"Peace, Count the Clock": Shakespeare's Humanist Usage of Anachronism in *Julius Caesar*

Chikako D. Kumamoto
Emeritus, College of DuPage

Shakespeare is known to have included anachronisms in his work. For instance, Hamlet is attending the Martin Luther-connected University of Wittenberg (1.2.119), which was established in 1502 and not existent in the play's source, Saxo Grammaticus's twelfth-century *Denmark*; Bedlam, known as the Priory of St. Mary of Bethlehem (from which sprang the variant spellings Bedlam and Bethlem), was a mental institution founded in the early thirteenth century, but is depicted as operating in legendary King Leir's Britain (2.3.13-19); the medieval Richard, when he was still Duke of York, quotes Renaissance figure Machiavel to characterize his enemy Alençon as well as himself (*Henry VI, I*, 5.4; *III*, 3.2); Cleopatra wants to play a game of billiards, invented in fifteenth-century northern Europe (2.5); Theseus is dignified as the duke of Athens in a mythic Athens, though the Duchy of Athens emerged only in the early thirteenth century,[1] while in English history, the highest-ranking hereditary title of duke was not used until the Black Prince was created Duke of Cornwall in

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 16, 8-27
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

1337;[2] Puck's hearing a gun report is also incongruous since the gun was a ninth-century invention (3.2). The most often quoted anachronism is the striking clock, unknown in 44 B.C., the year of Caesar's assassination (2.1.206).[3]

The *OED* records the word "anachronism" as first mentioned in John Gregory's 1649 religious tract, *De Aeris et Epochis*.[4] In it, Gregory, Chaplain of Christ Church, Oxford, notes that "an error committed herein [in a Synchronism] is called Anachronism." He is commenting on the term in relation to "Synchronism," which in history means a chronological, usually tabular, list of historical persons and events, arranged to show parallel or synchronous occurrence. In another tract, *A Discourse of the LXX Interpretations*,[5] Gregory also scrutinizes Hebrew-to-Greek translations of *The Book of the Law* of Moses and notices chronology-related geographical inaccuracies occurring in the course of the book's making. His reference to anachronism appears where Gregory remarks on the location of the Isle of Pharos, which in Old Testament times was not connected by a causeway to the mainland of Alexandria. Finding fault with Aristaeas, who was allegedly a royal officer at the court of King Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-246 BC) and who (pseudepigraphically) narrates how the king came to possess the Hebrew-to-Greek translated books of the Old Testament,[6] Gregory writes, "But if our Information be rightly given, we should find this to be a notorious *Anachronism*; for at the days of the Translation Pharos was an Isle, and therefore they (i.e., seventy Hebrew translators) could not pass over thither by Lands"; ". . . therefore it holdeth still that *Pharos* remains an Isle till the days of Cleopatra, and we are sure that Aristaeas was dead long before; therefore for him to make mention of the *Hepstadium* (i.e., causeway) is an inexcusable *Anachronism*."[7]

Shakespeare wrote his plays before Gregory's tracts appeared.[8] As if by a prophetic insight, however, he already seemed to have foreseen Gregory's censure when he gave Hamlet the line, "The time is out of joint" (1.5.215;

published 1600-1).[9] In the play's action, Hamlet here confirms Marcellus's fear upon the Ghost's reappearance that "something is rotten in the state of Denmark" (1.4.100). But equally, this line might reveal Shakespeare's insight to be both dramatic and writerly because he makes a profound narrative and stylistic connection between time and truth. Shakespeare first links Hamlet's line to the idea of the organic body politic inherited from classical and medieval political thinking,[10] for Hamlet here employs bodily dislocation, "out of joint" ("a bone displaced from its articulation, dislocated"—*OED*, s.v. or sb. "joint"), to mean a corporeal disorder (clarifying Marcellus's adjective of "rotten") in the organic body politic of Denmark (the "state" in Marcellus's line). Further, Shakespeare expands Hamlet's corporeal metaphor to represent a temporal dislocation and connotes "the time" to be a metaphor for truth. Time out of its temporal order, then, is like truth out of its proper order, since, proverbially, "Truth is the daughter of time"; time provides knowledge and reveals truth. What "the time" provides Hamlet in this scene is the knowledge that in Denmark, the present (Claudius's, and in turn Gertrude's, bodies) has rendered the past (King Hamlet's and Hamlet's bodies) "out of joint" (i.e., incest, regicide, disinheritance), while the past persists in and works through the present and future of Hamlet's corporeal body to be shaped by the Ghost's commandment of revenge. Understood under this temporally dominant epistemological dimension in Hamlet's line, his following lament, "O cursed spite / That ever I was born to set it right!" (1.5.215-16), also expresses Shakespeare's dual insight. It sets Hamlet's filial duty of revenge in motion toward the tragic endpoint of Denmark's dislocated past time that he must set right. At the same time, Shakespeare might also be subtly applying these lines to himself, who must set chronological times right when writing his plays truthfully.

M. W. MacCallum finds Shakespeare's stance toward history to be combining "a pious regard for the assumed facts

of History, with complete indifference to critical research."[11] In actual practice, Shakespeare tends to exhibit more of MacCallum's latter assessment and writes deliberately against himself, as above-noted examples will attest. In fact, his pointedly sheer use of anachronisms seems to re-form, albeit predictively, Gregory's understanding of anachronism into his other ways of relating to history where past, present and future times would tellingly conjoin.[12] As encapsulated in a triple historicity personified in Hamlet's epistemic being, Shakespeare in effect enriches the idea of anachronism by imparting an additional cognitive capacity to it. This premise becomes fruitful for me as I focus on the clock (2.1) and other anachronistic objects in *Julius Caesar*, composed in 1599. Retrospectively building on my above-noted premise about Hamlet's triple-time being a mediating apparatus of time and truth, I obtain a new reading: first, in *Julius Caesar* Shakespeare illustrates his humanist use of anachronism as his conscious style of epistemic ability, anticipating the notion of what Gianbattista Vico calls "poetic chronology";[13] further, Shakespeare's use of anachronism is his ingenious hypothesis of history, which is reimagined as an ongoing quest to locate the truths about the moral character of the Roman conspirators and their factionalism. In the end, his epistemic art of anachronism subtly acquires the hint of the political and social scenes of the late Elizabethan age and thus unites different historical eras by similar or common human events and experiences.

To assist me in this reading, I first revisit contemporary thoughts and practices of history and history writing as Shakespeare and his contemporaries would have known and used them. Shakespeare's intellectual milieu, as suggested by Gregory's work, was one where the idea of anachronism was becoming generally noticeable. A growing recognition of chronological and other anomalies in and by historians, as well as textual commentators and antiquarians, was occurring. As the historian F. J. Levy traces it from the time of

Caxton to that of Bacon, such a trend meant changes in the intellectual orientation of historical thinking in England. In particular, the influences of continental humanism, the new Protestantism, and an increased national consciousness led to new ways of investigating and using the past.[14] Earlier, the study of the past was justified on utilitarian grounds, and the purpose of history writing was didactic in that the common use of history was to teach personal morality. Inherent in people's ethos was the traditional connection between microcosm and macrocosm analogy, seeing the universe not only as divinely ordered, but also as comprehensible based on such cosmic harmony and divinely ordered hierarchy.[15] The purpose of most writing—theological, historical, and even scientific—was to make man more aware of his place in the great scheme and workings of God. People's moral benefit came from reading the examples of people's good and bad conduct. Accordingly, the purpose of the historian was to demonstrate how people could improve themselves. History was meant to teach personal morality by learning from the past.[16]

As the sixteenth century progressed, changes occurred as to what history was to teach because the idea of what made a man good was undergoing change. In particular, humanist thinking emphasized the public, political aspects of man by dividing a man's public and private character. By adding to man new, more secular virtues, such as a virtue of practical, public statecraft, humanist thinking made the active citizen an ideal "in the temporal sphere."[17] This new thinking also led to new methods for understanding the past and writing history. Instead of discussing what people, in particular princes or rulers, ought to do in moral terms, historians sought to understand what they did in fact, how and why they did it, and how effective their measures were, in light of not moral examples, but of practicable maxims, rules, and examples of political wisdom and public administration they collected.[18] This new thinking also led to new methods for understanding

the past and writing history, conceptually providing a new sense of perspective and periodicity previously lacking in medieval chronicle texts. Among the new methods was the concept of anachronism, which Petrarch supposedly recognized first and which Lorenzo Valla notably worked out in detail. For the late medieval chronicle writer, all history, namely past and present events or persons, is present history.[19] The concept of an anachronism, however, showed "that the past differs from the present and that the various periods of the past differ from one another,"[20] proving the decisive factor in rewriting the record of the past. With this new kind of history writing being practiced by such historians as John Stow (an antiquarian detailing the realistic topography of the City of London under Queen Elizabeth), John Hayward and Francis Bacon (both "politic" historians setting out the causes of events and rulers without imparting morality, but while conjecturing probable causes),[21] the consequent view of history as truth was to reject most of the imaginative devices of literature.

But Shakespeare purposefully uses anachronism as his potent imaginative, epistemic device in Julius Caesar. Specifically, he does so by linking the play's actions to physical objects out of their temporal order and staging a series of linked scenes as his both original and epistemic moments of triple history[22] as the artist[23]: the Roman past (North-translated Plutarch) linked to Shakespeare's present, with his audience in the first Globe Theatre opened in 1599, his role-performing actors and their bodies clad in contemporary costumes and stage props familiar to his audience; Shakespeare's present in turn is linked to the play's trans-epochal, inter-theatrical status as the source of future actors, audiences, and historians.

Caesar's Rome and 1599's London are thus conjoined as Shakespeare works such Elizabethan objects as the "sleeve" (1.2.189), "nightcaps" (1.2.256), and the "doublet" (1.2.276) into the plot of act 1, scene 2, where actions surrounding

the presentation of the crown to Caesar are the focal point.[24] These anachronistic material irruptions into the plot remind his audience that great historical time has elapsed between their present and the past (or between inherited facts and dramatic narrative) that they are witnessing on stage. For the Roman toga has no "sleeve" by which Cassius tells Brutus to tug Casca as Caesar passes by. The contemporary corroboration of sleeveless toga worn by ancient Rome's ruling-class is the Peacham drawing in the "Longleat manuscript" depicting a scene from *Titus Andronicus*.[25] In the center of it is Titus, clad in toga over a short-sleeved tunic, facing the beseeching Tamora. Befitting his status as the general in his triumph, his toga seems striped with color of possible purple or purple and white. The "nightcaps" that the crowds toss up as Caesar refuses the crown Anthony offers the third time are late fourteenth century items; the "doublet," which Caesar is said to wear when offered the crown is a man's short close-fitting padded jacket, commonly worn from the fourteenth century to the seventeenth century. In all these instances, Shakespeare knowingly incorporates the passage of time to help his audience in the newly built Globe Theatre to gain an instant affinity with the people of times long past.

At the same time, by showing how his audience's lives are tangled with "the cognitive life of things" (John Sutton's terms for physical artifacts, including anachronistic objects),[26] these items help Shakespeare to shorten time's passage so as to heighten the threefold sense of time: his audiences are supposed to be in ancient Rome while the ancient Romans are supposed to be at the Globe as the actors role-play Roman characters and enact political events, surrounded by contemporary theatre props; this in turn is linked to Shakespeare's keen sense of his status with the future audience which will look upon his play as part of their past, as well as a source of historical knowledge of his time. More importantly, Shakespeare enfolds into his deceptively simple placement of anachronisms the disquieting truth about the

conspirators. First is the crown-presentation scene that he causes to take place entirely offstage, so that his audience learns of it secondhand and after the fact. Only the ordinary citizens' cheers that accompany Caesar's multiple refusals of the crown are audible, and such cheers are misunderstood by Brutus: "What means this shouting? I do fear the people / Choose Caesar for their king" (1.2.85-86) and "I do believe that these applauses are / For some new honours that are heaped on Caesar" (1.2.140-41). Like Brutus, other conspirators, as well as the theatre audience, hear of the events from Casca only afterward. By not showing this pivotal political moment on stage before the audience, but instead, placing the story of the crown in Casca's reporting, Shakespeare sets up a pregnant situation in which the theatre audience's only knowledge of Caesar's desire for kingship comes solely from the single vision of Casca, who is already prejudiced against Caesar and who is later to be seduced by Cassius to join the republican conspiracy (1.3.120-24). Why does Shakespeare have Cassius make sure that Brutus will "pluck Casca by the sleeve," and no one else, to learn what has happened? Plutarch tells of Caesar's explicit desire to be king directly, presenting Caesar's desire to be "the people's" "just cause," while provoking his republic-minded enemies' "illwill":

> But the chiefest cause that made him mortally hated, was the covetous desire to be called king: which first gave the people just cause, and next his secret enemies honest colour, to bear him illwill.[27]

But Shakespeare chooses to moderate the source and adopts indirection to create an undercurrent of ambiguity about the reliability and accuracy of Casca's account, which the conspirators are already predisposed to believe. Moreover, Shakespeare heightens the effect of ambiguity by making his audience see Caesar's kingly desire only through the lens of Casca's eyes and then the other conspirators' hatred and "illwill" toward Caesar. Thus, Shakespeare's anachronistic

use of the sleeve has the effect of leading his audience to question if Caesar's desire for kingship—the conspirators' primal motive against Caesar—may be less a reality than the conspirators want to believe. Shakespeare helps to further his audience's uncertainty also by the fact that it is only after Caesar's death that anyone else (especially Antony) connects kingship to Caesar.[28]

Casca's description of the people's reaction to Caesar's kingship by tossing their "nightcaps" also reflects another side of the conspirators' republican morality, hinting at the actual difference between their political platform for "the people" (the plebeians, commoners) and the republicans' actual views and treatment of "the people." The tone of social difference is already set as the play opens. Marullus and Flavius, Roman Tribunes who are supposed leaders and whose official task was to protect people against oppression, come upon a group of commoners in the street and find that they are on the way to "make holiday to see Caesar and to rejoice in his triumph" over his rival Pompey and Pompey's son (1.1.33-34). Being friends of Brutus and Cassius, Marullus and Flavius rebuke them, calling them "blocks," "stones," and "worse than senseless things" (1.1.39-40), and telling them that rather than celebrate his victory, they should fall on their knees and pray against "the plague" that will come from Caesar (1.2.41-60). During his report on Caesar's potential kingship, Casca, a patrician and senator like Brutus and Cassius, disparages the hooting commoners as "rabblement" (1.2.254-55), their "nightcaps" as "sweaty," and their breath as "such a deal of stinking breath" and "the bad air" (1.2.256-57, 261). By such disparagement, the ruling class separates themselves from those who are not patrician;[29] they form a distinct social and political order, perhaps Shakespeare reflecting his own hierarchal society. Ironically, they justify their political actions in the name of the people, Rome, Romans, and "the commonwealth" (3.2.45), all of which culminates in Brutus's eulogy where he asks whether the people "may the

better judge" of the conspirator's assassination of Caesar: "Romans, countrymen, and lovers . . . Censure me in your wisdom . . . Who is here so rude that would not be a Roman? Who is here so vile that will not love his country?" (3.2.14-35). In the end, however, the conspirators' lofty protestations and self-images ("the most boldest and best hearts of Rome," [3.1.136]) turn out to be their own self-interested stratagem to maneuver the people to their factional advantage. For, once committed to the conspiracy, Brutus tells his associates how the killing should appear to "the common eyes": it should look as an aristocratic, "gentle" "thing" and "our purpose necessary," not the crude hacking to death of ignoble prey, so that the people will call them "purgers" [of "the plague"], not "murderers" (2.1.185-93). Or he counsels them for the need for duplicity: hide our true "purposes" from the people and perform it like "Roman actors" (2.1.244-46). Against Cassius's objection after the assassination, Brutus allows Antony to speak, which in the people's eyes, "shall advantage more than do us wrong" (3.1.267). Connecting the "sweaty" "nightcaps" to "the rabblement," the conspirators not only betray their idealist's claims for the people to be suspect, but also shed light on the nature of their republican "commonwealth" to be formed by the political factionalism comprised of the class of patricians.

Caesar's "doublet" likewise underscores Casca's and other conspirators' enmity against Caesar, while undercutting the veracity of Caesar's ambition. A doublet being a tight-fitting, buttoned, high-necked double jacket, it is rather unwieldy for Caesar, in a theatrical gesture, to pluck open quickly so that the crowd would "his throat to cut" (1.2.276-77), a gesture which Casca interprets as Caesar's attempt to prove his lack of kingly ambition. Casca knows that Caesar's dramatic use of his doublet and his fainting spell are just his stratagems to win over the "hoot[ing]" and "clap[ping]" crowd (2.1.269-72). Thus, these material things in Casca's reporting add to the audience's skepticism, while they are meant to promote

the conspirators' conviction of Caesar's threat to the political structure of the state. And striking still about the doublet is its truth that the only characters who speak of Caesar's potential kingship are the conspirators, whereas other characters—Antony, especially—speaks of it only after Caesar's death.

Equally telling of the suspect value that directs the conspirators' behavior is Shakespeare's anachronistic "hats" in act 2, scene 1. Lucius, Brutus's page, tells his master that the conspirators have arrived. "Their hats are pluck'd about their ears," he says. "And half their faces buried in their cloaks / That by no means I may discover them / By any mark of favor" (2.1.81-83). Shakespeare did not know anything about Roman headgear, as Dover Wilson suggests.[30] But having "dressed his Romans in the slouch hats of his own time"[31] in such an illicit, furtive manner, Shakespeare causes the hats to take on the material signs of the conspirators' lawlessness and illegitimacy, adding to the morality of the scene.[32] This is confirmed by Brutus's soliloquy (83-93), which, prompted by Lucius's announcement, reveals his keen awareness that he and his associates are now driven to stealth ("O conspiracy, / Sham'st thou to show thy dang'rous brow by night" [84-85]) and hypocrisy ("Hide it in smiles and affability" [90]) to succeed in their undertaking.

In the play that is preoccupied with the threefold manifestations of time, the anachronistic clock (2.1.255-59), which strikes during the final stage of the assassination plan, is also aptly chosen. In Shakespeare's time, there were three ways to tell time: hourglasses, sundials, and mechanical striking clocks. The prototype mechanical clocks appeared during the 13th century in Europe (Dante refers to a clock striking the hours in *The Divine Comedy*),[33] and such a device was installed by King Edward III in the 1350s in England,[34] but not in ancient Rome. Why then does Shakespeare use the clock in *Julius Caesar*? An hour by the hourglass was seldom a literal hour; even when hourglasses were supposedly accurate,

their construction always left them subject to error. Sundials were "accurate" because they did not tell the time, but found it; and they worked only when the sun was out and had to be placed in unshaded spaces in order to be useful. Mechanical clocks, on the other hand, were attached to public clock towers, churches, cathedrals, palaces, and might have been placed somewhere even in the theatre. Recall "the two hours' traffic of our stage" in *Romeo and Juliet's* Prologue. Most significantly, they can be heard and counted. Recall sonnet 12: "When I do count [count the chimes] the clock that tells the time." The sound of the clock is thus dramatically used, first, to enhance the swift passages of time in act 2: night (2.1.96) when Brutus was "awake all night"; the break of dawn (2.1.111) that Decius notices; the hour of 3 in the morning (2.1.206) when the clock chimes; 8 o'clock (2.1.230) when Brutus suggests meeting with Caesar; the coming of morning (2.1.238-40) by which Cassius tells his conspirators to disperse; all of which will culminate in the soothsayer's prophetic mention of 9 o'clock (2.4.27) when Caesar will be assassinated. Placed amid their inexorable conspiratorial activities, the striking of three o'clock has the effect of urgent necessity to quicken their killing plan, compelling the plot to evolve rapidly at the linear and thus inexorable pace within a day. This sense of urgency suggests that their killing plot is an ill-conceived, hastily assembled plan, not well thought out over a period of time. Another interesting aspect to the play's time scheme is a biblical dimension to Caesar's death, for according to the *Gospel of Mark* (Chapter 15, verse 25), the crucifixion took place at the third hour (9:00 am) and Christ's death at the ninth hour (3:00 p.m.), paralleling those of Caesar's death. Unlike the conspirators' preoccupation with Caesar, who is an aspiring king about to suppress the wishes of Roman citizens, is he to be understood as a political martyr?

Audiences' moral disquiet about the conspirators' actions deepens when Shakespeare associates Brutus with

the "book." Brutus has just persuaded Cassius to wait until Antony and Octavius wear out their own armies with travel to Philippi. After the meeting, the wakeful Brutus sits up reading a "book" in his tent: "Look, Lucius, here's the book I sought for so. / I put it in the pocket of my gown" (4.3.293-94); "Let me see, let me see; is not the leaf turned down / Where I left reading" (4.3.315-16). Shakespeare's description of Brutus's book suggests perhaps a codex with leaves, though Brutus is a reader of a scroll culture. Historically, the codex was not widely used until the second century AD, beyond Brutus's time. Moreover, Brutus says he had placed his book in the pocket of his gown, suggesting that his is small enough to put in the pocket, something like an octavo size book (5x8 to 6x9.5 inches),[35] perhaps like our paperback book. According to Martin Lowry, it is the Renaissance humanist, Aldus Manutius, who began to print in pocket-sized, portable octavo format, which revolutionized reading.[36] Also anachronistic is the "pocket," which is a mid-fourteenth-century item, though Brutus's putting the book in his pocket suggests his accustomed reading habit.

The morality of the book, then, can be sought in its possible subject matter embedded in the vicissitudes of Cato the Younger and his suicide and Brutus's own suicide later in the play. Brutus's upbringing was attributed to Cato the Younger and, according to Plutarch, Cato was the one whom Brutus "studied most to follow of all the Romans.[37] Cato favored the Stoic philosophy of Antiochus and Ariston, and these philosophers in turn became one of the dominant influences on Brutus.[38] It seems reasonable to suppose that the book he is reading is one of these philosophers' thoughts. It seems also reasonable that Shakespeare casts the Cato-Brutus relation in a favorable light, Cato being Brutus's uncle, mentor, and political model. A political parallel can be drawn especially because Cato revolted against Caesar. Unwilling to live in a world led by Caesar and refusing even implicitly to grant Caesar the power to pardon him, he committed suicide in April 46 BC. For many Romans, Cato was regarded as the

leading symbol of republicanism, foreshadowing Brutus and his conspirators.

And yet, when Cassius asks Brutus what he is determined to do if they lose the impending battle, Brutus replies:

> Even by the rule of that philosophy
> By which I did blame Cato for the death
> Which he did give himself—I know not how,
> But I do find it cowardly and vile,
> For fear of what might fall, so to prevent
> The time of life—arming myself with patience
> To stay the providence of some high powers
> That govern us below. (5.1.110-17)

Brutus describes his mentor's philosophy and his stoic death as "cowardly and vile" despite the great respectability of suicide among the predominantly Stoical Romans. For instance, Cicero justifies suicide more often than not. He argues that when "God Himself has given a valid reason as He did in the past to Socrates, and in our day to Cato, . . . then of a surety your true wise man will joyfully pass forthwith from the darkness here into the light beyond";[39] he regarded Cato's suicide as sanctified by God. If, against their close blood, schooling, and political ties, Brutus is not a committed stoic like Cato, what philosophy does Brutus actually follow? Plutarch says, "Now touching the Graecian philosophers, there was no sect nor Philosopher of them, but he heard and liked it: but above all the rest, he loved Platoes sect best."[40] It is interesting that Plato—both in the *Phaedo* and the *Laws*—seems to regard suicide in general as unlawful, with exceptions only for judicial suicide and for men whom God summons [like Socrates] and in cases of extreme and intolerable suffering.[41] Brutus's rejection of the manner of Cato's death and Plutarch's description of Brutus's adherence to Platonism therefore characterize not only Brutus's apparently contradictory and shifting relationship between nephew and uncle, but also, by extension, his lack of steadfast political conviction and

the uncompromising decision of Cato. This reading may be supportable since he later commits suicide so as not to "go bound" and "led . . . / Through the streets of Rome" (122, 119-20). Perhaps through the anachronistic insertion of the book, Shakespeare also wants to show the inadequacy of any philosophy, or more specifically, just reading and studying a philosophy book—whether that of Cato's Stoicism, Brutus's Platonism, or Cassius's Epicureanism—as a realistic, enduring guide to human conduct or solace when faced with crises. By making Brutus's own suicide also look a "cowardly and vile" moral compromise (his avoidance of public humiliation and disgrace), Shakespeare, as possible monarchist, may be conveying his reluctance to present the arch-republican Brutus favorably. Shakespeare's final view of Brutus can be seen in Brutus's inadequate philosophy of history he expresses before his quarrel with Cassius (4.3.249-55):

> There is a tide in the affairs of men
> Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
> On such a full sea are we now afloat,
> Or lose our ventures.

Certain that he is in full command of the tide of time, Brutus commits his forces at Philippi to the fatal results for their cause, proving the unreliability of his conviction as well as the fickleness of destiny which seems to follow only the fortunate. Destiny or a moment in history ("a tide in the affairs of men"), has a moral significance, belatedly showing Brutus vagaries of existence that will thwart his military plans and undercut his faith in his own philosophy.

Act 3, scene 1, encapsulates Shakespeare's sense of triple historicity I have been tracing. The conspirators have just assassinated Caesar. As they perform a ritual of smearing their hands and swords with Caesar's blood,

Cassius proclaims, "How many ages hence / Shall this our lofty scene be acted over / In states unborn and accents yet unknown!" (124-26). Cassius exalts his and his associates' action, because Plutarch's story of Julius Caesar will be told as a "lofty scene,"[42] the events the play is enacting at the 1599 Globe will become an enduring source of a period of English history. They will also be repeated in "ages hence" and in states that not yet created and in languages "yet unknown," ostensibly establishing the conspirators' historical action as a noble deed against tyranny, not as the futility of political factionalism.

However, unlike the conspirators who took "the current when it serves" but lost their venture, Shakespeare as a humanist writer takes the current of anachronism as his epistemic and stylistic focus and succeeds in suggesting that the flawed understandings about Caesar on which the conspirators have acted is but an unpleasant reflection of the conspirators themselves. Shakespeare wins his writerly "ventures" with his own philosophy of time and history by foregrounding the ability of anachronistic objects to draw attention to, partake in, and mediate time's triple periods, conjoining disparate audiences, places, and temporalities in his play. Indeed, Shakespeare's dramatic "ventures" in *Julius Caesar* may be said to lie in the large truth that Cassius's and Brutus's speeches convey: time is inexorable in its forward movement, and yet, in the process, time negotiates what Jonathan Harris terms "untimely matter"[43] that creates "the past and present, less in the sense of making them up than of persistently transforming the web of relations that tether the past to us—and us to it [in the future time]"[44] through physical things, audiences, places, and temporalities in its final truth-telling about human actions like the conspirators'. Like his later creation, Hamlet, on *Julius Caesar* Shakespeare inscribes himself as an historic agent of the epistemic dramatic art born on the cresting tide of a triple historicity concentrated in anachronism.

Notes

1. Dominic Green, "The Bard Beyond Borders," *History Today* (April 2016), 43.

2. Mark Ormrod, "Got a Question?" *History Today* (March 2016), 94.

3. Acts and scenes of the plays referred to here are drawn from the texts by Folger Shakespeare Library, edited by Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine.

4. This title is one of eight separately titled tracts composing Gregory's book, *Gregorii Posthuma: Or, Certain Learned Tracts.* The full name of this tract is: *De Aeris et Epochis; Shewing the Several Accounts of Time among all Nations, from the Creation to the Present Age.*

5. The full title is, *A Discourse of the LXX Interpretations: The Place and Manner of their Interpretations.*

6. His contemporaneity with the king is disputed by biblical scholars. See the introduction to *The Letter of Aristeas*, trans. with an appendix of ancient evidence on the origin of the Septuagint, by H. St. J. Thackeray. Accessed April 1, 2016. https://archive.org/stream/theletterofarist00unknuoft/theletter ofarist00unknuoft_djvu.txt.

7. John Gregory, M.A., *Gregorii Posthuma, or Certain Learned Tracts* (London: 1683), 27, 31-32. Accessed April 1, 2016. https://books.google.com/books/about/Gregorii_Posthuma_Or_Certain_Learned_Tra.html?id=_fJbAAAAQAAJ. Aristaeas represents himself as one of the officers of the guard to Ptolemy Philadelphus (309-246 BC)

8. His last play (collaborated with John Fletcher), *The Two Noble Kinsmen,* was written in 1613-14.

9. William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, The Folger Library General Reader's Shakespeare, ed. Louis B. Wright and Virginia A. LaMar (New York: Washington Square Press, 1977.

10. In his *Republic* (Book 4), Plato discusses the ideal city-state or the human soul in terms of the organic notion of the body politic: for each to function in harmony, the various parts of the body supported one another in mutual interdependency, reflecting cosmic harmony and divinely sanctioned hierarchy. Medieval thinkers, such as John of Salisbury (in the *Polycraticus*) and Marsilius of Padua (in the *Defensor pacis*), presented their political ideas within this framework. Refer to David Hillman, "Staging Early Modern Embodiment," in Chapter 4 of *The Cambridge Companion to The Body in Literature*, ed. David Hillman and Ulrika Maude (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 41-58, in particular, 48-50. Hillman, however, observes that in early modern times, "the dysfunctional relationship between the various members of the body politic was becoming a growing topic of debate" (49).

11. M. W. MacCallum, *Shakespeare's Roman Plays and Their Background* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1925), 86. Accessed April 4, 2016 via https://archive.org/details/cu31924013159706.

12. This is the kind of thinking Margreta De Grazia recommends that our contemporary historians have: "As a way of loosening chronology's hold on historical thought, we were to remove the stigma from anachronism or turn that stigma to advantage." See her "Anachronism," Chapter 2 of *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*, ed. James Simpson and Brian Cummings (Oxford University Press, 2010), 32.

13. Giambattista Vico, *The New Science of Giambattista Vico, translated from the Third edition (1744)*, trans. Thomas Goddard Bergin and Max Harold Fisch (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1976). Particularly illuminating for my argument is Vico's third and fourth types of anachronism of *coniunctio* and *disiunctio*: "when times are connected that should be separated," and "when times are separated that should be connected," 279-84.

14. For much background information for this section of my paper, I am greatly indebted to: F. J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1967). Direct quotations from his volume are noted by page numbers, as in 203 here. On the subject of anachronism in the Renaissance, I am indebted to Margreta De Grazia's work noted in Note # 11.

15. Hillman, "Staging Early Modern Embodiment," 49.

16. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 5-6.

17. Ibid., 238.

18. S. L. Goldberg, "Sir John Hayward, 'Politic' Historian," *The Review of English Studies*, 6.23 (July, 1955), 234.

19. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 21.

20. Ibid.

21. Goldberg, "Sir John Hayward," 234-35.

22. *OED*: "a written narrative, constituting a continuous methodological record in order of time, of important or public events, especially those connected with a particular country, people, individuals, etc."

23. Alexander Nigel, and Christopher S. Wood, "Toward a New Model of Renaissance Anachronism," T*he Art Bulletin* 3 (September 2005), 404. The authors discuss the importance of an artist, as an author, an auctor, a founder, or a legitimate point of origin in the late medieval and early modern periods.

24. All quotations cited come from Folger Shakespeare Library *Julius Caesar*, ed. Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine (New York, London, Toronto, Sydney: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1992).

25. Setting aside the critical debates on the direct connection between the Peacham drawing and Titus Andronicus, I refer to the drawing simply as a reliable artefact showing the contemporary notion of Roman togas. In the drawing, Titus wears toga over a short-sleeved tunic (ancient Roman culture deemed a long-sleeved tunic effeminate). Refer to the following on Roman costumes: Article by Philip Smith, B.A., of the University of London on pp1134 1137 of William Smith, D.C.L., LL.D.: A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, John Murray, London, 1875. Accessed June 3, 2016, via http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/secondary/SMIGRA*/Toga.html.

26. John Sutton, "Porous Memory and the Cognitive Life of Things," in *Prefiguring Cyberculture: An Intellectual History*, ed. Darren Toft, Annemarie Jonson, and Alessio Cavallaro (Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technogy Press, 2002), 130-31.

27. Italics are mine. Sir Thomas North, *Plutarch's Life of Caesar*, ed. Rev. Walter Skeat. Accessed June 2, 2016, via http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.03.0078%3Atext%3DCaes. In another version of the translation, The *Life of Julius Caesar*, in the Appendix to the play in The Arden Shakespeare, edited by David Daniell, the relevant passage goes like this: "But the chiefest cause that made him mortally hated, was the covetous desire he had to be called king (323)."

28. Antony confirms a version of Casca's story: "I thrice presented him a kingly crown, / Which he did thrice refuse" (3.2.105-6).

29. Critics have noted, however, the commoners in the play are not subjugated plebeians: they show contempt of the law (1.1) and don't seem to have particular grievances, nor feel themselves victims, like those in *Coriolanus*. See the introduction to the Arden *Julius Caesar* edited by David Daniell, 11.

30. *Julius Caesar: The Cambridge Dover Wilson Shakespeare*, ed. John Dover Wilson (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 127.

31. Ibid.

32. While agreeing with Jonas Barish's comments on the hats in this section of my paper, I attempt to respond to his comment that "They [hats] cannot therefore simply be brushed aside, but must either be shown or their absence somehow accounted for" (34). It is my hope that my paper's thesis will be understood as my way of "accounting for" the hats' and other anachronisms' presence in the play, following Barish's advice to understand the "wisdom that the playwright is unmistakably eager for us to acquire" (36). See his article, "Hats, Clocks and Doublets: Some Shakespearean Anachronisms," in *Shakespeare's Universe: Renaissance Ideas and Conventions: Essays in Honor of W. R. Elton* (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publication, 1996), 29-36.

33. Gerhard Dohm-van Rossum, *History of the Hour: Clocks and Modern Temporal Orders*, trans. Thomas Dunlap (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), 92.

34. Alasdair Hawkyard, "Sir John Fastoff's 'Great Mansion by Me Late Edified': Caister Castle, Norfolk," in *Of Mice and Men: Image, Belief and Regulation in Late Medieval England*, ed. Linda Clark (Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 2005), 45.

35. *American Library Association Glossary of Library and Information Science*, eds. Michael Levine-Clark and Toni M. Carter, 4th ed. (Chicago: American Library Association, 2013), 38.

36. Martin Lowry, *The World of Aldus Manutius* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1970), 137-67.

37. Plutarch, *Brutus*, trans. Thomas North, ed. Rev. Walter W. Skeat. Accessed 5 April 2016 at http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.03.0078%3Atext%3DBrut.

38. Ibid.

39. Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, trans. G.E. King (London and New York, 1927), 87.

40. North, see Note 27.

41. Plato, *The Dialogues of Plato*, trans. Benjamin Jowett, 4 vols., 4th ed. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1953), I:410-14, 441-42.

42. Unlike Cassius's elevated view, Brutus devalues their assassination act as a "sport" (3.1.127), adumbrating the critical rift to emerge between them.

43. This expression comes from the title of Jonathan Gil Harris's work, *Untimely Matter in the Time of Shakespeare* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), in which he considers the relation of physical objects to history, 18-19.

44. Ibid, 174.