

SHAKESPEARE AND THE CLASSICS

by Lydia Baumbach
(University of Cape Town)

The subject I have chosen for this paper¹ is an ambitious one, covering as it does a wide and well-trodden field of scholarship. It raises many questions, to some of which we may never find a satisfactory answer. So I have decided to limit myself to a restricted corner of the field, choosing three of Shakespeare's Roman plays, *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *Coriolanus*, and examining first some of the questions which have been raised by generations of Shakespearean scholars, then looking briefly at Shakespeare's main source for the three plays and finally concentrating on certain aspects of the plays which best illustrate Shakespeare's use of the Classics.

One of the much-discussed questions goes back to 1623, when Ben Jonson made his well-known statement imputing to Shakespeare 'small Latine and lesse Greeke'; we ask ourselves, 'Is this true?' It is a question which has occupied the minds of generations of Shakespearean scholars, some of whom tend to the opinion that Shakespeare had more of a classical education than Jonson gave him credit for. One of the longest and most ambitious treatises on the subject is T. W. Baldwin's *William Shakspeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke* written in 1944. In two volumes, he goes into great detail about what was taught in the grammar schools of Shakespeare's day; but as J. A. K. Thomson, writing in 1952² points out 'Professor Baldwin tells us in very great detail what Shakespeare *could* have learned at school. But the hard fact is that we do not know what amount of schooling Shakespeare had.' Yet Shakespeare's plays are full of allusions to the Classics, and many of the plays are set in Greek and Roman times. It has been pointed out that the ancient world supplies the setting for one third of the Shakespearean canon – two of the comedies, both narrative poems, four of the five romances, and six of the eleven tragedies.³ Apart from that, the plays with a non-classical setting are permeated with references to Greek mythology, Greek and Roman Literature, History and Philosophy, and permeated in such a way that suggests more than a passing acquaintance with the subject. I give you two examples, the first from *The Merchant of Venice*, lines 1–14.

Enter Lorenzo and Jessica

Lor. The moon shines bright: in such a night as this
When the sweet wind did gently kiss the trees
And they did make no noise — in such a night
Troilus methinks mounted the Troyan walls,
And sighed his soul towards the Grecian tents,
Where Cressid lay that night.

- Jes. In such a night
 Did Thisbe fearfully o'ertrip the dew
 And saw the lion's shadow ere himself
 And ran amazed away.
- Lor. In such a night
 Stood Dido with a willow in her hand
 Upon the sea-banks, and waft her love
 To come again to Carthage.
- Jes. In such a night
 Medea gathered the enchanted herbs
 That did renew old Aeson.

Even though Shakespeare did not get his references quite right – e.g. Dido did not try to waft Aeneas back to Carthage with a willow wand in her hand – yet the poet shows more than a passing acquaintance with classical and medieval literature.

My other example comes from history, and shows Shakespeare's knowledge of Julius Caesar's famous boast 'Veni, vidi, vici.' Plutarch in his *Life of Caesar*⁴ tells of Caesar's victory over Pharnaces near Zela: 'And because he would advertise one of his friends of the suddenness of this victory, he only wrote three words unto Anitius at Rome: 'veni, vidi, vici.' In *Henry IV* Part II Falstaff boasts:

'I have foundered nine score and odd posts; and here, travel-tainted as I am, have, in my pure and immaculate valour, taken Sir John Coleville of the dale, a most furious knight and valorous enemy. But what of that: He saw me and yielded; that I may justly say, with the hook-nosed fellow of Rome, 'I came, saw and overcame.'⁵

But the question still remains: did Shakespeare know enough Latin to be able to go straight to the sources, or was his knowledge of the Classics derived solely from the translations which existed in Elizabethan England, such as Golding's translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and North's Plutarch? Perhaps this is an unfair question to ask, reflecting as it does the 20th century classical scholar's attitude to source material, and a disregard, or perhaps misconception, of how a poet and particularly a playwright works. We must beware (to use Tennyson's words) of joining 'the prosaic set of editors of booklets, book-worms, index-hunters, or men of great memories and no imagination, who *impute themselves* to the poet, and so believe that *he*, too, has no imagination, but is forever poking his nose among the pages of some old volume in order to see what he can appropriate'.⁶ That Shakespeare must have been able to read Latin sufficiently is shown by the fact that some of his sources, as far as we know, did not exist in translated form in his day, such as Seneca's *Hercules Furens* and Ovid's *Fasti* Book II, which has certain echoes in Shakespeare's *Lucrece* (1.730): 'A captive victor that hath lost in gain' — cf. *Fasti* 2.811: 'quid victor, gaudes: haec te victoria perdet'. On the other hand, the Renaissance in England was a time when many translations of the Classical authors were in circulation, and these were

almost certainly familiar to Shakespeare, his friends and audiences; the very air he breathed seemed permeated with echoes of classical literature. As is so often the case, the famous Dr. Johnson sums up the question very neatly when he says: ‘Some have imagined, that they have discovered deep learning in many imitations of old writers; but the examples which I have heard urged, were drawn from books translated in his time; or were such easy coincidences of thought, as will happen to all who consider the same subjects; or such remarks on life or axioms of morality as float in conversation, and are transmitted through the world in proverbial sayings. . . . It is most likely that he learned Latin sufficiently to make him acquainted with the construction [i.e. capable of translating Latin word by word], but that he never advanced to an easy perusal of the Roman authors’.⁷

In addition, we may point out that Shakespeare was a busy man of the theatre; he wrote and produced at least two plays a year; it has been estimated that he wrote more than a million words in twenty years, and we ask ourselves, where in the midst of all the activity of writing and stage production he would have found the time and the leisure to sit down and painstakingly translate all the Latin and Greek authors he used to inspire his plays – even if he had been perfectly able to do so.

Another question which has been much discussed by Shakespearean scholars is the extent to which Shakespeare’s Roman plays give a true picture of the Roman world. In 1680 Nahum Tate wrote: ‘I am sure he never touches on a Roman story, but the Persons, the Passages, the Manners, the Circumstances, the Ceremonies, are all Roman’.⁸ This view has had some notable adherents, amongst others Dryden, Pope, Samuel Johnson. Pope, e.g. found him ‘very knowing in the customs, rites and manners of Antiquity. In *Coriolanus* and *Julius Caesar* not only the Spirit, but the Manners of the Romans are exactly drawn, and a still nicer distinction is shown between the manners of the Romans in the time of the former and of the latter’.⁹ But other scholars take the opposite view, that ‘Shakespeare’s Romans are Elizabethans in togas’.¹⁰

It has long been the fashion to show where Shakespeare made mistakes in his representation of the Roman world; as John W. Velz puts it: ‘¹¹ from the time of John Dennis’s *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Shakespeare* (1712) it has become a scholarly parlor game to enumerate Shakespeare’s blunders in the Roman plays’. There certainly are many anachronisms in Shakespeare; I am sure everyone immediately thinks of the Romans tossing up their sweaty night-caps, or the clock striking three, or the reference to Caesar as the ‘chief bishop’ of Rome. But there is no doubt that the question goes much deeper than the game of finding these anachronisms; the question is concerned with the world Shakespeare depicts in his Roman plays: is it Roman or Elizabethan? So much has been written on the subject that it is impossible to do justice to the question in a paper of this nature; all I wish to say here is that the general consensus of opinion seems to be that Shakespeare ‘on the one hand loyally accepted his authorities and never deviated from them on their main route, but on the other

treated them unquestioningly from his own point of view, and probably never even suspected that their own might be different';¹² in other words he used his sources carefully, but infused into them the spirit of his own age, or, to go even further, the spirit of universality, which would have made *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus* acceptable to Elizabethan and Jacobean audiences, and to audiences of every generation, who might see in them confirmation of their capitalist, Marxist or democratic views. A scholar of Shakespeare's own time, Leonard Digges, an Oxford graduate, expressed the idea very well when, comparing Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* with Ben Jonson's *Catiline* and *Sejanus*, he wrote:

‘So have I seen when Caesar would appear,
And on the stage at half-sword parley were
Brutus and Cassius: oh! how the audiences
Were ravished, with what wonder went they thence;
When some new day they would not brook a line
Of tedious though well-labour'd Catiline, —
Sejanus too was irksome. . . .’¹³

A brief look at certain aspects of *Coriolanus* will suffice to show how Shakespeare used a Roman setting but made it relevant to his own day. In this play, Coriolanus is shown to be proud and hated by the people as a result. Shakespeare may well have been influenced by the reputation of Sir Walter Raleigh. Just like Coriolanus, he had had a successful military career from an early age. But he had many enemies because of his pride, his extortion and contempt of the poor. I quote part of a letter written by a certain A.B., writing to the Lord Treasurer Burghley in 1586: ‘No man is more hated than him; none cursed more daily by the poor, of whom infinite numbers are brought to extreme poverty by the gift of cloth to him. His pride is intolerable, without regard to any, as the world knows’. Further, Plutarch speaks of sedition at Rome as the result of famine, and in the opening scene of Shakespeare's play there is a near-riot of citizens who are suffering hunger as the result of a shortage of corn. A similar situation arose in England in 1607, the year before *Coriolanus* was first produced, when there was rioting and unrest in Leicestershire, Northamptonshire and Warwickshire (Shakespeare's own county). There had been a long period of famine and the peasants, made desperate by this, had revolted.¹⁴ These events may well have influenced the opening scenes of Shakespeare's play, and would have gripped the attention of his audience as being relevant to the times.

We turn now to look at Shakespeare's main source for his Roman plays, Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*. Of course there is evidence that Shakespeare used other ancient authors, such as Vergil and Ovid; the account of the love affair between Dido and Aeneas in *Aeneid* IV, for example, finds its echo in *Antony and Cleopatra*, but Plutarch is certainly his main source for *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*; not, however, Plutarch in the original Greek, but the translation of Sir Thomas North, which appeared in 1579, when Shakespeare was a young boy in his teens. I quote here the title page of North's translation: he

does not hide the fact that he himself did not go back to the original, but used the French translation of Jacques Amyot: 'The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans, compared together by that grave learned Philosopher and Historiographer, Plutarch of Chaeronea: Translated out of Greek into French by JAMES AMYOT, Abbot of Bellozane, Bishop of Auxerre, one of the King's privy counsel, and great Amner of France, and out of French into English, by THOMAS NORTH.'¹⁵ Shakespeare's first full play to be based on Plutarch's *Lives* was *Julius Caesar*, which was written in 1599; he returned to Plutarch in c. 1606 for the last of his tragedies, *Timon of Athens*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*. Shakespeare's use of the *Lives* shows his mastery over his material. The *Lives* are straight biography, following a chronological order; Shakespeare's approach is that of the dramatist, taking as the starting point an important event from the life of the hero, e.g. in *Coriolanus* the unrest of the people and their opposition to Coriolanus, which are mentioned about one third of the way through Plutarch's narrative, are depicted in the opening scene of the play. Often Shakespeare uses more than one *Life* as his source for one play, e.g. *Julius Caesar* is based on the *Lives* of Caesar, Brutus and Antony. Sometimes events which are separate in the *Lives* are conflated for dramatic effect, e.g. in *Julius Caesar* in the opening scene he makes Caesar's triumph for his victory over the sons of Pompey and the feast of the Lupercalia, when the kingship was offered to him three times, occur on the same day, whereas the events were in fact separated by about four months. Where the *Life* Shakespeare is using supplies him with dramatically usable material, he changes very little, except to adapt to blank verse; e.g. when Volumnia appeals to her son to spare Rome in *Coriolanus* 5.3.94ff. Shakespeare follows his source closely: I quote a few lines first from the *Life*, then from the play:

'If we held our peace, my son, and determined not to speak, the state of our poor bodies and present sight of our raiment would easily bewray to thee what life we have led at home, since the exile and abode abroad. But think now with thyself how much more unfortunately than all the women living we have come hither, considering that the sight which should be most pleasant to all other to behold, spiteful fortune hath made more fearful to us; making myself to see my son, and my daughter here her husband, besieging the walls of his native city, so as that which is the only comfort to all other in their adversity and misery, to pray unto the gods and to call to them for aid, is the only thing which plungeth us into most deep perplexity.'

Compare this with the opening lines of Volumnia's speech in Shakespeare¹⁶:

'Should we be silent and not seak, our raiment
 And state of bodies would bewray what life
 We have led since thy exile. Think with thyself
 How more unfortunate than all living women
 Are we come hither; since that thy sight, which should
 Make our eyes flow with joy, hearts dance with comforts,
 Constrains them weep and shake with fear and sorrow,

Making the mother, wife, and child to see
The son, the husband, and the father tearing
His country's bowels out. And to poor we
Thine enmity's most capital. Thou barr'st us
Our prayers to the gods, which is a comfort
That all but we enjoy.'

On the other hand, some scenes are not based on Plutarch at all, and if they are not derived from some undiscovered source, they are almost certainly invented by Shakespeare, e.g. the famous speech of Antony after the murder of Caesar beginning 'Friends, Romans, countrymen. . .' ¹⁷ is not derived from Plutarch.

It has been stated that though we speak of *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus* as Shakespeare's Roman plays, they have little in common except Shakespeare's authorship and their common source in Plutarch's *Lives*. I would venture to disagree and to suggest that there are some features in the plays which justify us in linking them together. The first is their interest in *character*: this is something which Plutarch himself emphasized. He explains his intentions and methods at the beginning of the *Life of Alexander* when he says: 'My interest is not to write histories, but only lives. For the noblest deeds do not always show men's virtues and vices; but oftentimes a light occasion, a word, or some sport, makes men's natural dispositions and manners appear more plain than the famous battles won wherein are slain ten thousand men, or the great armies or cities won by siege and assault'. ¹⁸ In his depiction of the characters of his heroes Shakespeare often builds on what Plutarch says: e.g. Caesar's well-known statement about Cassius:

'Let me have men about me that are fat,
Sleek-headed men, and such as sleep a'nights.
Yond Cassius has a lean and hungry look;
He thinks too much; such men are dangerous'

is based on Plutarch's 'as for those fat men and smooth-combed heads . . . I never reckon of them. But these pale-visaged and carrion lean people, I fear them most – meaning Brutus and Cassius (adds Plutarch).¹⁹ For the character of Julius Caesar, Shakespeare brings out clearly, both by what Caesar himself says, and by what others say about him, the combination of great power and human frailty, for which there is also evidence in Plutarch. Plutarch tells us that Caesar 'was lean, white, and softskinned, and often subject to headache, and otherwhile to the falling sickness (the which took him the first time, as it is reported, in Corduba, a city of Spain)'; ²⁰ Cassius describes an attack of epilepsy Caesar had in Spain, but for the story he tells about how he saved Caesar from drowning in their swimming match in the Tiber, there is no basis in Plutarch (in fact, Plutarch and also Suetonius mention Caesar's ability as a swimmer, but this story is nowhere mentioned). His greatness and strength are also shown in many ways – I am sure we all immediately think of Cassius' words 'Why, man, he doth bestride the narrow world like a Colossus. . .'. ²¹ but we also hear evidence of his fearlessness and greatness from his own mouth:

‘Cowards die many times before their deaths;
The valiant never taste of death but once.
Of all the wonders that I yet have heard,
It seems to me most strange that men should fear,
Seeing that death, a necessary end,
Will come when it will come’

This is based on a hint from Plutarch: ‘And when some of his friends did counsel him to have a guard for the safety of his person . . . he would never consent to it, but said, it would be better to die once than always to be afraid of death’.²² Even though Caesar gives his name to the play, Brutus can be said to be the tragic hero of the second part of *Julius Caesar*. The summing up of his character Shakespeare bases on Plutarch: ‘For it was said that Antonius spake it openly divers times that he thought that of all of them that had slain Caesar there was none but Brutus only that was moved to do it as thinking the act commendable in itself, but that all the other conspirators did conspire his death for some private malice or envy that they otherwise did bear unto him’. Compare this with Shakespeare:

‘This was the noblest Roman of them all:
All the conspirators save only he
Did that they did in envy of great Caesar;
He only, in a general and honest thought
And common good to all, made one of them’.²³

The characters of Mark Antony and Coriolanus receive a similar treatment: statements by Plutarch are used as the base on which Shakespeare builds; we take the character of Antony as illustration. The character of Antony which Shakespeare inherited from Plutarch was in the main the character of a man ruined by sexual passion. To some extent Shakespeare confirms this aspect of the character of Antony in the very first words of the play. Philo, one of Antony’s followers, speaks of ‘this dotage of our general’s’. Enobarbus sums up the situation when he says:

‘. . . our courteous Antony,
Whom ne’er the word of ‘NO’ woman heard speak’.²⁴

Antony himself shows that he sets a lower value even on Rome than on his love for Cleopatra when he says:²⁵

‘Let Rome in Tiber melt, and the wide arch
Of the ranged empire fall! Here is my space.
Kingdoms are clay. Our dungy earth alike
Feeds beast as man. The nobleness of life
Is to do thus — when such a mutual pair
And such a twain can do’t, in which I bind,
On pain of punishment, the world to weet
We stand up peerless’.

Octavius, too, confirms the picture:²⁶

‘From Alexandria

This is the news: he fishes, drinks, and wastes
The lamps of night in revel; is not more manlike
Than Cleopatra, nor the queen of Ptolemy
More womanly than he; hardly gave audience or
Vouchsafed to think he had partners. You shall find there
A man who is the abstract of all faults
That all men follow’.

And yet Shakespeare makes of Antony more than just someone destroyed by passion; he shows another side to his character. Here too he built on a hint from Plutarch; Plutarch tells how, by mixing with his soldiers, jesting and drinking with them, he made himself loved by them. Shakespeare, too, shows Antony as a general well loved and admired by his men; he shows him (in *Julius Caesar* in particular) as a man who can take charge in a crisis; he shows him to be capable of generous behaviour, e.g. when he hears of Enobarbus’ desertion and sends his goods after him.²⁷

Shakespeare’s use of Plutarch is not limited to the main character of the plays, but extends to the minor characters also; here he often builds on the merest hint in Plutarch. A good example is the character of Menenius in *Coriolanus*. Plutarch says: ‘The Senate . . . did send unto them certain of the pleasantest old men and the most acceptable to the people among them. Of these, Menenius Agrippa was he who was sent for chief man’. On this hint he builds up the picture of one of the most influential and humane characters of the play. He appears in the first scene as one who tried to reconcile the nobles and the people: as one of the citizens put it: ‘Worthy Menenius Agrippa, one that hath always loved the people’.²⁸ It is he who, to gain the people’s support, tells the fable of the belly as the recipient of food, but with the purpose of feeding the whole body.²⁹ It is he who, throughout the play, tries to check Coriolanus’ pride and anger, and who against his better judgement, goes to the camp of the Volscians to try to persuade Coriolanus to return to Rome, but is rebuffed. As Coriolanus said:

‘This last old man,
Whom with cracked heart I have sent to Rome,
Loved me above the measure of a father’.³⁰

Another unifying feature in the three Roman plays is Rome itself. Each of the plays represents Rome at a different but crucial stage in her history: *Julius Caesar* shows us a Rome divided; *Antony and Cleopatra* a Rome against the background of the greater Mediterranean world, a Rome threatened by outside influences; *Coriolanus* a Rome in the formative period of republican government and democratic development. Through these different aspects of Rome, runs the unifying thread of the Roman virtues such as ‘virtus’ and ‘pietas’. Coriolanus can be said to represent ‘virtus’. For Coriolanus courage and prowess in battle are the highest virtues; Shakespeare builds on Plutarch when he makes Cominius say:

‘It is held
That valour is the chiefest virtue, and
Most dignifies the haver’

cf. Plutarch: ‘Now in those days valiantness was honoured in Rome above all other virtues; which they call ‘virtus’, by the name of virtue itself, as including in that general name all other special virtues besides. So that ‘virtus’ in the Latin was as much as valiantness’.³¹ The Roman virtue of ‘pietas’ is evident in the plays both in a positive and a negative way. Coriolanus, by his attack on Rome on the side of the Volscians, shows a failure in ‘pietas’, as does Mark Antony in *Antony and Cleopatra*; but Coriolanus’ mother Volumnia can be seen as embodying that virtue in her appeal to her son, while in *Julius Caesar* Brutus’ actions are represented as springing from a sense of duty towards Rome. We recall his words:

‘Shall Rome stand under one man’s awe? What, Rome?
My ancestors did from the streets of Rome
The Tarquin drive, when he was called a king.
‘Speak, strike, redress.’ Am I entreated
To speak and strike? O Rome, I make thee promise
If the redress will follow, thou receivest
Thy full petition at the hand of Brutus’.³²

A question that has been asked by many scholars, is whether the Roman plays are histories or tragedies. This question, too, could represent a common thread which binds the plays together; in all three plays historical events are used as background; but the characters are perhaps not so much chosen for their importance in history, though their importance cannot be denied. They are chosen rather for their tragic quality: Coriolanus falling a victim to his pride, his insistence on his honour, and his courage; Caesar, ‘constant as the Northern Star’, brought low by his ambition; Brutus dying through misguided ‘pietas’; Antony a brave and able man ruined by sexual passion.

I close with a brief reflection. We have been thinking here mainly about Shakespeare’s debt to and use of his classical source for the Roman plays, North’s *Plutarch*; but what about the importance of Shakespeare in moulding our ideas about the Roman world? It has been pointed out that since the early 19th century generations of school-boys and school-girls have been brought up on *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*, and one modern writer has stated that ‘it can hardly be doubted that Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar* has had more effect than Caesar’s own commentaries in creating our impressions of his personality.’³³ This is a subject that deserves further research: the effect that Shakespeare has had on the way the Romans exist in our imagination; and finally, Shakespeare’s Roman plays may also be one of the factors which will help to keep alive a knowledge of and interest in Classical Studies.

NOTES

1. This paper was delivered as my presidential address at the 16th Biennial Conference of the Classical Association of South Africa at the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg, on 22 January 1985.
2. J.A.K. Thomson, *Shakespeare and the Classics*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1952, 135.
3. John W. Velz, *Shakespeare Survey* 31, Cambridge 1978, 1.
4. *Shakespeare's Plutarch* ed. T.J.B. Spencer, Penguin 1964, 71.
5. *2 Henry IV*, 4. 3.39: further references to this saying are found in *As you like it* 5. 2.33 and *Cymbeline* 3. 1.22.
6. Quoted in *Shakespeare Survey*, 10, Cambridge 1957, 16.
7. Quoted in *Shakespeare Survey*, 10, 26.
8. Quoted in *Shakespeare Survey*, 31, 1.
9. Quoted in *Shakespeare Survey*, 10, 27.
10. Myron Taylor, 'Shakespeare's Julius Caesar and the Irony of History', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 24 (1973) 301.
11. John W. Velz, *Shakespeare Survey*, 31, 1.
12. Sir Mungo William MacCallum, *Shakespeare's Roman Plays and their Background*, London, Macmillan 1967, 56.
13. Quoted by MacCallum, *op. cit.* 85.
14. Shakespeare *Coriolanus* ed. G.R. Hibbard, Penguin 1967, introduction, 10–13.
15. Quoted in Preface to *Shakespeare's Plutarch*, 9.
16. *Coriolanus* 5. 3. 94 ff.
17. *Julius Caesar* 3. 2.74.
18. *Shakespeare's Plutarch*, 7–8.
19. *Julius Caesar* 1.2. 191 ff.; *Shakespeare's Plutarch, Life of Caesar*, 85; see also *Life of Brutus*, 109.
20. *Shakespeare's Plutarch, Life of Caesar*, 37; cf. *Julius Caesar* 1. 2. 100ff.
21. *Julius Caesar* 1. 2. 134 f.
22. *Julius Caesar* 2. 2. 32 ff.; *Shakespeare's Plutarch, Life of Caesar*, 78.
23. *Shakespeare's Plutarch, Life of Brutus*, 140; *Julius Caesar* 5. 5.68.
24. *Antony and Cleopatra* 1.1.1; 2.2. 227ff.
25. *Antony and Cleopatra* 1.1. 33–40.
26. *Antony and Cleopatra* 1.4. 3–10.
27. *Antony and Cleopatra* 4. 5. 12–18.
28. *Shakespeare's Plutarch, Life of Coriolanus*, 303; *Coriolanus* 1.1.49f.
29. *Coriolanus* 1.1.94 ff.
30. *Coriolanus* 5. 3.8.
31. *Coriolanus* 2. 2.87; *Shakespeare's Plutarch, Life of Coriolanus*, 297.
32. *Julius Caesar* 2. 1.52 ff.
33. T.J.B. Spencer, *William Shakespeare: the Roman Plays*, London 1963.

ACTA CLASSICA



Acta Classica is published annually by the Classical Association of South Africa. The journal has been in production since 1958. It is listed on both the ISI and the SAPSE list of approved publications.

Published by
The Classical Association of
South Africa

For further information go to:
http://www.casa-kvsa.org.za/acta_classica.htm