

# CAESAR THE CELEBRITY: SHAKESPEARE'S REPRESENTATION OF JULIUS CAESAR

Mehedi Karim Shimanto \*

## Introduction

If one asks a historian, “Who is Julius Caesar?” he/she might answer that Julius Caesar was a great leader of ancient Rome. It is no new knowledge that Caesar was a “[c]elebrated Roman general, statesman, and [dictator]” (*Britannica Concise Encyclopedia* 309). But if one asks the same question to a litterateur what might be his/her answer? William Shakespeare seems to have already attempted an answer to that query. In his play *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare portrays Julius Caesar as a great Roman military leader who is tragically assassinated. To recapture historical events of such magnitude in the form of a play, Shakespeare uses “Plutarch’s *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans*” and follows “the relevant sections of Plutarch’s biographies of Caesar” meticulously (Dobson, 229). Thus Shakespeare remains true to the actual history and in this sense *Julius Caesar*, despite being a work of fiction, can be called a non-fiction. Yet this play might appear to be more literary in nature than non-literary because

[s]everal themes and human situations we find in *Hamlet* and the other ‘great’ tragedies [of Shakespeare] can already be found in *Julius Caesar*, in particular the hero’s tragic dilemma which, in the last resort, claims more of our attention and sympathy than the political fate of Rome, even though the two can hardly be separated. (Mehl, 221)

Thus Shakespeare’s play is not simply history recaptured. One may find in that play the story of Caesar narrated more dramatically. There Julius Caesar is more heroic and more alive than actual history would portray him to be. Perhaps this is why it has been said that “*Julius Caesar* is in various aspects a most exceptional and most important work” of Shakespeare (Zander 3).

But does Shakespeare portray Caesar simply as a leader there? Does he plainly reenact history? Or does he have anything extra to say about Caesar? This paper shows that William Shakespeare seems to have

---

\* Lecturer, Department of English, University of Dhaka.

depicted Julius Caesar, the historical figure, as a celebrity in his play. A celebrity is a successful and famous individual who has attained the attention and love of mass population. This person is a charismatic, cravingly sought after character who has crazy fan following. And also, celebrities often fall prey to envy and misfortune. In *Julius Caesar*, we find all these things happening to Caesar. Caesar appears to be a celebrity there because in the play he is not only a compelling personality, he is an idol. He is so popular in the play that it seems he is almost deified. Just to have a glimpse of him his admirers act like fanatics. Everyone talks about him so admiringly as if Caesar were not a man, but a god. Even Caesar himself seems to be aware of this magnificent aura of his which simply cannot be translated as the aura of a mere leader. To come to the point, in the play it appears that this reputation conferred upon Caesar might have come from his being more than just a leader. This research says Julius Caesar, in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, seems to be represented as a celebrity.

### **The History of Caesar**

But before exploring that “star” status of Cesar, Caesar’s true story needs to be known. How did Caesar achieve greatness? How did he rise to the top of the Roman republic? According to *Britannica Concise Encyclopedia*, Caesar

held the prominent posts of Q[uaestor] [a magistrate] and P[raetor] [a judicial officer] before becoming governor of Farther Spain in 61–60. He formed the First T[riumvirate] [a political alliance] with P[ompey] [a statesman and general of Roman republic] and M[arcus] L[icinius] C[rassus] [a merchant banker and politician] in 60 and was elected C[onsul] [an annually elected chief magistrate of the Roman republic] in 59 and P[roconsul] [a consul with extended powers] in Gaul and Illyria in 58. After conducting the G[allic] W[ars], during which he invaded Britain (55, 54) and crossed the Rhine (55, 53), he was instructed by the Senate [a governing advisory council] to lay down his command, Senate conservatives having grown wary of his increasing power, as had a suspicious Pompey. When the Senate would not command Pompey to give up his command simultaneously, Caesar, against regulations, led his forces across the Rubicon River (49) between Gaul and Italy, precipitating the Roman Civil War. Pompey fled from Italy but was pursued and defeated by Caesar in 48; he then fled to Egypt, where he was murdered. Having followed Pompey to Egypt, Caesar became lover

to C[leopatra] [an Egyptian queen] and supported her militarily. He defeated Pompey's last supporters in 46-45. He was named dictator for life by the Romans. He was offered the crown (44) but refused it, knowing the Romans' dislike for kings. He was in the midst of launching a series of political and social reforms when he was assassinated in the Senate House on the ides of March by conspirators led by C[assius] [a Roman general and administrator] and B[rutus] [a politician]. (309)

From this brief but informative description it is evident that Caesar led an illustrious life. Professionally he held many powerful positions. There is no doubt he must have been a very influential person. He displayed tact and true diplomacy in his political career. It seems he acted as if he were his own master. He led wars, demolished nations and punished his rivals. He was bold and daring. He was both a conqueror and a lover. He was a reformer also. But he fell prey to political conspiracy and was tragically murdered. This was the story of Julius Caesar.

But how can this historical figure be a celebrity? In the above mentioned quote there is no hint that Caesar lived his life like a superstar. He was simply a ruler. Even the term "celebrity" itself might not sound right with the name Julius Caesar. How can Shakespeare portray Julius Caesar as a celebrity?

### **Caesar and Stardom**

To understand how Caesar can be a star, the concept of celebrity must be known first. A celebrity is an individual who attracts and deserves attention. This means a celebrity must be someone very famous and renowned. Also, a celebrity always stands out from the general people: he/she is unique and special. Who are these celebrities then? Rojek defines stardom as "the attraction of glamorous or notorious status to an individual within the public sphere" (10). Analyzing Rojek's definition, Longhurst et al say "people gain celebrity status for either 'glamorous' reasons, such as super-models, footballers and pop stars, or for more 'notorious' reasons, such as serial killers or people who have committed 'lewd acts'" (52). From Rojek's definition three key points about a celebrity can be pinpointed: first, it is the people who decide who a star is; second, a star can attain name and fame either for being exceptionally good at something or for being abnormally twisted or antisocial in nature; and third, celebrities can entertain (as movie stars, singers etc.), shock (as serial

killers, hackers etc.) or offer something unique and new. Here a question might arise: should a person be a star though he/she is “notorious”? Boorstin seems to have already answered this question. He says: [t]he celebrity is a person who is known for his wellknownness” (57). So from Boorstin’s perspective, not one’s talent or wickedness but the level of one’s knowableness to the mass people determines one’s stardom.

Did Julius Caesar have that stardom? Plutarch wrote that Caesar “had sought dominion and power all his days, and after facing so many dangers he had finally achieved them. And the only benefit he reaped was its empty name, and the perils of fame amid his envious fellow citizens” (qtd. in Pelling 258). Based on this report it can be argued that a man who just craved for “dominion and power” and who could not earn more than an “empty name” cannot be a star. But does Shakespeare have a different opinion in this regard? Has he depicted Caesar as a celebrity? The following discussion argues that he has.

### **The Fans of Caesar : Craze and Devotion**

A celebrity is nobody if he/she doesn’t have fans. The people’s attitude towards a person determines if he/she would become a star or not. In Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar*, Julius Caesar is a celebrity because he seems to have huge fan following and popularity there. According to Longhurst et al, fans are those admirers who display “some kind of excess of admiration of an activity or star” (264). It means fans have excessive love for their favorite star. So fans are basically lovers and supporters. Unless a celebrity gains their love, he/she cannot be called a celebrity. Simply put, celebrities need and depend upon these fans. Yet, in Jenson’s opinion, fans are fanatics and insane people (9). They often act in a frenzied manner because they are over excited about their favorite star. Their love for the celebrity may sometimes cross the boundaries of logic and commonsense. To understand such complex psychology of a fan, Jenson divides fans into two classes: firstly, “obsessed loner[s]” who are fans who “(under the influence of the media) [have] entered into an intense fantasy relationship with a celebrity figure” and who might sometime “achieve public notoriety by stalking or threatening or killing the celebrity;” and secondly, the “frenzied or hysterical member of a crowd” (11). To simplify, from crazy enthusiasts to devoted followers, a celebrity can have all kinds of fans.

Now, does Caesar have fans like these in the play? And do his fans adore him in the above described manners? William Shakespeare's play seems to answer affirmatively to these questions. In the beginning of the play, a group of people are celebrating Caesar's victory over Pompey in the civil wars. They are eagerly waiting for Caesar to come because they want to hail him. However, these men are reprimanded by two tribunes, Flavius and Murellus who think that the people are just wasting their time. To this, one of the admirers answers: "we make holiday to see Caesar and to rejoice in / his triumph" (1.1.34-35). So in the very first scene, Shakespeare is showing that the people of Roman Republic are so passionate about Caesar that just to get a glimpse of him they would even leave their jobs and offices. The way they are craving for a look of Caesar implies that they are viewing Caesar as someone rare. The tribunes who criticize this temperament of the people seem to be fearful that Caesar might eventually become greater than a leader. That is why Flavius says, "let no images / Be hung with Caesar's trophies" lest Caesar should "soar above the view of men / And keep us in servile fearfulness" (1.1. 72-73, 78-79). In this speech, it is even clearer that Caesar was becoming a star to men. Fans often hang on walls the posters of their favorite celebrities. Here Flavius is especially anxious about the "images" of Caesar. Is he sensing that Caesar is becoming a celebrity to the people? Thus in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, from the very beginning an ambience can be felt where Caesar is treated not merely as a general, but as a VIP whose images are hung and whose arrival is rejoiced grandiosely. Unless Caesar is more than just a leader in the play, it is unlikely that he would receive such treatment.

Another example from scene 2 of the play discloses how popular Caesar was becoming. When Caesar returns to Rome victorious, he is offered the crown: the people want him to be their king. But Caesar refuses to be the monarch of Rome. At this, the people's reaction is very significant. Brutus, Cassius and Casca are talking about that attitude of the people toward Caesar :

CASCA. Why, there was a crown offered him;  
and being offered him, he put it by with the  
back of his hand, thus; and then the people fell  
a-shouting.

BRUTUS. What was the second noise for?

CASCA. Why, for that too.

CASSIO. They shouted thrice: what was the last  
cry for?

CASCA. Why, for that too.

BRUTUS. Was the crown offered him thrice?

CASCA. Ay . . . and he put it by  
thrice, every time gentler than other; and at every  
putting-by mine honest neighbours shouted. (1.2.219-230)

From this conversation between Brutus, Cassius and Casca, it is understood that Caesar was offered the crown of Rome thrice and he denied kingship every time. But each time he rejected the proposal, each time the crowd yelled and shouted demanding Caesar to be their king: “the people fell a-shouting” because Caesar “put by” the crown. In Casca’s words, repeatedly “for that” reason only, the crowd screamed again and again to show Caesar their support. A ruler can also have public support and love. But the manner those people applaud Caesar is overwhelming. It feels they want Caesar not because they have to choose a person for the position of a king but because they are simply crazy about him. Had Caesar simply been a dictator, he would not have had taken delivery of such overwhelming public sympathy. Earlier in this paper, two types of fans have been mentioned: lonely fans and fans in groups (Jenson 11). Here the crowd who cries for Caesar to be the king represents those fans in a crowd who are mad about their beloved stars. The following example clarifies his point even better :

CASCA. ....  
and still as he refused it the rabblement  
shouted and clapped their chopped hands, and  
threw up their sweaty night-caps, and uttered  
such a deal of stinking breath because Caesar  
refused the crown, that it had almost choked  
Caesar; (1.2.244-249)

Here, the actions of the people, e.g. crying, shouting, throwing things in excitement, uttering their heartfelt emotion etc., clearly identify them as fans in a group. As Jenson elucidates, a star can have fans who express love for the celebrity as a “frenzied and hysterical member of a crowd” (11). In this sense, in *Julius Caesar*, the love the common mass show for Caesar can be interpreted as the love of a group of fans for a star. From this perspective, Caesar is a celebrity.

But not only these people, lonely individuals also loved Caesar. In Shakespeare’s play, Artemidorus embodies such fans. In the play, this man wrote a letter to Caesar to warn him against the conspirators. The letter is as follows:

ARTEMIDORUS. *Caesar, beware of Brutus; take heed of  
Cassius; come not near Casca; have an eye to  
Cinna; trust not Trebonius; mark well Metel-  
lus Cimber; Decius Brutus loves thee not; thou  
hast wronged Caius Ligarius. There is but one  
mind in all these men, and it is bent against  
Caesar. If thou be'st not immortal, look about  
you: security gives way to conspiracy. The  
mighty gods defend thee! Thy lover,  
Artemidorus (2.3.1-10)*

As this letter confirms, Caesar does have true fans and admirers. Normally, a letter in such language is not written by a subject to his/her ruler. The language of the letter implies that Artemidorus loves Caesar and in such a tone he tries to tell Caesar who loves him and who does not. It seems he wants his idol, Caesar, to be aware of his lovers and haters. He knows many big names are plotting against him, yet he wants Caesar to live. This is a level of unquestionable devotion only a true fan is capable of displaying. He is so devoted he does not even hesitate to confront Caesar in public to try to save him:

ARTEMIDORUS. Hail, Caesar! Read this schedule.  
DECIUS. Trebonius doth desire you to o'er read,  
At your best leisure, this his humble suit.  
ARTEMIDORUS. O Caesar, read mine first, for mine's a suit  
That touches Caesar nearer. Read it, great Caesar.  
CAESAR. What touches us ourself shall be last serv'd.  
ARTEMIDORUS. Delay not, Caesar; read it instantly.  
CAESAR. What! is the fellow mad?  
PUBLIUS. Sirrah, give place. (3.1.3-9)

Here Artemidorus is earnestly requesting Caesar to read his letter: “[d]elay not, Caesar, read it instantly.” But Caesar, like an arrogant and careless master, dismisses him: “is the fellow mad?” Caesar at this time acts not like a leader but like an egotistical snob. This side of Caesar seems to have been highlighted here - that Caesar might have been really seeing himself as a celebrity who can only be admired from a distance but cannot be touched.

Even when Caesar is dead, the general people treat him as such. Though at first Brutus is successful in making the people into believing that Caesar's assassination was necessary, the people do not deplore Caesar. On the contrary, the public shower respect on Caesar:

FIRST CITIZEN. Bring him with triumph home unto his house.

SECOND CITIZEN. Give him a statue with his ancestors.

THIRD CITIZEN. Let him be Caesar.

FOURTH CITIZEN. Caesar's better parts

Shall be crown'd in Brutus.

FIRST CITIZEN. We'll bring him to his house with shouts and clamors.  
(3.2.54-58)

So still after Caesar's demise with all the accusations heaped upon him, the people decide to make Caesar's statue to commemorate him. They would even give him a proper funeral with "shouts and clamors." In all these instances, the people's natural love for Caesar is unmistakable. Even when they are convinced by Brutus that Caesar was dangerous, they do not criticize or maltreat Caesar. Such a love can hardly be won by a mere army general. It feels this love is for a wonderful man who has charmed them. That is the reason, "[t]he figure of Julius Caesar stands out, brilliant. From the start he is idealized in point of power, general respect, glory . . . he is endued dramatically with strength, importance, almost divinity" (Knight 119). Here Knight's focus is also on how Caesar is idealized and deified. He elucidates that "the general acclamation" Caesar receives makes him "a sublime figure-head." But without that "general acclamation," he is "weak, egotistical, [and] petulant" (119-120). Just as a celebrity is not a celebrity without the applause of the fans, so it appears Caesar is not great without the acclamation of the people. In this sense, Caesar can be called a star.

### **Caesar's Own View of Himself as a "Star"**

Not only the people's acclamation, Caesar's own elated opinion of himself also makes him a star. Particularly the following instances verify how Caesar himself talks or behaves as if he were a star. When Metellus Cimber petitions Caesar for the repeal of the banishment of his brother, Caesar denies that appeal saying :

CAESAR. ....

Thy brother by decree is banished:

If thou dost bend and pray and fawn for him,

I spurn thee like a cur out of my way.

Know, Caesar doth not wrong, nor without cause

Will he be satisfied. (3.1.44-48)

That Caesar is too arrogant and egotistical here is obvious. His speech discloses that he is not going to lower himself. Even when Brutus, Cassius, Casca and others beg him for mercy, he says:



CAESAR. I could be well moved, if I were as you;  
 If I could pray to move, Caesar was prayers would move me;  
 But I am constant as the northern star,  
 Of whose true-fix'd and resting quality  
 There is no fellow in the firmament.  
 The skies are painted with unnumber'd sparks;  
 They are all fire and every one doth shine;  
 But there's but one in all doth hold his place.  
 So in the world, 'tis furnish'd well with men,  
 And men are flesh and blood, and apprehensive;  
 Yet in the number I do know but one  
 That unassailable holds on his rank,  
 Unshaked of motion; and that I am he,  
 Let me a little show it, even in this;  
 That I was constant Cimber should be banish'd,  
 And constant do remain to keep him so.

CINNA. O Caesar

CAESAR. Hence! Wilt thou lift up Olympus? (3.1.)

It appears, even when everyone requests Caesar to call off his order, he does not change his mind. But more interesting than that is his assertion when he himself refers himself as a “star”: “I am constant as the northern star” and declares himself as a denizen of the “firmament.” As Knight says, “[t]he North Star alone remains constant in the skies, and Caesar must be such a star to men” (121). So according to Knight, Caesar wants to be like a star to men. Though the reason why he views himself as a star is that “[h]e wants primarily to ‘show’ his constancy: to the world, to himself” (121), the focus here is not merely on Caesar’s constancy and rigid ideals. The overall impression created by Caesar’s speech is that as a star he dwells above the territory of normal human beings. And as such,

[h]e represents an ideal of constancy, permanence, and absoluteness: a style of *integer vitae* that asserts itself even when apparently weak or infirm. In Freudian terms, Caesar is an ego-ideal to which others either aspire to or conspire against. Caesar’s famous constancy is his *virtù*, an ideal of virility and ethical integrity. (Willbern, 215)

Perhaps, because of his “ego-ideal to which others either aspire or conspire against,” Caesar emerges as a star.

The idea is further expanded. Caesar seems to be of the opinion that he is not a man of flesh and blood, but a fiery creature. He displays contempt for normal human beings: “men are flesh and blood, and apprehensive.” At the same time he purports that “[t]he skies are painted with unnumber'd sparks; / They are all fire and every one doth shine; / But there's but one in

all doth hold his place.” He means, his status is fixed in the *sky*, and he, as the “northern star,” illuminates the sky. So he believes that he is something more than a mere human being: “[u]nshaked of motion; and that I am he.” So Caesar himself thinks himself as some kind of idol whose level is beyond the reach of mankind and who should be revered accordingly. That is why he shouts: “[w]ill thou lift up Olympus?” comparing himself with Mt. Olympus. In all these occasions, Caesar seems to be of the belief that he is someone extraordinary just like a superstar. This idea is strengthened by the following assertion:

[Caesar] is spoilt by victory, success, power and by the republican courtiers who surround him ... he exclaims against flatterers and cringers, and yet both please him. All around him treat him as a master, his wife as a prince; the senate allow themselves to be called his senate; he assumes the appearance of a king even in his house; even with his wife he uses the language of a man who knows himself secure of power; and he maintains everywhere the proud, strict bearing of a soldier, which is represented even in his statues. (Gervinus, 77-78)

Therefore, both in the ways Caesar treats others and the ways he is treated by others, he comes out a special person who, like a celebrity, is the topic of everyone’s gossip.

So can it be assumed that in his own opinion Caesar is a celebrity, a man of celebrated status? His recurring references to “stars,” “the sky,” “mountains,” etc. in his dialogue create an impression that he considers himself a luminary which, in Goddard’s view, is an “assumption of divinity” (203). Thus in many ways, the overall tone of his above quoted speech is not of a leader’s, but of a star’s. Perhaps it can be the reason why Griffin says that in William Shakespeare’s play Caesar has a habit of referring to himself pompously, as a model (384) and “[t]herefore, whatever we may think of Caesar as a man, we must see him also as a symbol of something of vast import, resplendent majesty, and starry purpose” (Knight 122).

### **Caesar the Celebrity**

Now after all the above discussion, can it be said that the Caesar of *Julius Caesar* is a celebrity? To answer this question Rojeck can be taken help from again. Rojeck classified celebrities into three types:

1. Ascribed celebrity – which is celebrity status that typically follows bloodline and biological descent. The foundation of this celebrity is predetermined and something born into; for example, monarchy.
2. Achieved celebrity – derives from the (perceived) accomplishments of an individual in open competition. In the public realm these celebrities are recognized as individuals with rare talent. For example, early sporting stars such as Jesse Owen.
3. Attributed celebrity – result of the representation of an individual as noteworthy or exceptional by cultural producers (such as the mass media), regardless of an individual's actual talent or skill. (Longhurst et al 53)

Here some aspects which are deemed essential to obtain stardom have been shed light upon. First, a person can be a celebrity because he/she has famous bloodline; second, a person can be a star for being a genius; and third, he/she can be a celebrity because he/she has been publicized and broadcast far and wide. Now, which category does Shakespeare's Caesar fall into? As this paper has already illustrated, Shakespeare's Caesar is loved by the people because of his accomplishments and magnificence. In this sense, Caesar can be called an "achieved celebrity." According to Longhurst et al,

Achieved celebrity pre-dates the rise of the mass media, and whilst those who were marked out for their significant achievements were widely known and talked about, key elements of their private self were secret from public view. By contrast the contemporary 'achieved' celebrity is ever present and open to digestion through various arms of the mass media, and as such, become much dependent upon their 'public' face. (53)

So, achieved celebrities are not new in societies. They existed even when there was no mass media. And because of this, their private life was a secret. So Shakespeare's Julius Caesar must be an achieved celebrity in the traditional sense of the term then. But interestingly enough this is not happening in the play. Shakespeare's Caesar is always in the midst of people. Griffin says Shakespeare does not give Caesar any private space and soliloquy:

he is only ever on stage alone for long enough to speak three lines ([2].[2].1–3). . . . Shakespeare's Caesar is never private. Even with the people in whom he comes closest to confiding, his wife and Antony, he

refers to himself in the third person, using his name like a title . . . An impression results not of a virtuous ruler or of a ruthless tyrant, the traditional choice, but of a powerful presence with a blank behind it. (382)

Thus Shakespeare's Caesar speaks avowedly in front of public as if he were always under the spotlight: "From the very first scene, Julius Caesar is powerfully present, even though he does not enter the stage before the second scene" (Mehl 222). And Caesar is "powerfully present" because he never hides himself: he wants everyone to feel his presence. Perhaps because of such tendency, he rarely unveils his innermost thoughts or his "private self." That is the reason Shakespeare's Caesar is a public figure who seems to have no private life: "Whenever he appears in person he seems more anxious to create an impression of superhuman stature and commanding presence than to allow us any revealing insight into his real thoughts and emotions" (Mehl 223). And this attempt on Caesar's part to "create an impression of superhuman stature and commanding presence" is his desire to create a powerful public image of himself. Longhurst et al say "the contemporary 'achieved' celebrity is ever present and open to digestion through various arms of the mass media, and as such, become much dependent upon their 'public' face" (53). Thus just like a "contemporary celebrity," Caesar depends on his "public face" and is "ever present and open" to public gossip.

But is there any connection between a celebrity and mass media? Though there is no mass media in the life of Shakespeare's Caesar, this Caesar understands well the importance of reaching the people. In Longhurst et al's words:

The contemporary celebrity is ... closely associated with the mass media ... where depth [and] meaning are no longer important, and increasingly what is important is surface and image. It does not really matter what David Beckham or Brad Pitt are *really* like – all that matters is their media and celebrity images, which become disconnected from any sense of reality. (53)

That is why Caesar's public image is more important to him than his true personality. As a result, the way he talks or acts, in Griffin's words, can come neither from a "virtuous ruler" nor from a "ruthless tyrant," but from "a powerful presence with a blank behind it" (382). This "powerful presence" is the presence of a celebrity. And the "blank" behind such a

presence is the bleak and lusterless private life of that star. In *Julius Caesar*, as the “northern star” or “mount Olympus” Julius Caesar appears to be a powerful presence. This Caesar is not just a leader, but a prevailing existence which is revered by everyone. Thus Caesar may be a celebrity in the modern sense of the term as well.

## Conclusion

So it can be argued then that Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* depicts an idolized Julius Caesar. Though Caesar the man dies in the play, his aura persists. This idea is explained by Jehne in this manner: “[t]he image of an admired Caesar [is] not perished. ... Caesar's great talents and efficiency cannot be denied ... because his winning and generous manner impress[es] a modern observer as well” (65). So what is important about Caesar, as Jehne has figured out, is his “image.” Celebrities and stars always depend upon their public image or face value to be liked. Caesar's charisma, then, comes not from his achievements only, but from the impression he creates also.

And this is why this research views Caesar as a celebrity. He is an icon: “Caesar's impact, throughout the play, is more powerful, indeed more real, than his physical presence. ... His authority is taken for granted and does not have to be demonstrated by impressive rhetoric or despotic gestures” (Mehl 222). So Caesar in Shakespeare seems to have reached such a level, where he is no longer a powerful king purely. Rather the playwright paints a picture of such a Caesar who appears to have risen above his identity as a ruler. This Caesar is something more. He is a star to the people.

## Works Cited

- Bloom, Harold, ed. (2008). *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages : Julius Caesar*. New York : Infobase — Bloom's Literary Criticism.
- Boorstin, D. (1992). *The Image : A Guide to Pseudo Events in America*. New York : Random House.
- Britannica Concise Encyclopedia*. (2006). Revised and expanded ed.
- Dobson, Michael (2001). “*Julius Caesar* (Source).” *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*. Ed. Michael Dobson & Stanley Wells. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gervinus, Georg Gottfried. “Character of Caesar.” Bloom 77-78.
- Griffin, Julia. “Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* and the Dramatic Tradition.” Griffin 371-398.
- Griffin, Miriam, ed. (2009). *A Companion to Julius Caesar*. Sussex : Willey-Blackwell.

- Jehne, Martin. "History's Alternative Caesars : *Julius Caesar* and Current Historiography." Zander 59-70.
- Jenson, J. (1992). "Fandom as pathology: the consequences of characterization." *The Adoring Audience: Fan Culture and Popular Media*. Ed. L. Lewis. London : Routledge, 9-29.
- Knight, G. Wilson. "The Eroticism of *Julius Caesar*." Bloom 119-145.
- Longhurst, Brian, et al. (2008). *Introducing Cultural Studies*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Harlow : Pearson-Longman.
- Mehl, Dieter. "Julius Caesar." Bloom 220-240.
- Pelling, Christopher. "The First Biographers: Plutarch and Suetonius." Griffin 252-266.
- Rojek, C. (2001). *Celebrity*. London : Reaktion Books.
- Shakespeare, William (1992). *Julius Caesar. Shakespeare: Complete Works*. Ed. W.J. Craig. London: Magpie Books Ltd.
- Willbern, David. "Constructing Caesar: A Psychoanalytic Reading." Zander 213-226.
- Zander, Horst, ed. (2005). *Julius Caesar: New Critical Essays*. New York: Routledge.
- . "*Julius Caesar* and the Critical Legacy." Zander 3-55.