



Scan to know paper details and
author's profile

A Historical-Cognitive Linguistics Study of Caesar's Characterization in Shakespearean Plays

Dr. Bin Zhou

ABSTRACT

By using “polysemy model” of semantic change theories in historical linguistics, “mapping” and “conceptual integration” of metaphor, and “classical taxonomic structure” of categorization theories in cognitive linguistics, and literary conventions of structuralist poetics in literary studies, this article studies Caesar's characterization in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar and other plays. After analyzing the semantic change of “Caesar” and different characters' cognition on Caesar in the fictional world created by dialogues and character interactions, this article discovers that the negotiation and exchange between the total culture in 1599 and Shakespeare's personal artistic pursuit propel Shakespeare to create an ambiguous but great and unique Caesar in Julius Caesar, within the two kinds of intertexts consisting of different characters' discourses scattered in other Shakespearean plays, Caesar's ambiguity is eliminated, and his greatness and uniqueness are strengthened, and it is in his skillful maneuver of different literary conventions in characterizing Caesar that Shakespeare's great literary competence is manifested.

Keywords: shakespearean plays; caesar; semantic change; characterization; literary conventions.

Classification: LCC Code: PR2827

Language: English



Great Britain
Journals Press

LJP Copyright ID: 573358
Print ISSN: 2515-5787
Online ISSN: 2515-5792

London Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences

Volume 23 | Issue 24 | Compilation 1.0



© 2023, Dr. Bin Zhou This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 Unported License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), permitting all noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

A Historical-Cognitive Linguistics Study of Caesar's Characterization in Shakespearean Plays

Dr. Bin Zhou

ABSTRACT

By using “polysemy model” of semantic change theories in historical linguistics, “mapping” and “conceptual integration” of metaphor, and “classical taxonomic structure” of categorization theories in cognitive linguistics, and literary conventions of structuralist poetics in literary studies, this article studies Caesar’s characterization in Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar and other plays. After analyzing the semantic change of “Caesar” and different characters’ cognition on Caesar in the fictional world created by dialogues and character interactions, this article discovers that the negotiation and exchange between the total culture in 1599 and Shakespeare’s personal artistic pursuit propel Shakespeare to create an ambiguous but great and unique Caesar in Julius Caesar, within the two kinds of intertexts consisting of different characters’ discourses scattered in other Shakespearean plays, Caesar’s ambiguity is eliminated, and his greatness and uniqueness are strengthened, and it is in his skillful maneuver of different literary conventions in characterizing Caesar that Shakespeare’s great literary competence is manifested.

Keywords: shakespearean plays; caesar; semantic change; characterization; literary conventions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Julius Caesar probably is the most special and influential politician in western history. Among various artistic forms representing him, Shakespearean plays are the most unique. Caesar is presented in *Julius Caesar* and 15 other plays; in *Julius Caesar* Caesar is presented in his own discourses, and other characters’ direct evaluative and reported evaluative comments; in 15 other

plays Caesar is presented inadvertently in the characters’ direct and reported evaluative comments; in *Julius Caesar* and 7 other plays Caesar is canonized from a man to an icon ...

Influenced by these textual features, Caesar becomes the most controversial politician in Shakespearean plays. Some praise him as a great hero (Schlegel, 1811; Bonjour, 1958) and argue that his spirit represents the tendency towards Monarchism (Ulrici, 1839; Whitaker, 1953); some debase him as a notorious dictator (Hudson, 1872; Wilson, 1948; Corti, 1993); some distinguish between Caesar the man and his spirit (Dowden, 1881; Knight, 1931; Rice, 1973), the selfish and unselfish Caesar (Lowenthal, 1982; Miola, 1985; Blits, 1993), and the early and later Caesar (Kujawinska-Courtney, 1993). The controversy is mainly caused by three reasons: first, most critics have focused only on *Julius Caesar* and neglected Caesar in 15 other plays; second, most of them have overlooked the fact that “dialogue and character interaction” (Feng & Shen, 2001: 80) are the focuses of historical play studies; third, almost all of them have ignored Caesar’s canonization in *Julius Caesar* and 7 other plays. Historical linguistics “investigates the processes of language change” (Trask, 2000: 150), which involves changes “[I]n vocabulary, in pronunciation, in grammar, in meaning, and to some extent in spelling” (1994: 58). By studying the semantic change of “Caesar” in the fictional world created by dialogues and character interactions in *Julius Caesar* and other Shakespearean plays from the perspective of historical-cognitive linguistics, both Caesar’s characterization in Shakespearean plays and Shakespeare’s secret “literary competence” (Culler, 2001: 55) can be discovered.

II. SEMANTIC CHANGE THEORY & CHARACTERIZATION STUDY

Semantic change is one of the main focuses of historical linguistics, it is the process “where the existing meaning M_1 of a word acquires a new meaning M_2 , so that the word becomes polysemous with the two senses/readings M_1 and M_2 ” (Koch, 2016: 24), or to be more exactly, it is

“not a change in meanings per se, but the addition of a meaning to the semantic system or the loss of a meaning from the semantic system while the form remains constant ... all semantic changes within a speech community involve polysemy at their beginning point or at their end point” (Wilkins, 1996: 269). The process can be illustrated as follows:

TIME	FORM	MEANING	FEATURES
T_1	F	M_1	p, q, r
T_2	F	$M_1 (M_2)$	p, q, r (q, r, s)
T_3	F	$M_1 > M_2$	p, q, r > q, r, s
T_4	F	$M_1 = M_2$	p, q, r = q, r, s

Figure 1: Process of semantic change (an integration of figures by Wilkins (1996: 269) & Koch (2016: 25))

In Figure 1, from T_1 to T_4 , the word form is constant, but the meaning is different. At T_1 , the word has only one meaning M_1 in the language system, and M_1 has features “p, q, r”. At T_2 , a new meaning M_2 surfaces, which is not independent from M_1 and possesses partial features “q, r” of M_1 and a new feature “s”. At T_3 , M_2 spreads quickly and feature “s” becomes more prominent; although M_2 is independent from M_1 , it has not gained the equal status of M_1 . At T_4 , M_2 and M_1 have equal statuses and possess features “p, q, r” and “q, r, s”, respectively. In the fictional world of Shakespearean plays, “Caesar” has changed gradually from a monoseme to a polyseme, i.e., M_1 (“Caesar the man”) → $M_1 (M_2)$ (“the title of monarchs”) → $M_1 > M_2$ → $M_1 = M_2$.

This article plans to study the characterization of Caesar from the perspective of historical-cognitive linguistics by using “The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works” (Revised, 2001) and its subsequently included *King Edward III* (2017) as the texts. First, the process, reasons, and influences of the semantic change of “Caesar” within Shakespeare’s fictional world will be analyzed by using the integrated semantic change theory illustrated in Figure 1; then Shakespeare’s characterization of Caesar with literary “conventions” (Culler, 2001: 6) or “codes” (13) canonization and intertextuality will be studied;

finally Shakespearean plays’ advantages in representing the historical figure Caesar will be discussed. The study of Caesar’s characterization from the historical-cognitive linguistics perspective can not only supplement Caesar’s characterization study, but also overcome historical study’s difficulties in reconstructing Caesar’s canonization.

III. CAESAR IN SHAKESPEAREAN PLAYS

Logically, “Caesar” at first only has the meaning “Caesar the man” in Shakespeare’s fictional world; the meaning “the title of monarchs” first appears in Caesar’s own discourses in *Julius Caesar*; then it spreads quickly in the plebeians’ and Antony’s discourses after Caesar’s assassination in *Julius Caesar*, and in Cloten’s discourses in *Cymbeline*; finally it gains the equal status of “Caesar the man” in Bassianus’s discourse in *Titus Andronicus*, in Countess Salisbury’s, Audley’s, and Prince Edward’s/the Commons’ discourses in *King Edward III*, in Pistol’s discourse in *King Henry IV, Part 2*, in the host’s discourse in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, in Henry VI’s discourse in *King Henry VI, Part 3*, and in Richard III’s discourse in *King Richard III*. During the surfacing, spreading, and stabilizing courses of “the title of monarchs”, “Caesar the man” exists independently and never declines.

According to the “story time” (Chatman, 1978: 62), the semantic change of “Caesar” in Shakespeare’s fictional world can be roughly divided into four periods: Caesar’s early and middle ages, Caesar’s later age, Octavius’s age, and the age after Octavius. By studying the semantic change of “Caesar” in the four periods, Caesar’s canonization within Shakespeare’s fictional world can be clearly revealed.

3.1 Caesar’s Early and Middle Ages

In this article, Caesar’s early and middle ages are restricted to the period before his return to Rome from his “triumph over Pompey’s blood” (*Julius Caesar*, 1.1.52). Although Shakespeare starts his narration from Caesar’s later age in *Julius Caesar*, Caesar’s lives in his early and middle ages, which consists of four episodes chronologically, i.e., being sick in Spain, overcoming Nervii, swimming, and defeating Pompey’s descendants, can be constructed from Cassius’s, Antony’s, and Murellus’s discourses.

- CASSIUS But ere we could arrive the point proposed / Caesar cried, ‘help me, Cassius, or I sink!’ / I, as Aeneas, our great ancestor, / Did from the flames of Troy upon his shoulder / The old Anchises bear, so from the waves of Tiber / Did I the tired Caesar: and this man / Is now become a god, and Cassius is / A wretched creature and must bend his body / If Caesar carelessly but nod on him. / He had a fever when he was in Spain, / And when the fit was on him I did mark / How he did shake. ’Tis true, this god did shake: / His coward lips did from their colour fly, / And that same eye, whose bend doth awe the world, / Did lose his lustre: I did hear him groan: / Ay, and that tongue of his that bade the Romans / Mark him and write his speeches in their books, / ‘Alas,’ it cried, ‘give me some drink, Titinius,’ / As a sick girl. (*Julius Caesar*, 1.2.110-128)
- ANTONY You all know this mantle. I remember / The first time ever Caesar put it on. / ’Twas on a summer’s evening in his tent, / That day he overcame the Nervii. (*Julius Caesar*, 3.2.168-171)
- MURELLUS And do you now strew flowers in his way, / That comes in triumph over Pompey’s blood? (*Julius Caesar*, 1.1.51-52)

In (1), (2), and (3), the unshaded parts are the comments on Caesar’s early and middle lives. Although in Cassius’s, Antony’s, and Murellus’s discourses “Caesar” has only one meaning “Caesar the man”, its features are different.

To show Caesar’s mediocrity, by adopting the “direct speech” (Leech & Short, 2007: 260), Cassius not only depicts his action and appearance when he is ill, but also compares him with “[T]he old Anchises” when he is tired in swimming.

“[s]hake” and “groan” are the descriptions of Caesar’s actions, possessing features “weak and fragile” and “painful and brittle”, respectively. “[c]oward” and “did from their colour fly” are the descriptions of Caesar’s “lips”: the former itself is a feature, and the latter possesses features “weak and pale”. “[s]ame (coward)” and “[D]id lose his lustre” are the descriptions of Caesar’s “eye”: the former itself is a feature, and the latter possesses features “dull and dim”. “[c]ried” is the description of Caesar’s “tongue”, possessing features “coward and vulnerable”. By first putting “shake” and “groan” into the “container” (Lakoff, 1987: 287) of their superordinate category “Caesar’s action”, and “lips”, “eye”, and “tongue” into the container of their superordinate category “Caesar’s appearance”, then putting “Caesar’s action” and “Caesar’s appearance” into the container of their superordinate category “Caesar in illness”, Cassius constructs a weak, fragile, brittle, and coward Caesar, totally on the contrary of a qualified soldier and “[A]s a sick girl”. Cassius’s comparison of Caesar with Aeneas’s father “[T]he old Anchises” and “a sick girl” can be well explained by “projection mapping”. “The old Anchises” and “a sick girl” are in the “source domain”, possessing features “old, stupid, and fatuous” and “sick, weak, and frail”, respectively; Caesar is in the “target domain” (Fauconnier, 1997: 9). After mapping from the source to the target, Anchises’s and the girl’s features are transferred to Caesar. So in Cassius’s eyes, Caesar is just a weak, sick, stupid, and fatuous ruler.

By adopting the direct speech, Cassius “quotes the words used verbatim” (Leech & Short, 2007: 260) by Caesar. “[h]elp me” and “give me some water”

are Caesar's supplications to Cassius and Titinius, respectively. So for Caesar, he himself possesses features "helpless and tired, and weak and sick"; for Cassius, because he is present at both occasions, he also gives Caesar these features.

"[o]vercame" in Antony's discourse is the description of Caesar's military achievement, possessing features "talented and brilliant", and "triumph over Pompey's blood" in Murellus's rhetorical question is the description of Caesar's victory in the internal war, possessing feature "cruel and bloody".

Compared with the relevant parts in *The Life of Julius Caesar* (Plutarch, 1907), which is generally regarded as the major reference of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* and other Roman works, and in which Caesar is brave enough to face the sickness (18), overcomes the Nervii with difficulties (22-23), is a good swimmer (52), and defeats Pompey's descendants for his own safety (57-58), Cassius's, Murellus's, and Antony's comments on Caesar, and Caesar's self presentation in Cassius's discourses are all changed to some extent for their own purposes. Debasing Caesar with all means, Cassius wants Brutus to join in the conspiracy; soliciting Cassius and Titinius, Caesar wants to save his own life; showing to the plebeians Caesar's cruelty, Murellus wants to use them to curb Caesar; highlighting Caesar's military achievements, Antony wants the plebeians to revenge for Caesar. Which Caesar is more close to history is not important here, not only because "[A] distinction between 'fact' and 'fiction' ... seems unlikely to get us very far ... our own opposition between 'historical' and 'artistic' truth does not apply at all to ..." (Eagleton, 1996: 1) historical narratives/narrated histories, but also the purpose here is to study Caesar's characterization by focusing on the meaning of "Caesar" and its features for different characters in Caesar's early and middle ages.

By using the integrated semantic change theory illustrated in Figure 1, the meaning of "Caesar" in Caesar's early and middle ages for different characters can be summed up as follows: T_1 = Caesar's early and middle ages; F = Caesar; M_1 = Caesar the man; F_1 = weak and sick, stupid and

fatuous, and helpless and tired (for Cassius); helpless and tired, and weak and sick (for Caesar), talented and brilliant (for Antony); cruel and bloody (for Murellus).

3.2 Caesar's Later Age

Caesar's later age is restricted to the period between his return to Rome from his "triumph over Pompey's blood" (*Julius Caesar*, 1.1.52) and his death. Actually Shakespeare starts his story of *Julius Caesar* here.

During this period, Caesar's contemporaries still widely use "Caesar" to refer to "Caesar the man", but they give him features totally different from those in Caesar's early and middle ages. Here Cassius's, Antony's, and Brutus's comments on Caesar are chosen for analysis.

Cassius uses "god" (*Julius Caesar*, 1.2.111, 1.2.116), "lion" (*Julius Caesar*, 1.3.75, 1.3.106), "[C]olossus" (*Julius Caesar*, 1.2.132), "dreadful night" (*Julius Caesar*, 1.3.73), "strange eruptions" (*Julius Caesar*, 1.3.78), "tyrant" (*Julius Caesar*, 1.3.103), "a wolf" (*Julius Caesar*, 1.3.104), and "[S]o vile a thing" (*Julius Caesar*, 1.3.111) to recognize "Caesar the man". After mapping from the source to the target, "Caesar the man" is constructed into a monster with features "holy and powerful, dreadful and dangerous, strange and destructive, despotic and dictatorial, cruel and bloody, and vile and wicked". By using "my lord" (*Julius Caesar*, 1.1.2) and "most noble" (*Julius Caesar*, 2.2.118) to recognize Caesar, Antony gives "Caesar the man" features "respectable and noblest". Brutus uses "a serpent's egg" (*Julius Caesar*, 2.1.32), "the adder" (*Julius Caesar*, 2.1.14), and "a dish fit for the gods" (*Julius Caesar*, 2.1.161) to recognize "Caesar the man". After mapping from the source to the target, "Caesar the man" is given features "(potentially) dangerous and evil, and pure and sacred".

Influenced by his contemporaries' new attitudes towards him, Caesar's mentality towards himself also changes.

- CAESAR Speak. Caesar is turned to hear. (*Julius Caesar*, 1.2.17)

- CAESAR Would he were fatter! But I fear him not: / Yet if my name were liable to fear / I do not know the man I should avoid / So soon as that spare Cassius ... / I rather tell thee what is to be feared / Than what I fear: for always I am Caesar. / Come on my right hand, for this ear is deaf, / And tell me truly what thou think'st of him. (*Julius Caesar*, 1.2.197-213)
- CAESAR Caesar shall forth. The things that threatened me / Ne'er looked but on my back: when they shall see / The face of Caesar, they are vanished. (*Julius Caesar*, 2.2.10-12)
- CAESAR Yet Caesar shall go forth, for these predictions / Are to the world in general as to Caesar. (*Julius Caesar*, 2.2.28-29)
- CAESAR Caesar should be a beast without a heart / If he should stay at home today for fear. / No, Caesar shall not. Danger knows full well / That Caesar is more dangerous than he. / We are two lions littered in one day, / And I the elder and more terrible, / And Caesar shall go forth. (*Julius Caesar*, 2.2.42-48)
- CAESAR Shall Caesar send a lie? / Have I in conquest stretched mine arm so far / To be afeard to tell greybeards the truth? / Decius, go tell them Caesar will not come. (*Julius Caesar*, 2.2.65-68)
- CAESAR Caius Ligarius, / Caesar was ne'er so much your enemy / As that same ague which hath made you lean. (*Julius Caesar*, 2.2.111-113)
- CAESAR Are we all ready? What is now amiss / That Caesar and his Senate must redress? (*Julius Caesar*, 3.1.31-32)
- CAESAR I must prevent thee, Cimber: / ... Be not fond / To think that Caesar bears such rebel blood / ... I mean sweet words, / Low-crooked curtsies and base spaniel fawning. / ... / I spurn thee like a cur out of my way. / Know, Caesar doth not wrong, nor without cause / Will he be satisfied. (*Julius Caesar*, 3.1.35-48)
- CAESAR *Et tu, Brute?* — Then fall, Caesar. (*Julius Caesar*, 3.1.77)

In his own discourses above, except using self-referential pronouns and metaphors to refer to "Caesar the man", Caesar totally uses "Caesar" 15 times, "he" twice, and "my name" and "his"

once to refer to "Caesar the man" attached with "the title of monarchs".

When Caesar uses self-referential pronouns and metaphors to refer only to "Caesar the man", he gives himself different features at different occasions. By using "deaf" to describe his "ear" in (5), he gives himself features "sick, old, and mortal". By using "prevent" and "spurn" to scold Metellus, he gives himself features "just and impartial" in (12). In other discourses he gives himself features "powerful and awful".

When Caesar uses "Caesar", "he", "my name", and "his" to refer to "Caesar the man" attached with "the title of monarchs", he gives "Caesar the man" features "sick, old, and mortal, just and impartial, and powerful and awful", and by combining "just and impartial, and powerful and awful" with new features "regal and imperial", he creates a new meaning "the title of monarchs" and attaches it to "Caesar the man". The surfacing of "the title of monarchs" in Caesar's mind can be well explained by "conceptual integration" theory. First, a "genetic space" and two "input spaces" (Fauconnier, 1997: 149) are set up. The genetic space controls the two inputs, ensuring the elements in input A correspond to those in input B. The element "emperor" is in input A and "Caesar" is in input B, possessing features "powerful and awful, and regal and imperial" and "sick, old, and mortal, just and impartial, and powerful and awful", respectively. After the integration, the element "Caesar" in the "integrated space" (150) obtains the features of the "emperor" from input A and those of "Caesar" from input B. Yet Caesar not only cannot escape from being sick, old, and mortal, but also cannot realize the dream of being the emperor. To avoid these tortures, he unconsciously uses the psychological defence mechanism "fantasy" (Millon et al., 2004: 451) and creates two independent meanings "Caesar the man" and "the title of monarchs" by giving them features "sick, old, and mortal, just and impartial, and powerful and awful" and "just and impartial, powerful and awful, and regal and imperial", respectively, and attaches the latter to the former.

When Caesar utters (5), (6), (7), and (8), the hearers include only “the addressees” he intends to communicate with. When he utters (9) and (10), the hearers include not only the addressees, but also the unintended “bystanders”, whom Caesar has no intention to communicate with, but are in his awareness. When he utters (4), (11), (12), and (13) at the Lupercal and the Senate, the hearers include not only the addressees and the bystanders, but also many “eavesdroppers” (Xia, 2012: 111), who are not in Caesar’s awareness. The plebeians are bystanders, and foreign spies and peddlers in the crowds are eavesdroppers. Most of them not only have never seen Caesar before, but also have known no differences between Republicanism and Monarchism. When they hear an important person surrounded and flattered by the officers uses “Caesar” rather than “I” to refer to himself, they can easily connect “Caesar” with the title monarch, and regard the important person is the present “Caesar”, i.e., the present monarch. Assemblies at the Lupercal and the Senate are favorable for the spreading of the new meaning “the title of monarchs” in Rome, and the touring spies and peddlers can spread it to the whole Europe and even farther.

When Caesar utters (5), only Antony is present. Although Antony would not connect “Caesar” to “the title of monarchs”, he definitely understands Caesar’s implication by recalling his use of it at other occasions. This is the reason why he can quickly respond to the plebeians’ use of it after Caesar’s death.

The meaning of “Caesar” in Caesar’s later age for different characters can be summed up as follows: T_2 = Caesar’s later age; F = Caesar; M_1 (M_2) = Caesar the man (the title of monarchs); F_1 (F_2) = holy and powerful, dreadful and dangerous, strange and destructive, despotic and dictatorial, cruel and bloody, and vile and wicked [for Cassius], respectable and noblest [for Antony], (potentially) dangerous and evil, and pure and sacred [for Brutus], sick, old, and mortal, just and impartial, and powerful and awful [for Caesar] (just and impartial, powerful and awful, and regal and imperial [for Caesar]).

3.3 Octavious’s Age

Octavious’s age is restricted to the period between Caesar’s death and Octavious’s death. According to the story time, the relevant plays are *Julius Caesar* (after 3.1.77), *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *Cymbeline*. During this period, many characters still widely use “Caesar” to refer to “Caesar the man”, but the plebeians and Antony in *Julius Caesar* (after 3.1.77), and Cloten in *Cymbeline* begin to use it to refer to “the title of monarchs” independently.

When “Caesar” is used to refer to “Caesar the man” in the three plays, except Caesar’s or Romans’ enemies occasionally debase him, most characters give him positive evaluative comments. Antony’s and Brutus’s comments in *Julius Caesar* (after 3.1.77), Cleopatra’s comment in *Antony and Cleopatra*, and Cymbeline’s comment in *Cymbeline* are chosen for analysis here.

Antony uses “brave hart” (*Julius Caesar*, 3.1.204), “the heart of the world” (*Julius Caesar*, 3.1.208), “a deer” (*Julius Caesar*, 3.1.209), and “a monarch” (*Julius Caesar*, 3.1.272) to recognize “Caesar the man”. After mapping from the source to the target, “Caesar the man” is given features “innocent and pitiful, brave and heroic, central and dominating, and powerful and charismatic”. Brutus first debases Caesar as “the dust” (*Julius Caesar*, 3.1.116), then declares to give him “true rites and lawful ceremonies” (*Julius Caesar*, 3.1.241), and finally calls him “great Julius” and “the foremost man of all this world” (*Julius Caesar*, 4.3.22). So his cognition of “Caesar the man” ranges from “worthless and trivial” through “contributory and patriotic” to “great and foremost”. By using “[B]road-fronted” (*Antony and Cleopatra*, 1.5.30) and “hath mused of taking kingdoms in” (*Antony and Cleopatra*, 3.13.87) to praise Caesar, Cleopatra gives “Caesar the man” features “clever and intelligent, and careful and considerate”. In “Caesar’s ambition, / ... did almost stretch / The sides o’ th’ world, against all colour here / Did put the yoke upon’s” (*Cymbeline*, 3.1.49-52) and “our laws, whose use the sword of Caesar / Hath too much mangled” (*Cymbeline*, 3.1.56-57), Cymbeline gives Caesar negative features “ambitious and oppressive, and destroying and destructive”.

The assembly on the square after Caesar's death is crucial for the detachment of "the title of monarchs" from "Caesar the man".

- 3 PLEBEIAN Let him be Caesar. (*Julius Caesar*, 3.2.51).
- PLEBEIAN Caesar's better parts / Shall be crowned in Brutus. (*Julius Caesar*, 3.2.51-52)
- 1 PLEBEIAN This Caesar was a tyrant.
3 PLEBEIAN Nay, that's certain. / We are blest that Rome is rid of him. (*Julius Caesar*, 3.2.69-70)
- ANTONY Here was a Caesar: when comes such another? (*Julius Caesar*, 3.2.243)

In (14), (15), and (16), the plebeians use "Caesar" 3 times to refer to "the title of monarchs". As the previous analysis shows, there is a close connection between the plebeians' understanding of "Caesar" as "the title of monarchs" and Caesar's calling of himself with "Caesar" in public. Because no one corrects their faults, the plebeians previously understanding and spreading "Caesar" as "the title of monarchs", and the plebeians accepting their spreading now have a fixed cognition that "Caesar" is "the title of monarchs". So it is not surprised that they use it in this way.

Antony has heard Caesar call himself "Caesar" many times, now when hears the plebeians understand "Caesar" as "the title of monarchs", he definitely knows the reasons. Even if he didn't know the reasons at that moment, in order to utilize the plebeians to revenge for Caesar, he would adopt this usage expediently. Antony's use of "Caesar" in this way in (17) definitely ensures those plebeians who are still doubtful about it, because in their eyes the dead important person's friend Antony will not mistake his title as "Caesar". It should be noticed that even if the plebeians know "Caesar" is the important person's name later, "the title of monarchs" not only hasn't disappeared, but also continued to spread further and farther, and finally becomes fixed in language. This is related with the plebeians' totally different experiences before and after Caesar's death. When Caesar is alive, Rome is strong, glorious, wealthy, and stable; when he is

dead, Rome becomes fragmented, inglorious, poor, and unstable. The plebeians' continuance to use "the title of monarchs" reflects their yearnings for Caesar's age and appreciations for Caesar. So in both the plebeians' and Antony's eyes, "the title of monarchs" has features "just and impartial, powerful and awful, and regal and imperial".

The story of *Cymbeline* happens after Octavius's coronation. At that period even the foreigner Cloten can playfully use "Caesar" to refer to "the title of monarchs".

- CLOTEN There be many Caesars Ere such another / Julius. (*Cymbeline*, 3.1.12-13)
- CLOTEN (as I / said) there is no moe such Caesars, other of them may / have crook'd noses, but to owe such straight arms, / none. (*Cymbeline*, 3.1.36-39)

In (18) and (19) Cloten not only uses "many Caesars" and "other of them" directly to refer to "the title of monarchs", but also in "such another / Julius" and "such Caesars" uses "Caesar the man" as the reference point to recognize "the title of monarchs". So in his eyes, "Caesar the man" possesses features "brilliant and talented", and "the title of monarchs" on the contrary possesses features "ordinary and common". There are two main reasons that he uses "Caesar" in this way. First, after several decades' spreading, "the title of monarchs" has already become independent in language, he is just following the "semiotic convention" (Culler, 2001: 27). Second, Lucius now is demanding England to pay revenues to Rome according to the pact. By using "Caesar" in this way, he wants Lucius to know that only Julius Caesar can conquer England, even if Octavius and others have the title "Caesar" and possess Caesar's strong wills, they lack his talents. Cloten's playful use of "Caesar" in this way shows that within just several decades the two meanings have already spread to the corner of Europe and "the title of monarchs" has been accepted at least by the upper class.

The meaning of "Caesar" in Octavius's age for different characters can be summed up as follows: T_3 = Octavius's age; F = Caesar; $M_1 > M_2$ = Caesar the man > the title of monarchs; $F_1 > F_2$ =

innocent and pitiful, brave and heroic, central and dominating, and powerful and charismatic [for Antony], (at first) worthless and trivial, (then) contributory and patriotic, and (finally) great and foremost [for Brutus], clever and intelligent, and careful and considerate [for Cleopatra], ambitious and oppressive, and destroying and destructive [for Cymbeline], brilliant and talented [for Cloten] > just and impartial, powerful and awful, and regal and imperial [for the plebeians and Antony], ordinary and common [for Cloten].

3.4 Age after Octavious

The age after Octavious is restricted to the time after Octavious's death. The relevant plays are *Titus Andronicus*, *Hamlet*, *King Edward III*, *King Richard II*, *King Henry IV, Part 2*, *King Henry VI, Part 1*, *King Henry VI, Part 2*, *King Henry VI, Part 3*, *King Richard III*, *As You Like It*, *Measure for Measure*, *Othello*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *All's Well That Ends Well*, and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. During this period, "the title of monarchs" gains the equal status of "Caesar the man".

"Caesar" referring to "Caesar the man" is used in two ways:

First, it is used directly by Boyet in *Love's Labour's Lost*, by Hamlet and Horatio in *Hamlet*, by King Edward III in *King Edward III*, by King Richard II's Queen in *King Richard II*, by Suffolk and Saye in *King Henry VI, Part 2*, and by Prince Edward in *King Richard III*. Except King Richard II's Queen in her sadness evaluates "Caesar the man" negatively, and Hamlet evaluates him both positively and negatively, all the other characters give him positive evaluative comments. Here Hamlet's evaluations on him are chosen for analysis.

Hamlet uses "clay" (*Hamlet*, 5.1.211) and "earth" (*Hamlet*, 5.1.213), and "so capital a / calf" (*Hamlet*, 3.2.106-107), "[I]mperious" (*Hamlet*, 5.1.211), and "kept the world in awe" (*Hamlet*, 5.1.213) to recognize "Caesar the man". "[c]lay" and "earth", and "so capital a / calf" are in the source domain, possessing features "trivial and unimportant", and "very important and very strong", respectively. "Caesar the man" is in the

target domain. After mapping from the source to the target, "Caesar the man" obtains both the features of "clay" and "earth", and "so capital a / calf". By saying "keep the world in awe", Hamlet also gives "Caesar the man" features "fearful and powerful". So Hamlet gives "Caesar the man" not only positive features "imperious, very important, and very strong, and fearful and powerful", but also negative features "trivial and unimportant". Because Hamlet is in great sorrow of his father's death, and is sighing for life's chop and change now, these negative features are not his true thoughts on "Caesar the man".

Second, it is used as a reference point for comparison by the Second Lord in *As You Like It*, by Escalus and Lucio in *Measure for Measure*, by Iago in *Othello*, by Rosalind in *All's Well That Ends Well*, by King Edward III in *King Edward III*, by Bardolpha in *King Henry IV, Part 2*, by Joan and Benford in *King Henry VI, Part 1*, and by Queen Margaret in *King Henry VI, Part 3*. Except Rosalind evaluates "Caesar the man" negatively, all the other characters give him positive evaluative comments. Here Benford's evaluation on him will be analyzed.

In "A far more glorious star thy soul will make / Than Julius Caesar or bright" (*King Henry VI, Part 1*, 1.1.55-56), when Benford says Henry V's star is "far more glorious ... / Than Julius Caesar", he is at Henry V's funeral. So it is not surprised that he elevates Henry V above "Caesar the man". Actually by using "Caesar the man" as the reference point, he has already given him positive features "talent and brilliant, and glorious and holy".

"Caesar" referring to "the title of monarchs" is used in two kinds of discourses:

First, it is used in the direct evaluative comments by Bassianus in *Titus Andronicus*, by the Host in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, by King Richard III in *King Richard III*, by Pistol in *King Henry IV, Part 2*, by King Henry VI in *King Henry VI, Part 3*, and by Countess Salisbury and Audley in *King Edward III*.

- BASSIANUS If ever Bassianus, Caesar's son, / Were gracious in the eyes of royal Rome. (*Titus Andronicus*, 1.1.10-11)

- HOST Thou'rt an emperor- Caesar, *Kaisar* and Vizier. / ... / Said I well, bully Hector? (*The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 1.3.9-11)
- KING RICHARD III And she shall be sole victoress, Caesar's Caesar. (*King Richard III*, 4.4.336)
- PISTOL Shall pack-horses / And hollow pamper'd jades of Asia, / ... / Compare with Caesars and with Cannibals, / And Troyant Greeks? (*King Henry IV, Part 2*, 2.4.161-165)
- KING HENRY VI No bending knee will call thee Caesar now. (*King Henry VI, Part 3*, 3.1.18)
- COUNTESS SALISBURY That love you offer me you cannot give, / For Caesar owes that tribute to his Queen. (*King Edward III*, 1.2.417-418)
- AUDLEY Victorious Prince — that thou art so, behold / A Caesar's fame in kings' captivity. (*King Edward III*, 4.9.37-38)

By calling himself “Caesar's son” in (20), Bassianus gives “the title of monarchs” features “just and impartial, powerful and awful, and regal and imperial”. The host uses not only “Caesar”, but also its German form “Kaisar” to refer to “the title of monarchs” in (21). In both forms, he gives “the title of monarchs” features “powerful and awful, and regal and imperial”. By comparing “pack-horses” and “hollow pamper'd jades of Asia” with “Caesar”, “Cannibals”, and “Troyant Greeks” in (23), Pistol gives “the title of monarchs” features “talented and brilliant, powerful and awful, and regal and imperial”. By using “Caesar's Caesar” in (22) and “Caesar” in (24) to refer to “the title of monarchs”, both King Richard III and King Henry VI give it features “powerful and awful, and regal and imperial”. By saying “[F]or Caesar owes that tribute to his Queen” in (25), Countess Salisbury gives ‘the title of monarchs’ features “responsible and loyal”. Audley uses a pun in “[A] Caesar's fame in kings' captivity” in (26). First, “Caesar” refers to “Caesar the man”, because after the conquest of Gaul, Caesar humiliates the King of Gaul publicly. Second, “Caesar” refers to “the title of monarchs”, because the present “Caesar” is Prince Edward's father Edward III. So he gives “Caesar the man”

and “the title of monarchs” features “talented and brilliant” and “just and impartial, powerful and awful, and regal and imperial”, respectively.

Second, it is used in the reported evaluative comment by Prince Edward in *King Edward III*.

- PRINCE This tumult is of war increasing broils / As at the Coronation of a king / The joyful clamours of the people are, / When ‘Ave Caesar’ they pronounce aloud. (*King Edward III*, 1.1.161-164)

In (27), Prince Edward uses the direct speech “[A]ve Caesar” to report the Commons' salutations to his father King Edward III. The direct speech guarantees that he hasn't changed the Commons' original discourse, i.e., they definitely use “Caesar” to refer to “the title of monarchs” and give it features “powerful and awful, and regal and imperial”. Prince Edward's report of “[A]ve Caesar” shows that he can use “the title of monarchs” easily. In the system of language appraisal, “they pronounce” belongs to “expand” of the “engagement” (Martin & White, 2005: 133-134), i.e., it is the Commons rather than Prince Edward who give these features to “the title of monarchs”. But because Prince Edward loves the present “Caesar” his father and is the legal heir to the throne, it can be inferred that he not only accepts the features given by the Commons, but also endows it with other features as “just and impartial, and talented and brilliant”.

“Caesar” referring to “the title of monarchs” is used by all ranks, in its German form, in a pun, and in the reported evaluative comment shows that after many centuries' spreading, “the title of monarchs” has already been accepted by all European languages, rooted in all Europeans' hearts, and acquired the equal status of “Caesar the man”.

The meaning of “Caesar” after Octavius's age for different characters can be summed up as follows: T_4 = after Octavius's age; F = Caesar (Kaisar ...); $(M_1 = M_2)$ = (Caesar the man = the title of monarchs); $(F_1 = F_2)$ = (imperious, very important, and very strong, and fearful and powerful [for Hamlet]; talent and brilliant, and glorious and holy [for Benford]; talented and

brilliant [for Audley]) = just and impartial, powerful and awful, and regal and imperial [for Audley and Bassianus]; powerful and awful, and regal and imperial [for the host, the Commons, King Richard III, and King Henry VI]; talented and brilliant, powerful and awful, and regal and imperial [for Pistol]; responsible and loyal [for Countess Salisbury]; just and impartial, talented and brilliant, powerful and awful, and regal and imperial [for Prince Edward].

IV. CAESAR'S CHARACTERIZATION IN SHAKESPEAREAN PLAYS

Julius Caesar in different ages are viewed differently by the characters in Shakespearean plays. He is a brilliant, talented, but cruel and bloody general with weak and sick body in his early and middle ages; although he is weak, sick, and old, he is viewed as a semi-god by himself and most characters in his later age; he is not only respected and adored almost by everyone, but also viewed as the title of monarchs in Octavius's age; his historical status as one of the greatest politicians in the world and the icon of Roman imperial regime are stable after Octavius's age.

So ambiguous, so great, and so unique a Caesar is the product of the "negotiation and exchange" (Greenblatt, 1988: vii) between "the totality of the institutions, social practices, and discourses" (Abrams & Harpham, 2009: 219) and Shakespeare's personal artistic pursuit. When Shakespeare wrote *Julius Caesar* in 1599, he had to cater for different Londoners' different tastes to obtain commercial interests, respond to his patron Southampton's possible demand to praise the future conspirator Essex, escape the harsh book censorship, implicitly remind the Queen to correct her faults ... At the same time, his artistic pursuit propels him to create his own ideal Caesar.

It is a great challenge for Shakespeare's literary competence to regulate all the internalized literary conventions to produce such a Caesar. In *Julius Caesar*, Caesar is presented in Caesar's own discourses, and the other characters' direct and reported evaluative comments. When presented in his own discourses, Caesar stresses his own

greatness almost all the way. When presented in the direct and reported evaluative comments, Caesar is given different evaluations through the other characters' multiple points of view. When presented in the reported evaluative comments, varieties of speech presentation such as "direct speech", "narrative report of speech acts", and "free indirect speech" (Leech & Short, 2007: 260) are adopted ... All these literary conventions are maneuvered to produce the effects of ambiguity and greatness, but the effect of uniqueness can only be produced by the functioning of canonization.

Caesar's canonization takes 4 steps in Shakespeare's fictional world, which is reflected on the semantic change of "Caesar" as follows: $M_1 \rightarrow M_1 (M_2) \rightarrow M_1 > M_2 \rightarrow M_1 = M_2$. In order to foreground Caesar's assassination and its aftermath, Shakespeare skillfully conceals Caesar's early and middle lives in Cassius's, Antony's, and Murellus's direct evaluative comments, and Cassius's reported evaluative comments. Canonization now takes the form M_1 with different features for different characters, which is favourable to show not only Caesar's early and middle lives, but also these characters' personal characteristics. In Caesar's later age, although it still takes the form M_1 in Cassius's discourses, it is very close to $M_1 (M_2)$. The drastic change of Cassius's cognition of Caesar on the one hand reflects Caesar's status increases quickly, on the other hand shows Cassius's jealousy towards "a greater" (*Julius Caesar*, 1.2.208) than himself. In Caesar's discourses it takes either the form M_1 or the form $M_1 (M_2)$. Caesar's alternative adoption of M_1 and $M_1 (M_2)$ can successfully show his complex inner activities, i.e., the conflict between the ideal of being immortal and the reality of being mortal. In Octavius's early age, i.e., the story time of the second half of *Julius Caesar* (from 3.1.78), the two meanings become independent and takes the form $M_1 > M_2$. On the one hand, the wide use of M_1 is favourable to show the other characters' renewed attitudes towards Caesar and reveal their own characteristics, on the other hand, the independence of M_2 signals that "Caesar" as a regime begins to be accepted by others.

The harmonious functioning of literary conventions as “point of view, narrative voice” (Shen & Wang, 2010: 52), “speech presentation” (67), and canonization has already helped Shakespeare successfully create an ambiguous, great, and unique Caesar in *Julius Caesar*. Yet for most readers it is not easy to give Caesar a judicial comment as they do to the monarchs in Shakespearean plays even after many times’ attempts.

So only by referring to the intertext in other Shakespearean plays, can most readers have a deeper and more judicial comment on Caesar. An intertext “is a corpus of texts, textual fragments, or text-like segments of the sociolect that shares a lexicon and, to a lesser extent, a syntax with the text we are reading (directly or indirectly) in the form of synonyms, or even conversely, in the form of antonyms. In addition, each member of this corpus is a structural homologue of the text” (Riffaterre, 1984: 142). In Shakespearean plays, except in *Julius Caesar* (marked the main text), Caesar is presented in 2 kinds of intertexts: discourses scattered in 15 other plays in which “Caesar” has the meaning “Caesar the man” (marked intertext A); discourses scattered in 7 other plays in which “Caesar” has the meaning “the title of monarchs” (marked intertext B). The relationships between the main text and the 2 kinds of intertexts are controlled by “intertextuality”, i.e., “the web of functions that constitutes and regulates the relationships between text and intertext” (1990: 57). Caesar’s greatness and uniqueness are much clearer in the 2 kinds of intertexts than in *Julius Caesar*. Because Shakespeare needn’t to worry about the outside pressures when he praises Caesar in the discourses scattered within these plays, the literary conventions are relatively easy to be coordinated to achieve the effects of greatness and uniqueness.

In Octavious’s middle and later ages, canonization still takes the form $M_1 > M_2$. While multiple points of view, direct and reported evaluative comments, and varieties of speech presentation are still the main literary conventions within the 2 kinds of intertexts, most of the comments on M_1 are positive and M_2 has already been accepted by the

upper class. Caesar’s greatness and uniqueness are further strengthened.

After Octavious’s age, it takes the form $M_1 = M_2$. By adopting the same literary conventions, giving M_1 positive evaluations and using M_2 freely, both Caesar’s unique and great status in history, and the regime he creates become everyday facts.

To explain how the literary convention intertextuality functions to characterize Caesar, this article divided it into 4 types: “(main text) positive + (intertext) positive”, “(main text) ambiguous/negative + (intertext) positive”, “(main text) positive + (intertext) ambiguous/negative”, and “(main text) ambiguous/negative + (intertext) ambiguous/negative”. Because for most common readers Caesar’s greatness and uniqueness are submerged under the ambiguity, it takes the form “(main text) ambiguous + (intertext) positive” as to the relationships between *Julius Caesar* and intertext A, and between *Julius Caesar* and intertext B.

The sharp contrast between the ambiguous Caesar in *Julius Caesar*, and the great and unique Caesar in intertext A and intertext B can not only create “conflict, contradiction, and tension” (Wellek & Warren, 1942: 120) between *Julius Caesar* and the two kinds of intertexts, but also solve them by creating an “equilibrium” (85) around the theme the canonization of Caesar. The exquisite structure again proves that Shakespearean works indeed has high “literary values” (238).

Jameson (1981) regards history is real, but “it is fundamentally non-narrative and nonre presentational” (82), “that history is not a text, not a narrative, master or otherwise, but that, as an absent cause, it is inaccessible to us except in textual form, and that our approach to it and to the Real itself necessarily passes through its prior textualization, its narrativization in the political unconscious” (35). Caesar as a man did truly exist in history, but all about him can only be known through all kinds of texts well wrought with literary/artistic conventions. Theoretically speaking, every kind of texts has its own advantages to represent one or more aspects of Caesar. Compared with other kinds of texts,

Shakespearean plays have two advantages: first, by focusing on Caesar's assassination in *Julius Caesar*, "eine wahrhaft historische, eine Sternstunde der Menschheit" (Zweig, 1962: 5), including the crucial moment of Caesar's canonization, is vividly shown in dramatic ways; second, by extending Caesar's story to other plays, Caesar's historical influence, including his canonization, is objectively represented. Shakespeare's representation of Caesar may be different from the irretrievable "Real" in some details, but his great talents in revivifying the complex political conflicts, different characters' mentalities, and Caesar's canonization are the most persuasive among all kinds of texts, including the historical texts. So Shakespearean plays have their unique advantages in representing history and the study of Caesar's characterization from the historical-cognitive linguistics perspective has successfully revealed Caesar's canonization.

V. CONCLUSION

Analyzing the semantic change of "Caesar" from "Caesar the man" to the co-existence of "Caesar the man" and "the title of monarchs" with equal statuses, this article discovers that "the title of monarchs" is first used by Caesar in his own discourses in his later age, becomes independent in other characters' discourses in Octavius's age, and finally gains the equal status of "Caesar the man" after Octavius's age. Caesar is constructed not only as one of the greatest politicians in the world, but also as the icon of the Roman imperial regime by the harmonious functioning of different literary conventions, especially canonization and intertextuality. Compared with traditional literary studies, the study of Caesar's characterization from the historical-cognitive linguistics perspective not only reveals Shakespeare's great literary competence to maneuver literary conventions in characterizing Caesar, but also complement historical studies by reasonably revivifying Caesar's canonization.

REFERENCES

1. Abrams, M. H. & Harpham, G. G. (1981/2009). *A glossary of literary terms* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
2. Blits, J. H. (2015). Introduction. In R. Parks (Ed.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 192, pp. 132-139). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
3. Bonjour, A. (1958). The structure of *Julius Caesar*. In M. W. Scott & S. L. Williamson (Eds.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 7, pp. 284-292). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
4. Chatman, S. (1978). *Story and discourse: Narrative structure in fiction and film*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
5. Corti, C. (1993). Shakespeare's uncultured Caesar on the Elizabethan stage. In M. Lee (Ed.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 133, pp. 191-200). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
6. Culler, J. (1981/2001). *The pursuit of signs: Semiotics, literature, deconstruction*. London: Routledge.
7. Dowden, E. (1881). The Roman plays. In M. W. Scott & S. L. Williamson (Eds.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 7, pp. 174-179). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
8. Eagleton, T. (1983/1996). *Literary theory: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
9. Fauconnier, G. (1997). *Mappings in thought and language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Feng, Z. & Shen, D. (2001). The play off the stage: The writer-reader relationship in drama. *Language and Literature*, 10 (1), pp. 79-93.
11. Greenblatt, S. (1988). *Shakespearean negotiations: The circulation of social energy in Renaissance England*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

12. Hudson, R. H. N. (1872). Shakespeare's characters: *Julius Caesar*. In M. W. Scott & S. L. Williamson (Eds.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 7, pp. 167-169). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
13. Jameson, F. (1981). *The political unconscious: Narrative as a socially symbolic act*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
14. Knight, G. W. (1931). The eroticism of *Julius Caesar*. In M. W. Scott & S. L. Williamson (Eds.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 7, pp. 233-238). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
15. Koch, P. (2016). Meaning change and semantic shifts. In P. Juvonen & M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (Eds.), *The lexical typology of semantic shifts* (pp. 21-66). Boston, MA: De Gruyter Mouton.
16. Kujawinska-Courtney, K. (1993). *Julius Caesar*: Two visions of the past. In M. L. LaBlanc (Ed.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 74, pp. 118-136). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
17. Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
18. Leech, G. & Short, M. (1981/2007). *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose* (2nd ed.). New York: Pearson.
19. Lowenthal, D. (1982). Shakespeare's Caesar's plan. In K. D. Darrow & A. Henry (Eds.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 50, pp. 234-258). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
20. Martin, J. R. & White. P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
21. Millon, T., Grossman, S., Millon, C., Meaggar, S. & Ramnath, S. (2000/2004). *Personality disorders in modern life* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Son.
22. Miola, R. S. (1985). *Julius Caesar* and the tyrannicide debate. In M. Lazzari, C. C. Dominic, J. O. Krstović & M. L. Onorato (Eds.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 30, pp. 326-333). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
23. Plutarch. (1579/1595/1907). *North's translation of Plutarch's Life of Julius Caesar*. London: George Gills & Sons.
24. Proudfoot, R., Thompson, A., Castan, D. S. (2001). *The Arden Shakespeare complete works*. London: Thomson Learning.
25. Proudfoot, R. & Bennett, N. (Eds.). (2017). *King Edward III*. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare.
26. Rice, J. C. (1973). *Julius Caesar* and the judgment of the senses. In M. Lee (Ed.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 85, pp. 119-127). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
27. Riffaterre, M. (1984). Intertextual representation: On mimesis as interpretive discourse. *Critical Inquiry*, 11 (1), 141-162.
28. Riffaterre, M. (1990). Compulsory reader response: The intertextual drive. In M. Worton & J. Still (Eds.), *Intertextuality: Theories and practice* (pp. 58-78). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
29. Schlegel, A. W. (1811). Antiquities of the French stage and criticisms on Shakespeare's historical dramas. In M. W. Scott & S. L. Williamson (Eds.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 7, pp. 159-160). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
30. Shen, D & Wang, L. (2010). *Western narratology: Classical and postclassical*. Beijing: Peking University Press. (申丹、王丽)

亚. (2010).《西方叙事学: 经典与后经典》. 北京: 北京大学出版社.)

31. Trask, R. L. (1994). *Language change*. London: Routledge.
32. Trask, R. L. (2000). *The dictionary of historical and comparative linguistics*. Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
33. Ulrici, H. (1839). Criticisms of Shakespeare's dramas: *Julius Caesar*. In M. W. Scott & S. L. Williamson (Eds.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 7, pp. 160-161). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
34. Wellek, R. & Warren, A. (1942/1956). *Theory of literature* (3rd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World Inc.
35. Whitaker, V. K. (1953). *Julius Caesar* and tragedy of moral choice. In M. W. Scott & S. L. Williamson (Eds.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 7, pp. 264-268). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
36. Wilkins, D. P. (1996). Natural tendencies of semantic change and the search for cognates. In M. Durie & M. Ross (Eds.), *The comparative method reviewed: Regularity and irregularity in language change* (pp. 264-304). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
37. Wilson, J. D. (1948). An introduction to *Julius Caesar* by William Shakespeare. In M. W. Scott & S. L. Williamson (Eds.), *Shakespearean criticism: Excerpts from the criticism of William Shakespeare's plays and poetry, from the first published appraisals to current evaluations* (vol. 7, pp. 253-255). Detroit, MI: Gale Research Inc.
38. Xia, D. (2012). Hearer roles in triadic communication. *Foreign Language Research*, 165 (2), pp. 109-112. (夏登山. (2012). 三方交际的听者类型.《外语学刊》, 165 (2), pp. 109-112.
39. Zweig, S. (1943/1962). *Sternstunden der Menschheit: Zwölf historische Miniaturen*. Darmstadt: S. Fischer Verlag.