on names in the cue space offers the actor a choice. The Coriolanus-actor may either respect the transfer of names and perform accordingly, or he may choose to emphasize Coriolanus' consistent contempt for the transient hollowness of identity. Marshall argues that this shifting of names represents "the uneasy foundation of Martius' masculine identity." For Marshall, "Although the addition of the honorific "Coriolanus" seems initially to record his attainment of coherent identity, the name depends on his political loyalty to Rome, and eventually the exiled Martius rejects it" (108). In this sense, the naming is a bait-and-switch. It initially suggests that Coriolanus has realized a public identity, but eventually serves to only represent the "desert" of Coriolanus' "desire," or the dissatisfaction Coriolanus feels with respect to his identity's dependence on performance. In the cue space, the re-naming foreshadows the political endeavors in which Coriolanus will fail. Of course, the name "Coriolanus" is not causal to the character's subsequent campaign for consul. One could argue that he does *need* to perform the trappings of importance. But he does need to perform, in some sense of the word, some kind of domestic or civilian role (a role that is not 'martial hero') in order to function in his society. The name functions as an empty signifier of identity performance. The name only presents itself so that Coriolanus, and eventually others, may reject it. The tragedy of Coriolanus' character is that he is constantly reacting to roles that he would reject.

At the beginning of his renaming scene, Coriolanus delivers a strange, rhythmic cue, "hear themselves remembered" (1.9.29). The cue wistfully describes the entire point of having names, preserving them, and promoting them in the first place. The owners of names enjoy hearing themselves remembered, but names are also "praises sauced with lies," a sentiment Coriolanus delivers in the subsequent cue that he will later prove true when he fails to live up to the public's expectations of his new honorific (52). Like Caesar's, Coriolanus' name sets him up for failure. Coriolanus, now an important public figure, must perform the trappings of importance. He refuses to perform, and his country rejects him. After he is cast out of Rome, Coriolanus is repeatedly cued with the interrogative phrase "name?" as Aufidius attempts to determine his identity:

AUFIDIUS
Whence com'st thou? What wouldst thou? Thy **name?**
Why speak'st not? Speak, man. What's thy **name?**
CORIOLANUS [*unmuffling*] If, Tullus,
Not yet thou knowest me, and seeing me dost not
Think me for the man I am, necessity
Commands me name myself.
AUFIDIUS What is thy **name?**
CORIOLANUS
A name unmusical to the Volscians' ears,
And harsh in sound to thine.
AUFIDIUS Say, what's thy **name?**
Thou hast a grim appearance and thy face
Bears a command in't. Though thy tackle's torn,
Thou show'st a noble vessel. What's thy **name?**
CORIOLANUS
Prepare thy brow to frown. Know'st thou me yet?
AUFIDIUS
I know thee not. Thy **name?** (4.5.55-66).

Aufidius not only cues Coriolanus with "name" four times in succession, he also deploys "name" as a repeated cue in lines 55-56 and lines 61-64. The exchange emphasizes Coriolanus' vulnerability. This flood of names would have made it difficult for the Coriolanus-actor to know

when to begin speaking and maintain a rhythm; the repetition would have encouraged him to speak prematurely. In this sense, the cue space encourages an awkward combat between hesitation and potential interruption. Coriolanus hesitates to name himself because the name that he was awarded by Rome has been undermined since he has been cast out. Coriolanus makes it clear that Aufidius does not "know" him until he knows his name, and Coriolanus' humble appearance, coupled with his renaming history, confuses the situation. Like the Romans in *Julius Caesar*, Coriolanus emphasizes the sounds of names: his name is "unmusical" and "harsh" (60-61). When Coriolanus introduces himself, he is frank about the emptiness of his surname:

> My name is Caius Martius who hath done
> To thee particularly and to all the Volsces
> Great hurt and mischief. Thereto witness may
> My surname Coriolanus. The painful service,
> The extreme dangers and the drops of blood
> Shed for my thankless country are requited
> But with that surname - a good memory
> And witness of the malice and displeasure
> Which thou shouldst bear me. Only that name remains. (67-75)

His name is a "memory," a phantom, a ghost without origin (73). It is an empty gesture awarded by a "thankless country" (72). Yet, it is the only identity marker Coriolanus has that will allow Aufidius to recognize him. After Coriolanus reveals himself, Aufidius calls him "Martius" and embraces him (104-112). Aufidius' use of "Martius" may suggest affection, or it might suggest a kind of overly familiar disrespect, a disingenuousness that would suggest Aufidius simply intends to use Coriolanus for his own purposes, then dispose of him. At the end of the play, Aufidius mocks Coriolanus with the name "Martius" before the Volscians dispose of him. In a cue, Aufidius pairs the name with a treasonous noun: "Ay, 'traitor', Martius" (5.6.88). Coriolanus returns the name incredulously, "'Martius'?, " a reverse of Caesar's "et tu, Brute?"

(89). Before Coriolanus is killed, his original name “Martius” is thrown around like something unsavory and unwanted.

Beyond nameplay, Coriolanus often delivers cues that draw attention to his own performance and that comment on performance in the abstract. Though Coriolanus cannot quite hide his contempt for the people of Rome, his part would have suggested to the Early Modern actor that he does, for at least a few lines of prose, attempt to perform the role of public servant. In his prose speech, Coriolanus promises to “flatter [his] sworn brother, the people, to earn a dearer estimation of them” and “practise the insinuating nod and be off to them most counterfeitly” (2.3.94-95, 97-98). Though Coriolanus chooses to adopt the formal elements of common speech, he refers to performance in the pejorative. Coriolanus seems to understand that political life requires the learned skill of social maneuvering, but the word “counterfeit” presents a problem. “Counterfeitly” can mean “in a counterfeit manner; feignedly, pretendedly, deceitfully, falsely” (def. adv.), or if we refer to the Chaucerian verb form “To make a fraudulent imitation of, forge (e.g. coin, bank-notes, handwriting)” (def. 1.b), or the adjective form from Caxton “Transformed in appearance, disguised” (def. 3).The problem of counterfeiting is a dilemma of character. The use of the term implies the existence of a more genuine or ideal form. When one counterfeits paper money, for example, one is imitating a version that is more valuable and less deceitful. There exists a physical representation of this ideal that can be held and compared with the counterfeit version. The ideal Roman or citizen of the state, however, is an abstract concept. The ideal is subjective, manipulated in different ways for different purposes by different people. For Coriolanus, the performance of identity dismantles his idea of social hierarchy and privileged power structures. Ironically, Coriolanus berates “custom” as his enemy; he resents the notion that politicians must politick, and he resents the lines that have been written

for him (2.3.115). Coriolanus sees his existence as a binary, "I am half through; The one part suffer'd, the other will I do," between his 'genuine' self and his performed self (121-122). Coriolanus is hyper-aware of the performance required of him, yet he cannot hide his contempt for performance itself, which implies a tension between character and actor.

In the scene in which the people demand to see his wounds, Coriolanus cues a citizen with "enigma" (87), which can mean either "A short composition in prose or verse, in which something is described by intentionally obscure metaphors, in order to afford an exercise for the ingenuity of the reader or hearer in guessing what is meant; a riddle" or "Something as puzzling as an enigma; an unsolved problem" (def. 1.b, 2) When Coriolanus asks the Citizen what his "enigma" is, he poses an ironic question. Clearly, the answer is Coriolanus himself. Coriolanus is a verse composition who temporarily converts to prose for political necessity. He is also a puzzle that the citizens of Rome will eventually refuse to solve, a "scourge to [Rome's] enemies" and "a rod to her friends" (2.3.80-89). He is the man who achieves martial deeds worthy of political titles but is not willing to perform the political humility that such titles necessitate. Coriolanus insists that the people should be glad that he has "not been common in [his] love" (92), as he twists his cue, "loved the common people" (91), from a potential object of love into a pejorative adjective. Continuing to speak in prose and in a bout of linguistic gymnastics, Coriolanus promises to "practise the insinuating nod" and perform "most counterfeitly," and refers to persuasion as "bewitchment" (98-99). "Insinuating" is the most clear pejorative, "that artfully works his way into company, position, favour, etc.; wily, wheedling, ingratiating. Of persons, their manner" (def. 2). Coriolanus' ideas about flattery suggest that men are born noble. Their nobility is a trait that should be paradoxically internal, yet also immediately apparent to outside observers so that the "insinuating nod" becomes unnecessary. As Coriolanus says, "Better it is to

die, better to starve / Than crave the hire which first we do deserve" (2.3.111-112). Nobility is something awarded at birth. One should not have to counterfeit nobility.

"Prank" is another performance pejorative that Coriolanus uses to refer to the tribunes' attempts to exercise, and then exorcise, authority:

> Behold, these are the tribunes of the people,
> The tongues o' the common mouth: I do despise them;
> For they do prank them in authority,
> Against all noble sufferance. (3.1.21-24)

"Prank" is nestled between two ambiguous pronouns that make it difficult to distinguish between the tribunes and their people. The tongue, the metonymic label Coriolanus consistently applies to the tribunes, serves as signifier for the "common" flattery that Coriolanus has already complained of. The tribunes perform authority; they claim to have authority, but in doing so they "prank" the people. One of prank's meanings has decorative connotations: "To fold, arrange in pleats; to decorate with pleats" (def. v^1). Then, there is the more obvious version that is still preserved in modern usage: "To play a trick or practical joke; to joke" (def. v^2). Another meaning has connotations of live performance: "To prance (in various senses); to caper, dance; to parade" (def. v^3). The combined layers construct a term that is deceptive, decorative, and prone to dance, a triumvirate of performance. Coriolanus hates the tribunes for their theatricality, not only for their deception, but for their reliance on prancing, decorative flattery to achieve power. When Coriolanus says, "I'll never be such a gosling to obey instinct, but stand, / As if a man were author of himself / And knew no other kin" (5.3.34-37), the "as if" suggests that Coriolanus becomes disillusioned with the notion that man "authors" himself and suspects that his performance may have already been decided for him. He suspects that he has lost control, "Like a dull actor now, / I have forgot my part, and I am out, / Even to a full disgrace" (40-42).

The part of Coriolanus is consistently self-referential, and its metadramatic awareness tragically undermines his failure to perform a satisfactory role.

Coriolanus also deploys metonymic labels for the common people. He cues them with a dismissive cadence, as "breath" or "voices" (2.2.144, 148). For Coriolanus, the only function the people serve is breathing, both in the sense of consuming air and in the sense of exhaling titles, exhortations, and expectations. Coriolanus responds to the entrance of three citizens with "Here come more voices" (2.3.123) and repeats "voices" several times throughout the same speech. Coriolanus, by contrast, is more than a breather. For Coriolanus, this authority of breath, voice, and tongue, of speech acts constructing identity, deployed by gaping, hungry, needy mouths filled with rows of dangerous teeth, is unstable and frightening because it undermines 'inherent' nobility. Coriolanus' final scene strips him of whatever nobility he has left. The scene is bookended by the vague pronoun "him." His last cue is a string of "kill, kill, kill, kill, kill him!" (5.6.131). He comes close to being ended by a verb, but the pronoun is tacked on at the end, adding insult to injury, as Coriolanus is deprived of the honorific of being ended with a concrete, specific word. The play again reminds us that the performance of identity is a violent process of want, lack, difference, and distance.

IV. A Proposed Pedagogy of Part Scripts

In a seminal composition theory essay, “Inventing the University,” David Bartholomae attempts to unpack some of the problems in beginning student writing. He determined that many students had trouble imagining an academic audience. Like Early Modern actors, undergraduate students are expected to develop and contextualize a public identity, to develop a “voice” with a limited understanding of the specific rules and context for that voice. Students and Shakespearean actors know that they must perform, and they adjust their methods according to the manner in which the performance is received. This is also how most graduate teaching assistantships in English departments work. While pursuing a degree in literary scholarship, new “teaching assistants” are thrust into a classroom in order to “figure out” how to perform the role of instructor by teaching rote composition, one of the most important and taxing courses (for both instructors and students) in the modern university. The audience cheers or jeers, usually some of both, but rarely does the relationship directly result in improved writing. Meanwhile, the GTA is taught that “a real job” will allow escape from the role of composition teacher.

I believe that the humanities graduate research degree in Literature is unsustainable in the changing academy. Along with my thesis, I include this brief, and I hope practical, discussion of pedagogy here to emphasize that many professional difficulties in the humanities stem from a lack of attention to pedagogy. In a thesis emphasizing close reading of texts, I do not wish to perpetuate the notion that the standard path for graduate level work should be a focus on scholarly research. Devoting a life and career to the primary resources that a scholar like Tiffany

Stern has access to is impractical for the majority of graduate students. Few graduate students have the means or the opportunity to access original documents, and few will ever have employment opportunities as full-time research scholars. This does not mean that thoughtful and careful analysis is without intellectual value. Palfrey and Stern's methods have a clear, practical usefulness; their deployment could enrich a classroom full of students with only a rudimentary understanding of Shakespeare. Some of their criticism is esoteric, to be sure, but it is easy to explain to people why Palfrey and Stern's research is important. Students are often bored by Shakespeare because his plays are presented to them as static, literary holy grails, all sloppiness and interactivity glossed over, a presentation which fosters a literary reverence that blockades critical thinking.

The specter of the 'complete' Shakespeare play need not continue to haunt classrooms. When Shakespeare's texts are taught as holistic, their interactive, fluid natures are reduced. Dismantling Shakespeare's idealized fictional authority would be a productive use of class time. Middle school and high school students especially would feel less inclined to avoid critical thinking via literary reverence and more inclined to mess around with the plays, tear them apart, and imagine how they might work (which is part of what I aspired to do in this thesis project). A Shakespeare play becomes itself not through the absolute control of an auteur figure, but through a collection of disjointed parts that have the potential to become a complete text. A pedagogy based on Palfrey and Stern's research methods would assign students to specific characters and encourage students to reflect on the experience of performing lines according to a sequence of unmarked cues. Students would be allowed to read from, and even alter, their characters' lines. Students would memorize their cues and study their individualized parts before viewing a complete text. Cues would glue the performance together. Any hiccups in performance would be

teachable moments, ripe for meta-cognitive discussion. Students would then reflect on how their selection of cues affected their construction of character. Critical writing assignments would ask students to consider how their cues made them think about their characters differently, whether the cues were easy or difficult to remember, how the performance of a cue by a peer changed their perception of what was once a static textual phrase. A pedagogical approach informed by Palfrey and Stern has the potential to bring true interactivity and collaborative learning to the classroom without the need for expensive technological gimmicks.

Conclusion

Dramatic texts would graft permanence onto something impermanent. They would presume to preserve something that is only alive in the first place because it will soon be over. A performance is altered as soon as it is documented, so in some ways it is impossible to analyze performance through dramatic texts. Nonetheless, Shakespeare has taught us that working within constraints can be a productive enterprise. Looking for the genesis of character in parts and cues can help complicate binary discussions about a character like Julius Caesar, contextualize discussions of ambivalence, lack, and difference in a character like Coriolanus, and ground debates over words like "interiority," "inwardness," and "agency. " More broadly, if we hope to analyze how text becomes performance becomes text, part of our role inevitably becomes speculation on which kinds of performance decisions might function as more permanent sites of characterization. We need more research of the kind that Palfrey and Stern have done, as well as more analysis of the cue space that considers the alternate possibilities of textual history. Cue analysis, perhaps most significantly, would benefit from pedagogical research that brings part scripts into the classroom and observes how students shape characters according to parts and cues. Palfrey and Stern's findings suggest that the constraints of Early Modern performance produced great theater. Teachers, critics, and researchers must also be frank and practical when it comes to constraints. I view this thesis project, then, as an argument for working within and acknowledging constraints.

Works Cited

Bartholomae, David. "Inventing the University." *Teaching Composition: Background Readings*. Ed. T. R. Johnson. New York, NY: Bedford/St. Martins, 2008. 3-31. Print.

Bloom, Harold. "The Taming of the Shrew." *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. New York: Riverhead, 1998. 28-36. Print.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990. Print.

"Con, v." *OED Online*. March 2013. Oxford UP. Web. 27 May 2013.

"Counterfeit, v." OED Online. March 2013. Oxford UP. Web. 25 February 2014.

"Counterfeitly, adv." OED Online. March 2013. Oxford UP. Web. 25 February 2014.

"Counterfeiting, adj." OED Online. March 2013. Oxford UP. Web. 25 February 2014.

Daniell, David. Introduction. *Julius Caesar*. By William Shakespeare. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2002.1-147. Print.

"Dangerous, adj." *OED Online*. March 2013. Oxford UP. Web. 27 May 2013.

Delaney, Bill. "Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. " *Explicator* 58.3 (2000): 124-128. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 6 June 2014.

Desmet, Christy. *Reading Shakespeare's Characters: Rhetoric, Ethics, and Identity*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1992. Print.

"Enigma, n." OED Online. March 2013. Oxford UP. Web. 15 February 2014.

Grady, Hugh. "Moral Agency and Its Problems in *Julius Caesar*: Political Power, Choice, and History." *Shakespeare and Moral Agency*. London: Continuum, 2010.15-28. Print.

Greenblatt, Stephen. "Shakespeare and the Uses of Power."*New York Review of Books* 54.6 (2007): 75-82. *Master FILE Premier*. Web. 25 May 2013.

Greenwald, Michael L. "'An Enterprise of Great Pitch and Moment': *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra* at the Alley Theatre, 1996." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48.1 (1997): 84-90. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 May 2013.

Julius Caesar. By William Shakespeare. Perf. Benjamin Curns. Blackfriars Playhouse, American Shakespeare Center, Staunton. 9 March 2013. Performance.

Jurgenson, Nathan. "The Disconnectionists." *The New Inquiry*, 13 Nov. 2013. Web. 3 Feb. 2014.

"Liable, adj."*OED Online*. March 2013. Oxford UP. Web. 27 May 2013.

Marshall, Cynthia. "Wound Man." *Feminist Readings of Early Modern Culture: Emerging Subjects*. Ed. Traub, Valerie, M. Lindsay. Kaplan, and Dympna Callaghan. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 93-119. Print.

Maus, Katharine Eisaman. *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1995. Print.

McNamee, Lawrence F. "The First Production of *Julius Caesar* on the German Stage." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 10.3 (1959): 409-421. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 May 2013.

Miola, Robert S. "*Julius Caesar* and the Tyrannicide Debate." *Renaissance Quarterly* 38.2 (1985): 271-289. *Historical Abstracts with Full Text*. Web. 6 June 2014.

"Monster, v. " *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, March 2014. Web. 4 April 2014.

O'Dair, Sharon. "Conduct (Un)becoming or, Playing the Warrior in *Macbeth*." *Shakespeare and Moral Agency*. Ed. Michael Bristol. London: Continuum, 2010. Print.

Palfrey, Simon, and Tiffany Stern. *Shakespeare in Parts*. Oxford UP, 2007. Print.

Paolucci, Anne. "The Tragic Hero in Julius Caesar. " *Shakespeare Quarterly* 11.3 (1960): 329-333. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 6 June 2014.

Phelan, Peggy. *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*. London: Routledge, 1993. Print.

Plutarch. *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes*. *Julius Caesar*. Appendix. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2002. 323-371. Print.

"Prank, v." OED Online. March 2013. Oxford UP. Web. 10 February 2014.

"Preface to the Reader." The Holinshed Texts (1577, Volume 1, P. 4 with Companion Text). *(*1577*,* Volume 1, P. 4 with Companion Text*)*. Ed. Paulina Kewes, Ian Archer, Felicity Heal, and Henry Summerson. The Holinshed Project. Web. 05 May 2014.

"Rote, n.1."*OED Online*. March 2013. Oxford UP. Web. 27 May 2013.

Rutter, Carol Chillington. "Facing History, Facing Now: Deborah Warner's *Julius Caesar* at the

Barbican Theatre." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 57.1 (2006): 71-85. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 May 2013.

Schanzer, Ernest. *The Problem Plays of Shakespeare; a Study of Julius Caesar, Measure for Measure, Antony and Cleopatra.* New York: Schocken, 1963. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Coriolanus*. Ed. Peter Holland. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2011. Print.

—. *Julius Caesar*. Ed. David Daniell. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2002. Print.

Taylor, Myron. "Shakespeare's Julius Caesar And The Irony of History." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 24.3 (1973): 301-308. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 5 June 2014.

Walker, Roy. "Unto Caesar: A Review Of Recent Productions. " *Shakespeare Survey* 11. (1958): 128-135. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 6 June 2014.

Yachnin, Paul Edward, and Jessica Slights. "Introduction." *Shakespeare and Character: Theory, History, Performance, and Theatrical Persons*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. 1-21. Print.

Yu, Jeffrey J. "Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, Erasmus's *De Copia*, And Sentential Ambiguity. " *Comparative Drama* 41.1 (2007): 79-106. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 6 June 2014.