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CHPATER - II

2) A REVIEW OF ENGLISH AND ROMAN HISTORY

(A) A Review of English History From 1200 A.D. to 1520 A.D.

2.1 Introduction

The histories of human civilizations, either political, or royal in particular, have always been the perennial sources of our intellectual curiosity and sentimental passion. They have, above all, always been loved and adored mainly because, "they are written in the life blood of real civilization" (Trevelyan, 1955 : 9) Of course, there are certain reasons as to why, they are so loved and so adored, listing or citing the reasons would become a monotonous journey. However, it seems that the whole historical phenomenon has always been flooded around some central human impulse, or, rather around some noble or ignoble human actions like war and violence, crown and throne, conspiracies and betrayals and the likewise.

Histories of the world, therefore, ever written or be written afterwards, would certainly tend to depict man as the most dangerous enemy of man (kind); noble protagonist, or an ignoble antagonist, a traitor as a matter of fact, and so long as histories would tend to portray this kind of man, they would certainly or rather primely exist in the mind of mankind. Histories, therefore exercise their own views on mankind and as a result, mankind fosters the ways for histories. All human races accordingly, have their own past restored well into their historical heritage or burdened right into their racial unconsciousness. Every individual shares the burden of his race and hence harks back to his historical past to know his ancestors. It is this psychohistorical relation which makes him love and adore histories; and this process runs from generation to generation, as farther you move, farther you recede to your past.

The impelling sentimental quest of imagining the lives of our ancestors evokes and accumulates some amorphous historical significance which requires some definite and appropriate form to restore the said accumulated historical content. It means, the synthesis of phenomenon and form constitutes the structure of historical writing. Since, as much as the
historical phenomenon is significant, so must be its form. Hence, the question at the outset faced by all the early historians of the world was the question of form, "in what form can the story best be told?" or "how then is the tale to be told?"

The apparent answer to the queries as cited above is 'narrative'. Narrative form had been applied for writing histories, "history proper came to be recognized as a continuous selective, and integrated narrative and to be distinguished from more records of fact, such as annals" (Campbell, 1970 : 21) Thus impelling force of shaping historical phenomenon, giving it a concrete and most appropriate structure, Professor Huizing has described it as, "an imposition of form upon the past." The recognition of historical writings has its firm footing, but the intellectual quest continued to exist, because, history then made to confront politics, philosophy and art. History was related to politics, philosophy and art, for history by far and deep extent supposed to be imbibed in them, or the vice versa. The historical significance as varied to time and place, best be stewed into different vessels like politics, philosophy and art, make them flourish and prosper taking myriad shapes and filaments.

2.2 Periods and Dates

The historical statements are vague, unless they are specifically labelled by dates and periods. English Histories, are divided and subdivided according to their periodical orders, and for some retrospective purposes, they are entitled as, The Sixteenth Century England, Eighteenth Century England and likewise, or they are meaningfully labelled as Elizabethan England, Renaissance or Restoration period, or The Age of Victoria etc. "Dates and periods are necessary for the study and interpretation of history. All historical phenomenons are conditioned by time and are produced by the sequence of events. Dates therefore, apply a necessary for any historical statement." (Trevelyan, 1955 : 92)

While considering the political histories of England, the historical periods appear to have been denoted mainly by names of some dominating historical personages or dynasties, This may not be a correct approach but one thing is pretty clear that the historical periods are denoted in the fashions beyond mention, and the most appropriate, among them is one which closely and exactly comprehend the spirit of time, without any of the event go untouched.
2.3 Types of Histories

By observing the historical annals of England, it appears that the identification of historical trends or types undergo many changing phases. At the outset, there were "religious (Biblical) and secular histories," (Bacon, 1941: 161) but these identification were replaced by "Civile and Royale Histories," (Ibid : 161) and later, from late in sixteenth century till today, they are identified as social and political histories of England.

Social history as it appears, has played most exhaustive and dominant role in forming the social and national character of England. It has provided a definite link between economical developments and political histories of the nation. And beyond that, it has pictured the ever-changing and pervading social life of England "Its scope may be defined as the daily life of the inhabitants of the land of two past ages; this includes human as well as the economic relation of different classes to one another, the character of family and household life, the condition of labour and of leisure, the attitude of man and nature, the culture of each passing age, as it arose out of these general condition of life and took ever changing forms in religion, literature, music, architecture, learning and thought." (Trevelyan, 1955 : 07)

Social history has got a causative force, which moulds and remoulds the political and economical situations; political history though privileged by powers, has to work as a political proxies of social history: For, "without social history, economic history is barren and political is unintelligible" social history in comparison to political history, is passive in character but has begotten catalytic power to reinforce all the social, economic and political factors to melt and reshape them in its own fold and form. "On the whole, social change moves like an underground river obeying its own laws or those of economic change, rather than following the direction of political happenings that move on the surface of life."

Royal histories are read with great interest because they deal with an unusual phenomenon of war and valour, revenge and rebel, crown and throne. Since, poets and dramatists in particular chose royal histories for their artistic creations. "Every man delights to behold the pictures of ancient persons as of Hercules, Hector, Julius Caesar, Arthur, and reverences them as though they were half Gods: how much more pleasure, should it be to behold
the lively images of their minds which appear in their acts and ideas while they were here in this life.” (Campbell, 1970 : 40)

### 2.4 Royal History of England

Royal history of England, in particular, is considered as the most significant and glorious history of all the histories of the world, partly because, the royal mode of British Monarch had its own standard and status, which no other monarchies of the world could match, and partly because it is this Royal history of England which tells the tale of long sought struggle that ended ultimately with the settlement of England. The Royal history of England in fact, has become a source of perennial interest, since the poets took inspirations from it and wrote about it in countless forms and fancies, which all read today, to witness the glories of Royal England.

Henry II, came on throne in 1154. He was the first Plantagenet king. He was the son of the French noble. He captured the most part of France in 1171 he also captured Ireland. His last days were spent in agony. His sons were rebels against him. When he came to know that his younger son John is the leader of rebels, he got shocked and died of that shock, in 1189. After Henry II's death, his elder son Richard I was throned. He was very good ruler. He ruled England for nearly ten years. He was a brave king and was called "Lion-Heart". He died in 1199.

After Richard I's death, his younger brother John was the King. His reign was troublesome to his country. He lost most of the part of France which was under the English rule. His taxation was high and tyrannical. Under the leadership of Stephen Langston, the common people got signed" the famous 'Magnacharta'. He died in 1216. After him, his son Henry III came to throne. When he came to throne, he was a boy. So regent looked after the kingdom. In 1227, he became of full age and married the Eleanor of Province and tried to be friend with France. His son, Edward I became the King in 1272. He ruled upto 1307. Then Edward II reign was notable. He became monarch of England in the year 1307. His reign was till the year 1327. Edward III's reign was from 1327 to 1377.

Richard II was the grandson of Edward, "The Black Prince," who died in the French war. He was just of eleven years when he ascended the throne in 1377. His uncle John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster and Edmund of Langley, Duke of York, acted as regents during the minority of the
King. But their Government was unpopular, because of excessive taxation of 1379 and 1380. There was insurrection in the year 1381 named the Peasant's Revolt. At the age of fifteen, he met rebels to face at Smithfield and prevailed upon them to disperse. On 3rd May, 1389, the King was of full age, dismissed his uncles and started ruling without opposition. For eight years, he ruled peacefully. But in September 1396, he lost his first wife. This led to loose his balance of mind, which resulted in his tyranny. In 1397, Richard captured Warwick, Arundel and Gloucester, who had impeached his supporters. Arundel was executed, Warwick imprisoned, and Gloucester died in prison. In 1398; Hereford brought a charge of treason against Horfolk. The King banished both of them; and after the death of John of Gaunt, he seized his estates and refused his inheritance to Hereford, whose exile implied no crime.

But Hereford returned early in July, 1399 while Richard was in Ireland and declared that he came but to demand his family succession. The Earl of Northumberland and Westmoreland joined him. They marched southward and the number of followers joined them. The King's ministers fled learning the capital open. Consequently, when Richard returned he found Henry in possession. At last he surrendered Henry on August 19th, 1399 at Flint. On September 20th, he signed a document by which he resigned the crown. Next day, the deed was read in Parliament. Formal sentence of disposition pronounced and the new King was taken by the hand by the Archbishop of Canterbury; and led to the vacant throne Richard died in 1400. The manner of Richard's death is unknown. This event is known in History as "Bloodless evolution".

With the accession of King Henry IV, (Bolingbroke) in 1399, the English monarchy entered into a period of dynastic crisis which lasted over a century. The main reasons were the existence of the two great royal houses of York and Lancaster, springing from the younger sons of Edward III and the circumstances attending the seizure of the throne by Henry.

There was revolt of Richard's half brothers but Henry stamped it, showing Richard's body in order to dispel a rumour that he was still alive. Then the Welsh, under Owen Glendower, rose against Henry but he was defeated by the Duke of Northumberland and his son Hotspur. But shortly after, Hotspur entered into an alliance both with the defeated Scottish Earl Douglas and with Owen Glendower, against Henry. They were defeated at the battle of Shrewsbury in 1403.
Hotspur was killed and Douglas was taken as prisoner - though Owen Glendower continued the struggle, with the help of the French, until his death in 1416.

The King Henry IV died in the year 1413 and his elder son, Prince Hal, succeeded his father as Henry V. During his reign, the dynastic crisis was in abeyance. There was a nine year’s interval of national glory and resurgence. In 1415, Henry laid claim to the French crown through his great grandfather. Edward III has invaded France. In October, 1415, he won a famous victory at the battle of Agincourt against great odds, because of his English archers. The French King was forced to give his daughter Catherine to him in marriage, and to recognise him as his heir in preference to his own eldest son, the Dauphin.

The King Henry V, soon became enshrined in tradition and legend as one of the greatest of all England's patriot Kings. He was considered as the ideal King. But he died in 1422 of a camp-fever. If he had lived a few months longer he would (On the death of the French King) have been crowned in Paris as King of France. Englishmen continued to mourn him as their ideal warrior King, who died at the height of success.

King Henry V, had a nine-month old son (by his French Queen Catherine) who was also named as Henry, came to the throne in 1422. He married Margaret of Anjou. Because of John of Arc, English fortunes in France declined the Dauphin assumed the throne of France. King Henry was saintly but suffered from the recurrent fits of insanity. In the year 1454, his mind was eclipsed. Richard, Duke of York was appointed as the protector by Parliament. On Henry's recovery, there was a dynastic conflict. It is usually known as the Wars of the Roses because the house of York took as its emblem a white rose, and that of Lancaster (to which Henry VI belonged) a red rose. At the battle of St. Albans in 1455, the Yorkists got Victory and they took Henry as the prisoner. Again he fell ill, and Richard once again resumed his regency. When Henry recovered, he tried his best to reconcile the two factions.

In 1459, Margaret of Anjou, Henry's vigorous Queen, rallied the King's supporters and routed the Yorkists at Wakefield, and Richard was killed. In 1461, Edward the new Duke of York, defeated Lancastrians and proclaimed King Edward IV to himself. He captured Henry and put him in the Tower of London. Edward, quarreled with Warwick (Known as a Kingmaker) who was his ally, entered into negotiations with Queen Margaret now exciled in France and the
French King Louis XI. In 1470, Warwick defeated Edward IV, who fled to Burgundy and restored Henry to throne. But after six months, Edward returned, captured Henry, defeated Lancastrians at Barnet, at which Warwick, the king maker was killed and again at the battle of Tewksbury, Henry's son was killed and Queen Margaret, captured and imprisoned in the Tower. On the same night, Henry was murdered in the Tower (probably by Edward's brother Richard, Duke of Gloucester) and the Lancastrian cause ended apparently.

The rivalry continued between two royal houses. King Edward IV confiscated enemy's estates. But he died in 1483 leaving behind him two sons Edward and Richard, aged twelve and nine respectively. Edward became the King Edward V. But his uncle, the bunch backed Richard was appointed Protector, imprisoned both of his nephews in the Tower. Parliament wanted a strong King so they requested Richard to assume the crown in 1483.

Henry Tudor, the grandson of Owen Tudor, a Welsh knight, who had married Queen Catherine, widow of Henry V, marched towards London, number of people joined him. On August 22nd 1485, the last battle of Roses was fought and Henry got victory. Richard died in the battle. With the death of Richard, the ancient line of Plantagenet came to an end; which ruled England over 300 years. The King Henry VII, began a new dynasty and a new chapter started in the History of England. He married Princess Elizabeth of York, daughter of Edward IV. (During his reign the playing cards were invented and the Queen's portrait on the playing cards is of princess Elizabeth which is not changed even today By this marriage, there was merging of red rose of York with white rose of Lancaster turned into the Tudor rose. In the reign of Henry VII, England became an advanced nation. In Bacon's words, "he was a wonder for wise men." He died in the year 1509.

His son King Henry VIII, ascended the throne in 1509. He was jovial but ruthless, married six wives, and chopped off the heads of three of them. He invaded France in the battle of the Spurs and also got victory at the battle of Flodden. In 1527, he sought a divorce from his Queen Kathrine. He had fallen in love with Anne Boleyn. This was not the only reason for divorce. Henry has no male heir. So he wanted to marry Anne. But she could not give him a son. She gave him a daughter called Elizabeth. This Elizabeth was the great Queen of England who ruled England from 1558 to 1603.
2.5 The Growth Of English Drama

English drama, apart from some stray and obscure anthropological references, folk dances in seasonal festivals and similar folk activities; finds its origin in concrete form, first in Latin and later in English Christianity. About tenth century and even before that, there was a religious convention to perform liturgical drama, which had been presented by the clergies and acted by choristers or choir; of course, such liturgical plays were absolutely the part of religious services or rituals and were performed in utmost rudimentary provisions, regarding its stage, costume and characters. However, such dramatic performances, especially celebrated on Christmas and Easter day, created a special taste of entertainment in the local public of the vicinities of the Church and sought popularity and recognition. David Daices observes this phenomenon, as: "the rituals of the Christian Church, with its two great festivals of Christmas and Easter day, and its celebration of the significant points in Christ's career from birth to resurrection was itself inherently dramatic." (Daiches, 1960 : 210)

Since then, the liturgical drama enjoyed prosperity and continued its impact until the Miracle Plays emerged with a new phase and substance. The Miracle plays defer from liturgical, in respect of themes and performance and they brought the drama out of the Church in the open public on the streets. The liturgical drama was sacred and was faithful to Biblical thematic context, the miracles delt with the Pseudo Biblical contexts, depicting the stories of saints and martyrs like Cain and Abel, Abraham and Isaac, Balaam and Balaka etc. Miracle plays were written on the themes which depicted the pre-Biblical and past-Biblical events of slaughter conspiracy and betrayals. Hence, they were denounced by Church, however they attracted the spectator in crowds.

The transition of drama, from Miracle to Morality plays marks the confirmation of dramatic tradition which has its firm roots to future drama of Elizabethan period. The drama in its full form and phase, began its development in the direction of Elizabethan drama. Morality plays were mainly written on the themes of virtues and vices, Truth and Righteousness; the seven deadly sins were the common themes for miracle plays, since, they were known as the ‘Pride of life’.
The best known morality plays, *The Castle of Perseverance*, *Mudus*, *Every Man*, entertained the crowds of audiences by depicting the fights and struggles of Good Angels vs Bad Angels. Virtues and vices.

The real English drama with its complete form appears first during fourteenth and Fifteenth Century. Playwrights, after the phase of Morality play cycles were known literary figures who developed drama in the direction of tragedies, comedies and Chronicle plays. Drama began to take free access in its themes, forms and performances. And, thereafter University wits rejuvenated the existing trends of art and learning, which encouraged English drama to flourish beyond limits. The group of playwrights like John lily, Robert Greene, George Peckle, Thomas Lodge, Thomas Kyd, Thomas Nashe and Christopher Marlowe produced a variety of plays, the Senecan tragedies, Romantic comedies and Chronicle plays created a taste of entertainment in the public of the day.

### 2.6 Shakespeare's Dramatic Art

The sixteenth century England witnessed two great things: one is the prosperous reign of Queen Elizabeth, and the other is the manifestation of manifold renaissances. The former ruled England and the later ruled them all, and altogether, they reinforced a radical change in the political and social life of the nation. Queen Elizabeth, to the best of her ability, ruled England with divine nobility and royal wisdom, and her loyal subjects loved and honoured her the most. Of course, it was for the first time, so appeared in the course of history that the ruler and the ruled ones have had such a mutual relationship of love and honour, which, as a matter of fact, resolved to build the fate of the great nation. And yes, that was done! Royal courts and luminous palaces were built with the golden towers over them, both royal and social life was restructured with the inward and outward decorum, and the whole nation gleamed luminously under the divine heavens. The most enthusiastic historians of the time, comprehended this wonderful phenomenon by titling it as "The Golden Age of Queen Elizabeth".

The national prosperity of the days by no means fostered and exercised the creative spirit of the people of England who were greatly passioned by the sentiment of patriotism. The spiritual and intellectual quest of the public life, resumed to create new meaning in every aspect of human life. The gloomy darkness of the middle ages was replaced by the secular
magnificence, and the inordinate restrictions of ethics and religion were discarded. The free will began to foster the creative fertility in all the respective fields, like philosophy, art and literature. Consequently, myriad forms of art and literature emerged spontaneously, like impetus buds strive to open up into the carmine blossom of the ardent spring. And the birds sang sweet songs to welcome this dawn of renaissance.

Needless to say, that this age saw great artists and seers, and had a great harvest of artistic creations. Why the poetry, of this period, was so rich and affluent, and why the drama of this time became universal in nature. Overall artistic creations during this period flourished to the culminative standards, and the dramatic art of this time remained matchless forever. Since, this, Elizabethan age is essentially known as the 'Age of drama'. One more thing is necessary to mention here that the artists of an unusual intellectual faculties produced the vivid range of unusual dramas. However, it is equally important to note that their dramatic art was most ardently and voluntarily responded by the public of this age. Whatever written and staged was appreciated and inspired. Dramatic art and life became one; Hence drama grew crossing beyond all terrestrial limit.

Above this overall enchanting scene, a brilliant star loomed over the carmine-horizon of England. He was William Shakespeare, who through his magic touch, made the drama a divine art. Here we see, really the secular, however the most passionate magnificence of human life appeared first on the English stage, which the audiences responded with frenzied joys. But we have to remember one more thing that the greatness of Shakespeare as a dramatist is as much rests upon his personal genius. As it rests upon his age, upon his audiences and the readers of his age. If Shakespeare had born in the middle ages, what could have been his position? No more than a clergyman reading sermons in the chapel or a school teacher in some morality school. Hence, it is rightly pointed out about his greatness: "Shakespeare chanced upon the best time and country in which to live, in order to exercise with distraction and most encouragement the highest faculties of man" (Daiches, 1960 : 246)

Opinions about Shakespeare's greatness as a dramatist, have been recorded in various ways. His greatness lies in the fact that wherever drama is performed as in art form, the people of that country bow before him and pay him tribute for his dramatic genius. In world's literature, he
has his own position and unique contribution to drama as a ‘literary genre’. His dramas are the same as he wrote them in Elizabethan age, but in every new age we meet new Shakespeare, and even today he is still with us, but he is quite different from that of Elizabethans.

No dramatist on the earth has enjoyed the everlasting popularity as Shakespeare has. The European Civilization loved and adored him as their teacher and guide. People lived and breathed his drama, because he taught them how to live and how to die on this earth. Rest of human civilizations on the earth imitated the European’s behavior.

Shakespeare's dramatic art is studied from various points of view, but none of them proved to be exhaustive one. Because Shakespeare's dramatic creation, as a whole, is like a thick beautiful orchard, and it is worthless to go on counting the trees and fruits in it. Our immediate concern is to taste the fruits and not to count them at all. Since Shakespeare's dramatic art requires simple approach, as to classify it according to its taste, as, history plays, comedies and tragedies. And one more significant thing is that his dramatic career extends well over a period of only 22 years - i.e. from 1590 A.D. to 1612 A.D. and subsequently his plays have been classified as comedies, tragedies and history plays.

In all the three types mentioned above, Shakespeare has best expressed his dramatic genius. It is rather difficult to assess as to what type excels upon the other. Shakespeare, as a dramatist had a comprehensive soul, which he revealed in his art in equal shares. However, a comparative assessment of his plays shows that, he is original in each of his plays, however he is seen fully matured in his great tragedies like, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Cymbeline* and *Macbeth*: here, in them, we find that Shakespeare's most mysterious intellectual faculties, and passions have been effectively used. His comedies, on the other hand, are based on his artistic genius, crafts and characters and have been woven best to meet the comic objectives. So far as we see his history plays, Shakespeare is seen very differently, because he has chosen to use royal history for his dramatic art with some reasons. Let us see them so far as they required for the further discussion.

Regarding his early history plays, Shakespeare happened to be a local dramatist, used to write drama for his local audience on the themes which were favored by them. Since, the primary object of his dramatic art, was to entertain the local public of the vicinity of his theatre. And that
made Shakespeare to write plays on the Royal history of England, the subject which was well responded by the audience, since, Shakespeare wrote history plays depicting the nobles and their rebels, who were engaged in fighting wars for power and plunders. This historical phenomenon was wonderful which helped Shakespeare to attract the crowds of audiences towards the theatre. Another reason is that, both the dramatist and the audience were greatly anspited by patriotic sentiment, hence history plays could very well serve the purpose.

The central point too be discussed in this context, is that what sources of history helped Shakespeare to right his history plays? While discussing this point, we have to clarify one more thing and that is, Shakespeare wrote in all fourteen history plays, out of which ten were based on English history and four on Roman. His English history plays are: *Henry VI* part one, two and three; Richard III, Richard II, *King John*, *Henry IV* part one, and two, *Henry V* and *Henry VIII*. His Roman plays are: *Julius Caesar*, *Timmons of Athens*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*.

While considering the sources used for his History plays, the names of Chronicle, historians like Edward Hall, Raphael Holinshed and John Stow are referred with importance. However it has been observed that Shakespeare preferred Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles Vol. III*, 1587 edition. Holinshed provides direct access to historical plays, because his chronicles are narratives of historical incidents and events, which through modifications and restructuring, provide good substance to the plots of history plays. Holinshed has not cited only the mere historical facts but represented them with moral context. Theory of cause and effect has also been used to narrate historical incidents. Shakespeare seemed to be specially attracted towards Holinshed's chronicles, for Holinshed has cited marginal comments, which have fully explained the significance of the incident and of the characters. It is in this context, Campbell observed that: "In his text and in his eyes, catching marginal comments he made clear his understanding of cause and effect in human actions and of the vengeance exacted by God for sin, working out with arithmetical accuracy, the relation of each sin to the divine vengeance." (Campbell, 1970: 74)

One can see, how Shakespeare has directly followed Holinshed in his play, *Richard III*. Shakespeare read Holinshed's chronicles, wherein he found that the marginal comment on the central character of Richard. "The just Judgement of God severalie revenging, the muther of the
innocent prince upon the malefactors" this marginal comment provides full substance to the main plot of the play Richard III.

Holinshed's scope of history is limited. Holinshed admits it and apologizes for his limitation, however he is considered as the most significant and direct link between Shakespeare's history plays and the Royal history of England. Shakespeare at many junctions admitted that Holinsed's chronicles provided him the most significant and ready access to his history plays.

Finally, while considering Shakespeare's history plays, we must presume the most important fact that Shakespeare mainly wrote history plays for stage and not for the readers of any age. And we are striving to judge his history plays by reading them. It is said that, “the taste of pudding is not in its recipe, it is rather in the eating of pudding”. In the same way, the taste of Shakespeare's historical play is there in enjoying it on the stage. But unfortunately, we are not lucky enough to go back to Shakespeare's age and can enjoy his stage. However by reading his all history plays, an attempt has been made to study how Shakespeare has treated history in his plays.

Shakespeare made a survey of English History from the last period of the reign of Richard II i.e. from the year 1398 to the death of Richard III in 1485 in his eight dramas. These dramas are divided into two tetralogies, with King John and Henry VIII serving as the Prologue and Epilogue. Covering the reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV and Richard III, was takes up first in four plays i.e. Henry VI, Part I, II and III and Richard III. These plays belong to Shakespeare’s early period of Career. The second tetralogy, consists Richard II, Henry IV Part I and II and Henry V. It is clear from above tetralogies that Shakespeare did not touch the Norman period of English History.

In writing of history plays, Shakespeare’s aim seems entirely different. The theme of the histories, in the words of Prof. Dowden is how a man may fail and how a man may succeed in attaining a practical mastery of the world.” (Dowden, 1881 : 127) These history plays deal with the finite issues of failure or success in the achieving of practical ends. (London,1881 : 125) Evil in the histories is the wrong doing which is followed by inevitable retribution.
Now, let us study the Shakespeare’s modifications and variations in different plays of History of England one by one. The *First part of Henry VI*, as Bullough calls it as, "a fantasia on historical themes rather than historical drama." (Bullough, 1960: 125) Yet in spite of the violence done to history, it would be a mistake to regard the play as a mere fantasia. Though Shakespeare departs from some historical events and episodes for which, there is no reference in history, the representation is not unhistorical. He correctly portrays the spirit of the age. The main theme of Henry VI Part I is the loss of the France possessions, ending with the negotiations of marriage between Henry VI and Margaret.

The play has a sprawling plot with four themes and may be regarded as a drama without a hero, though it contains, two best important characters, John and Talbot. Talbot is heroic in nature. Therefore, Tillyard is inclined to call this part of the tetralogy, viz the tragedy of Talbot. (Tillyard, 1962: 163) Shakespeare draws a very grand warrior whose name was a ‘terror to the France’, but his death at Boudreaux, Coincides with the end of the long Anglo-French Conflict.

The second part of Henry VI stresses on the civil strife and not a foreign war. It is the drama of personal ambition and political intrigue. The play divides itself into two halves and each has its own protagonist. The Duke of Gloucester is the protagonist is the first half and the Duke of York in the Second. All the remaining character plays a Subordinate role. Jack Cade is most interesting character, but he is excessively portrayed. But the drama reveals a large area of life, sweeping forward in continuous movement. The characters are from all walks of life. There are nobles and ordinary men, the brave soldiers as well as hardeneed sea-dogs, high born lords and ladies as well as Jack Cade and his associates.

The historical period covered in the play *Henry VI, Part III*, is the span of Twenty years, from the first battle of Saint Alban’s 1453 to the ransoming of Margaret 1475. The time represented on the stage is, according to Daniel, an many day. The central theme of The play is - the suppression of the Red Rose by the white. Henry is not able to fight or fly. Richard of York is the agent of the political realism that is born in Part II. There is no dramatic interaction of plot and character. Event’s separated by many years are telescoped, irrelevent details are rejected and new episodes added.
Shakespeare follows history but at certain places he makes significant changes. He omits the part of Sir Davy Halle, York's old servant and chief Connssailer. In the play, York is captured alive and delivered to Margaret, who makes him sit on a molehill, before putting a paper crown on his head, marking his aspirations. Sometimes, Shakespeare compresses the events of several years into a single episode, in which the King of France promises help to Margaret.

The play also does not furnish adequate evidences to show how Warwick came to be a king-maker. Here history gives us ample information about his position and characters, but Shakespeare omits all that information.

Henry's character as a matter of fact does not play any important part in the trilogy of which he is the titular hero, but considered as central character because all the incidents revolve round him and he is contrast to the other figures because he is good man without ambition and they are ferociously ambitious people without goodness.

In Richard III, Shakespeare attempted to write a tragedy out of a chronicle theme. His other history plays generally depict a long period of time in which there are many incidents and many of them are protagonists. But in Richard III and Henry VI - Part III, he directs his attentions on one protagonist who dominates the scene. Richard's one aim was to attain throne, and for that aim he does anything. While he plotting for the crown, Lord Hastings threatens to prove an obstacle in the way. In History, Richard is dark in colours and is bunchbacked. But Shakespeare's Richard is, 'of the diabolical class’. He is not weak because he is single-hearted in his devotion to evil. He does not serve two monsters."

The overall impression of the play as Lily Cambell sees it "the killing of the little princes in the Tower, rather than the illegal seizing of the throne, haunts the play-goer. Clarence's dream of divine vengeance, rather than the right of the House of York to rule, fills the mind and stirs the emotions. These are impressions left by tragedy rather than a history play" (Douden, 1818 : 143)

In Holinshed and other sources, the Historical John has his troubles. First trouble supported by France was that of Arthur, but it was over in 1203. In 1205, there was his great conflict with Pope for that year, he entreat into a dispute with the monks of Canterbury over the election of a new Archbishop. Then John was troubled by rebel barons of England aided by
France. But Shakespeare makes some changes in his play. He omits the scene in which Falconbridge ransacks the monastery and convent, with its indecorous and irrelevant comedy. He also omits the actual poisoning of King John. Though Magnacharta was the most important event in King John reign, Shakespeare takes no notice of it. He builds up his play, out of the loss of normally and the claims of Arthur. Again, the lords as presented by him have no complaints of their own and are moved only by the death of Arthur. So the affair of Arthur for Shakespeare, is of cardinal importance. The anticatholic tone has been significantly moderated and John himself is far from a hero in the play. The character of the Bastard Faulconbridge, the dramatic conflicts between Queen Eleanor and Constance, the pathetic scene between Hubert and young Arthur - there are some of the elements in the play which show Shakespeare's bursting the bounds of the olden chronicle form. Shakespeare closes his play with the following words:

“The England never did, nor never shall,  
Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror, 
But when it first did help to wound itself.  
Now these her princes are come home again,  
Come the three corners of the world in arms, 
And we shall shock them. Naught shall make us rue,  
If England to itself do rest but true”. (ActV, scene VII, Lines 112-118)

Shakespeare wrote Henry VIII in 1612-13. His last history play i.e. Henry V was written in the year 1599. Though he turned area, from the writing of historical plays, he did not forget Holinshed. Just as for his plays, like King Lear, Macbeth and Cymbeline, he turns for the sources Henry VIII to Holinshed. It was Henry's breach with Rome, which had far-reading repercussions in national politics and religion and also in international relations. But it has its roots in personal problems. One important and puzzling question in the English history is.. When did Henry VIII fall in love with Anne Bullen and what effect had this passion on his conscientious scruples about the validity of his marriage with Katherine. In Hall and Holinshed, there two affairs lie apart. The question about the queen's marriage was raised when, at the instigation of Wolsey, Henry decided on forsaking the Emperor. The nephew of Katherine and an embarking on an alliance with France. Queen Katherine became an object of everybody's sympathy when Henry
procedure for divorce with her. Shakespeare mix the two themes by making the love affair between Henry and Anne start much earlier than it did in fast. Buckingham was executed in 1521, the question of the divorce was not 'bruited' before 1527 and Henry did not marry Anne till the end of 1532. Shakespeare makes Henry Court Anne, before the execution Buckingham, when historically she would less than fifteen years of age. John's opinion -" The genius of Shakespeare comes in and goes and with Katherine" (Campbell, 1970 : 307) although, an exaggeration bears some truth. It is the tragedy of an ageing woman married to a man several years younger than her.

Would ye have me -
If ye have any justice, any pity;
If ye be anythin but churchmenis habits -,
Put my sick cause into his hands that hates me?
Alas! He has banished me his bed already
His love, too long also! I am old, my lords,
And all the fellowship I hold new with him
Is only my obedience.

(Gupta, 1964 : 159-160)

There is no concentration on any particular action and so the play seems to be without any purpose. There are no civil wars like other plays, but then is there any supremacy of the king? The course of the drama shows the development of the King's personality, and this development helps us to gather the scattered threads of the story. But the deeper unity is thematic rather than personal. Have, "life is portrayed as a flowing stream, the current at one point may be different from what it was or what it will be, but in spite of the devious paths it may take, it is a unity, for the simple reason that its essence is ceaseless movement. Nothing is real in life except its continuous flow."( Raleigh, 1908 : 152) And this continuity of life's movement links Henry VIII to Shakespeare’s other historical plays.

Richard II deals with the events which happened during the last two years of Richard's reign which resulted in his deposition and death. One important thing about the Richard II play is
its closeness to sober history. In no other historical play does Shakespeare keep so closely to the Chronicle. And if Shakespeare here follows history closely it is because, history happens to private him with what he wants. We know, Richard is whimsical tyrannius, and weak, but Shakespeare's presentation of his character is, it seems, rather sympathetic. It is fact that, Richard is guilty of misgovernment, but does he deserves deposition? And who gave the right to Bolingbroke depose him? Such questions are answered in the play by various characters. Though he is very proud about his exceptional physical charm, he is very passive, and 1427. He is selfcentared and extravagant man. Shakespeare treats, the character of Richard in an original manner. So Richard I is regarded as the tragedy of a private individual.

Therefore, Richard II is best read, as a human drama rather than "as a political document or as a moral homily. It is a personal tragedy like Richard III. that is to say, the emphasis is more on the declaiming fortunes of a single protagonist then on the course of events, or the social picture, or the development of any idea." (Ivor, 1925 : 13)

In Richard II, though Shakespeare remains faithful to his sources, on some occasions, he treats history imaginatively. The portrait of John of Gaunt is unauthentic. He is shown as great patriot, but in history, he is said to be an ambitious and self-seeking man. There are some new characters which are of Shakespeare's imitation i.e. the characters like Gardner, and his servants and also groom. Besides these, there are some miner change of time, place and incidences. But taken these changes all together, they mean very little.

Shakespeare has not added to the main serious action, any comic sub plot in the play as he does is King Henry IV Part I and Part II, Richard II has no double plot. The single plot deals with the uprising against Richard II, his arrest, dethronement and death. The action, without any deviations, moves swifty ahead, so that the play has an almost classical unity of action and effect.

Henry Bolingbroke becomes King of England deposing and killing Richard II. The first part of Henry IV begins just one year after the events chronicled in Richard II. The first three lines of the play picture the king -

So shaken as we are, so wan with care,
Find we a time for frightened peace to pant
And breathe short-winded accents of new broils

(Shakespeare 2003 : 9)

But the king does not find peace, for Westmoreland brings the news that Mortimer has been taken prisoner by the Scots and Henry Percy is fighting with Scots. The King compares young Hotspur with his own son and becomes sad. Again, Hotspur refuses to return war-prisoners and organise a great rebellion against king making allies with Douglas, the Archbishop of York and Glendower.

But there mounted troubles before rebels. All they must meet the King’s forces but Northumberland sends a letter telling his sickness, Glendower sends a word that he cannot ready his forces for fourteen days. Hotspur and Douglas now have to face King's army.

The King has camped his army near Shrewburg. Prince Hal proposes that he meet Hotspur in single combat but finally the battle is fought and poor Hotspur dies in the battle. Worcester is executed, Douglas is captured but later released. The King, then sent forces and the King says:

Rebellion in this land shall lose his sway
Meeting the check of such another day;
And since this business so fair is done,
Let us not leave till all our own be won.

(Shakespeare, 2004 : 68)

But King's this wish is not fulfilled. There was another rebellion revolt against The King. The first part of King Henry IV, ends with the death of Hotspur and King's resolve to complete his triumph over remaining rebels namely Glendower, Mortimer, the Archbishop of York & Northumberland.

The second part of the play, King Henry IV begins just after the first ends. There is no battle in the second part. Prince John captures Mowbray, Hastings and the Archbishop. The peace is agreed and rebel army is disbanded. Mowbray questions the justice and honour of such
an action, but prince John promised the rebels that he would redress their grievances and there would be no complain left them to raise because, he further assures them that he would take care of them and there would be no cause of rebel.

After this, we see the sick king worrying about the princes behaviour. Thus "Henry IV Part I and Part II show Shakespeare's combining the political issues with the comic in a new and striking manner. The central theme of the play is the education of Prince. Hal, King's son and later Henry V, But the while of one of he the plays is altered by the Character of Falstaff. The character of Falstaff is greater than the plays in which he is pictured. His character is "the richest comic creation in English literature." (Daiches, 1960 : 261) Shakespeare here combines comedy with history. He treats history from his own point of view and gives the true picture of Elizabethan - England. "The juxtaposition of different moral and social levels in both parts helps to give the play its richness."

_Henry IV Part I and II_ embodies the Elizabethan conception of history. The Elizabethans believed that the King was God's deputy on earth, and the deposition of a king or the usurpation of his throne was a sin. If this sin is committed, it brings the course of revolt, insurrections, civil wars, and rebellion. It is this moral view of History which Shakespeare illustrates through the events like the deposition and murder of Richard and the usurpation of the English throne by Bolingbroke. This is the reason why Dover Wilson has considered King Henry IV as "Shakespeare's greatest morality play".

The Arden editor of Shakespeare's Life of King Henry the Fifth, H.A.Evans, sums up the common features of the play when he says that," its interest is epic, rather than dramatic, it is the nearest approach on the part of the author to national epic." (Dover, 1944 : 14) A mood of exultation of the King is seemed through this play." Henry V stands as the ideal hero in contrast with the troubled John, the deposed Richard, the rebel _Henry IV_ for the traditional conception of Henry V was of a hero King." The theme of the play is again war and the progress of the warrior hero is the progress of the play and his French success as a great upward sweep in the history of England. His mental limitations are more glaringly brought to light when at night, in the disguised of an ordinary soldier, he meets John Bates, Alexander court, and Michael Williams. He can move among common soldiers as if he was one of them.
Henry V is mostly based on Holinshed's chronicles and covers the period from 1414 to May 1420. The characters and their achievements remain true. Sometime persons and times are telescoped. In this period, the dauphin of France was first Lewis, then John, then Charles. But for Shakespeare, he is merely the dauphin.

Henry's war upon France is also abridged and compressed. The battle of Agincourt in this play is followed by the peace making at Troyer in 1420, only the chorus to Act V bridges the years. Chorus also declares, "the entire occurrence, whatever characid -------(Cambell, 1970: 255)

The wooing of Henry is often criticized but it is important the Shakespeare's purpose to have the righteous war crowned by a peace that unites the two countries and of this new and wider unity Henry's marriage with Katherine is the fitting symbol. By this play, Shakespeare brought "his historical sequence to an end with a heartening picture of a society cured of its sickness and united under a prince whose own redemptive experience corresponded with that of his people. To an England living under the shadow of the Queen's approaching death, with all that this might mean, he offered this final assurance that under strong and disciplined leadership men had nothing to fear." (Armstrong, 1972: 253)

As seen earlier, Shakespeare presents the history of England of more than 300 years, i.e. from 1200 A.D. to 1520 A.D. through his history plays. According to Dowden, Shakespeare has given us three full length portraits of English Kings. Through the character of King John, Richard II and Henry VI, Shakespeare presents the 'Weakness' of English Kings. Henry IV, Henry V and Richard III are studies of Kingly strength. "John is the royal criminal, weak in the criminality; Henry VI is the royal saint, weak in his saintliness. The feebleness of Richard II cannot characterised in a word; he is a graceful sentimental monarch. Richard III, on the other hand, is a royal criminal, strong in his crime. Henry IV, the usurping Bolingbroke is strong by a five craft in dealing with events, by resolution and policy, by equal caution and daring. The strength of Henry V is his I plain heroic magnitude thoroughly sound and substantially founded upon the eternal varieties. Here, then, we may recognise the one dominant subject of the histories, viz, how a man may fail, and how a man may succeed in attaining a practical mastery of the world" (Dowden, 1881: 127)
2.7 Conclusion

The major emphasis of above discussion is that why and especially how Shakespeare has treated history in his dramatic art. And now, while framing the concluding statement, it is necessary to review the whole matter in the light of such parahypothetical point of view which unfolds the basic issues which is why Shakespeare chose to write drama on political issues of royal England, and the reasons of this why, forms the basis to his how he has treated or fused history in his dramatic art.

First, we must consider the general assumption that plays are usually written or crafted for stage, reading them seems to be secondary objective and this is very particular about Shakespeare's history plays, because his sole objective was to perform the play immediately after he finished it's craft. Truely, he wrote plays to be performed and to be enjoyed by the audience. Shakespeare's audiences used to wait impatiently for his every new dramatic performance and crowds of audiences used to throng around his theatre to witness in person the unusual magic of his dramatic art. There appears to be a direct relation, a direct link between the audience and their playwright. Since, it is said, that Shakespeare wrote history plays for his audience and not for the readers. And while fulfilling that objective he borrowed, events and incidents from the political history of royal England and fused them ingeniously in his dramatic art. Since, Shakespeare's history plays are, the product of his desire to be the man of the theatre. As such, there appears to be a reciprocal relationship between the playwright and his audience. It is this relationship which inspired the dramatist to write romanticised historical dramas. Hence, it would be right to conclude that Shakespeare was rather compelled to produce drama which later recogised as history plays. Secondly, Shakespeare's England was greatly passioned by the sentiment of nationalism and patriotism. England's victory on the battlefield of Armada in France inspired them greatly and a great tide of patriotic sentiment and nationalistic passion inspired them all, the commons and the nobles have began to aspire new vision. Shakespeare as an artist comprehended the spirit of his time and of his audience, and wrote plays on selected historical events which could aspire people's love for nation and could inspire their patriotic sentiment. Hence, Shakespeare selected to write drama on an unusual historical phenomenon like, war and valour, victories and conspiracies, crown and throne and the likewise. Consequently, Shakespeare's historical dramas became popular.
Third, Shakespeare lifted the historical events and incidents from the chronicles of Holinshed, Hal and Daniel and fused some of the prominent events them in his dramatic art. By using the historical phenomenon from the royal history of England, he produced ten history plays. They are - *Henry VI* Part I, II and III, *Richard III, Richard II, King John, Henry IV* Part I and II, *Henry V* and *Henry VIII*. The dynasties of royal England who were primely engaged in fighting wars for power and plunders have been depicted in these ten plays. The artistic objective of Shakespeare in depicting such phenomenon was to attract his audiences. Since, Shakespeare's artistic intention was no doubt to entertain but the ways he romanticised the historical stuff in his dramatic art, made him universal. We witness the height of his genius, because Aristotle has stated that the appeal of history is singular, whereas the appeal of poetry is universal. Shakespeare, while writing drama based on history used his unusual genius and as a result his local drama became universal, the temporal became perennial.

It is with this parahypothetical point of view, that leads us to the central point. Shakespeare has treated history or fused history in his dramatic art. His strength lies in his artistry and the way, he treated issued around power and politics from the past of this land known as England.

He borrowed his material from Hal, Holinshed and Daniel. He lifted great events and incidence from the chronicle histories of the historians as above, and imaginatively retold them with magnitude and grandiloquence. If we compare the historical incidents which he took from Holinshed's Chronicle with his dramatic creations like *Richard II, Henry IV* and the like-wise, we would find the great cult of imagination of the artist made history more meaningful. The major events or incidents are skillfully rebuilt with massive plots - the bare historical event is retold as a fairy tale, historical orders of the events have been altered and re-arranged in artistic order. Real historical incident when transformed through poetic method appears more real than the actual. Since, it appears that the royal history of England took its best recourse through Shakespeare's history plays.
Everything in the world has a history. Even the very words in a language. Each is born at a certain date like a person, forms, like him, certain habits and associations, keeps good or bad company, changes its ways, grows older, is in every respect like an individual, possessed of a certain value, poetic or prosaic, and of less or greater use for general and particular purposes.

In 206 B.C. there was no Roman literature no science no buildings that the Greeks would have called architecture, and nothing but the crudest sculpture. It was not surprising that a town like Syracuse, with its temples, theatres and play festivals, to say nothing of the military engines invented by Archimedes should have dazzled and fascinated the conjuring Romans. And they were quick to imitate what they saw. During the 100 years, that followed the second the death of Alexander the great in 323 B.C. Rome was in control of some part of each of these Carthaginian wars. Rome’s power, secure now in the western Mediterranean, spread to the East. After depositions and was almost as supreme at the Eastern though much fighting was constantly needed to keep her so. In 149 B.C. Rome embarked upon her third and final war against Carthage. Many Romans resented the continuing commercial prosperity of their world enemy, and one grim character, the senator Cato, went so far as finish all his speeches with the words, “Delenda est Carthago – must be destroyed.” An excuse was found in military operation begun by Carthage against the Numidians of the desert without Rom’s permissions. Once more the Romans invaded Africa and a three years struggle ended as Cato desired Carthage disappeared as a state. Its splendid capital city was reduced to ruins and the old Carthaginian territory that –

The history of Rome from the foundation of the city down to the defeat of Carthage, It did not take long for Greek religion to cast an equally powerful spell over the Roman’s religion was rather colourless, and consisted largely of performing the right ceremony at the right time. The gods were powerful beings who could be persuaded by sacrifice to send a good harvest or keep mildew from the crops, but as originally conceived by the Roman’s they were not vivid characters like the Greek god. So the Roman’s borrowed the Greek stories and attached them to their own Gods. Jupiter, for instance, the Roman king of the Gods took on the stories about the
Greek Zeus an Minerva, the Roman patron of household crafts like spinning and weaving, was invested with the legends surrounding the Greek warriors goddess Athene.

Roman’s were writing play the plots and characters were taken over wholesale from Greek models, but even so the plays were Roman in spirit. Many of the audiences for the early Roman comedies of ploautus and his successor, Terence must have spent a long time in Greek towns during the fighting. So we find the plays crammed with the stangy foreign words, they had by caught back from the wars in the manner of soldiers every where. And apart from plays, the Roman’s wanted to imitate the great Greek epic poems of Homer’s poems and made it fit the Latin language. In this new, strong, harsh rhythm, he wrote a Roman epics.

The year 133 B.C. saw soiting and bloodsheds in the streets of Rome. It saw the end of long period calm in Roman politics and the beginning of more than a 100 years of futile and ofeen Blood thirsty civil strife –the riot was a deable attempt by a gung of senators to kill a young Aristocrat, also a senator, named Tiberius Gracchus. It was successful.

Tiberius Gracchus was a brave and intelligent young man, who had an excellent education of the new of the new and fashionable Greek type, and Greek ideas of democracy and independence had greatly influenced his politics but enemies in the senate turned to violence. After murder of Tiberius Gracchus (in 133 B.C.) nine years later his younger brother, Gaius Gracchus, was also elected tribune in 123-122 B.C. He carried on his brothers work on his most important project that of improving the position of Rome’s allies in Italy.

But allies stood on riot against Rome, they had no right in the army republic, fighting Rome’s battles from one end of the Mediterranean, they had no say in Roman politics, no influence on declaration of war or making peace, no right in Roman law-courts no trade with Roman citizens on equal terms, in it, unfortunately ‘Gaius’ extended Roman citizenship to the allies. The privileged senators attacked and murdered the Gaius Gracchus in 122 B.C. The story of his brother Tiberius all over again: Violence, rioting, murder.

In 91 B.C., alias prepared war against Roman and in 91 B.C. They gathered central and southern Italy used for fight against Roman and they organized political organization and an army of 1,00,000 men. In the war with Rome that followed, the struggle for nearly a year was evenly matched and desparate – so much so that at the end of 90 B.C. The Roman decided to
make concessions. They passed a law granting Roman citizenship to any state. Rome had to give the allies what they were fighting for. From now on, Italy and Rome were one among other privileges, the new citizens could vote in Roman citizens – but they had to come to Rome do so. The local population, against Roman control Marius, a man of the people who had saved Italy from invasion by German tribes. But he failed and then the young and cruel Sulla entered in the war against allies. having possession of an army he marched on Rome and seized the control of Rome as a dictator of Rome in 81 to 79 B.C.

In 70 B.C. the young general Pompey follows Sullas consul but denied by senate. Sulla’s laws limiting the power of assembly and the tribunes. But Rome could grant him to a successful general in 67 B.C. Pompey destries the mediterranean pirates and Roman’s realized how vital it was to suppress allies. Pompey kept his forces together and was granted command in the Asian proviences and lastly Pompey conquests it in the east, 67 to 60 B.C.

In 63 B.C. a new man Cicero succeed greatly to the consulship. He had made a name in Rome by his brilliant handling of some very tricky cases, on behalf of the people of Sicily against their X-governer, the cruel and avaricious verres. Siciero was successful writer of philosophy and politics, he fascinating private letters which gave a vivid picture of the times in which he lived. Cicero unable to control Rome as Pompey did –nor would he have wanted to for he had too great respect to the senate and the constitution of the republic. It was the army commanders who became powerful, and the greatest these was a nephew of Morius named “Gaius Julius Caesar.”

Julius Caesar born in 100 B.C. Julius Caesar was fourty before he had command of an army, and his early career gave little hint of what was to come. He was to be a brilliant advocate in the law courts, but otherwise he seemed to be a typical ‘man about town’, with too little money too many debts and extravagant of life. The story of his early career which shows his carriage, ruthlessness and personality. Intravelling he captured by pirates. He was only about 25 at the time and at the student of university Rhodes. He challenged pirates that when the ransom was paid he would come that and see then hanged. After that when Ransom arrived they released him as soon as he was free, Caesar got together free, returned to the scene, and fulfilled his promised to the pirates.
Then Caesar consul in 59 B.C. as a result of packed with Pompey and a rich banker named Crassus. All three had a grudge against the senate, which was obstructing their plans. Pompey and Crassus thought that if Caesar was consul he would be able to over ride the obstruction. so Crassus took care of Caesar’s debts and Pompey provided the support of his followers at the election. As soon as Caesar become consul he had a variety of laws passed to the satisfaction both of Crassus financial associates and a Pompey – whose arrangement in the east at last confirmed and whose old soldiers were given small holding in Italy. At last the law an extended him term of office as governor of Gaul and an army to command it is the better chance to famous and powerful; to win glory and return to Rome in triumph. Caesar conquers all Gaul in 58 to 50 B.C. nine years he governed Gaul. He extended the Roman power from a strip of this provianve to the Roman dominiance.

He invaded Britain twice. He crushed a revolt that swept end to end of the land he had conquer at last he settling and organizing the whole area in so sound and just a way that Gaul in the entire Roman empire. As prospourous and civilized proviances. Caesar’s own account is swift and exciting, matching perfectly his amazing speed of action.

While Caesar was away conquering Gaul his friendship with Pompey began to break up. Pompey became Jealous of Caesar rapidly growing reputation as a soldier and drifted into the ranks into his enemies. when Caesar’s term of office as governor Gaul due to an end in 49 B.C. his enemy’s would not let him stape straight into the cousulship, because they wanted to attack him as a private citizen. In the law courts so Caesar refused to leave his proviance and his army without some guarantee of protection against his enemies then Caesar and Pompey tried to reach a compramise. But Caesar’s enemies with trake compelled him to choose between war and political ruin.

On 10 January 49 B.C. Caeser Rubicon with an army that flows down to the Adriatic between Ravenna and Rimini that crossing meant war, for the stream formed the boundary of his provience, “to cross the Rubicon has meant to take a fateful and final decision for action.

**Caesar defeats Pompey**

The campaigns of the civil war that followed ranged from one end of the Mediterranean to the other. In Italy, in Spain, in Africa, in Greece, in Asia minor, every where Caesar defeats
pompey at Pharsalus in Greece after death of Pompey Caesar made a dictator or caesar was supreme at Rome assumed the power of normal offices of state. Caesar supremacy made him emperor in 47 B.C. Caesar wins a battle at zea and settles Asia. Also in 46 B.C. Caesar defeats Pompecians in Africa in Thapsus and made victory in the death of Cato. In this period he changed the Roman calendar, year consisted of 355 days. Caesar added three months, giving a year of 445 days. As sun’s year in 45 B.C. and also decreed one or two extra days should be added to each of the Roman month of February. Thus Caesar put into the effect of astronomical of the scientist and his calendar remains in force today only one correction – introduced in Europe generally in the sixteenth century in the England eighteenth century. At last the 45 B.C. Caesar defeats Pompeians in Spain at Munda. And made successful and effective various administrative reform at Rome.

In 45 B.C. Caesar became dictator for life he was sole master of Rome and was in a dangerous position. The Romans could not endure kings. Caesar publicaly refused the title of king but honours were heaped on him and more unpopular leading senators of the siding with Pompey he had given them power and advancement, began to plot against him. He donot noticed of public opinion or trusting his fellow senator with him. Caesar enters Rome in Triump January 26 and at the Lupercalia February fifth reject the crown, after that he prepare to leave Rome parthians war but an account of plot construction of his opponent was successful as a conspiracy of 60 republicans succeed on (the ides 15th) of March 44 B.C. he went to the meeting of sinate as usual. At the foot of Pompey’s statue one of the group of 50 sinate came forward as a petition as Caesar struggled shouting, “But this is violence” Then he realized number of the conspirators, he wrapped his toga round him to die with dignity as a noble Roman should. One of the leaders of the plot was Bluturs, whom Caesar has pardoned and made him the chief magistrate at Rome. As Brutus came forward to strike his blow Caesar uttered his last words; “U too, my son”

An account of these last words vary. The words quotes were supposed to be have been spoken in Greek, the language Caesar and his friend offen use for conversation(p. No. 268)

“Murder would solve none of Roman’s problems”
The man of the future on the other were Caesar’s nephew and heir Octavian, the generals of Caesar’s army, notably Mark Antony and Caesar’s soldiers who were still devoted to his memory and, was to avenge Caesar’s death. On March 17, 44 B.C. Antony secure’s treasure and public and private papers. March 17, 44 B.C. the senate of Rome Enactes an Amnesty for Caesar’s murderer’s but conforms Caesar’s act. March 20, 44 B.C. Antony gave general speech over Caesar against Brutus and Cassius they both has left Rome Octavius arrives in Rome; the senate turns to him. In May 44 Antony Besieges Brutus in Mutina Then the senate declares war against Antony. Antony and the consules raise the siege of Mutina. Brutus occupies Macedonia and Cacus Syria. Breach of Octavian with the senate and coalition with Antony and Lepidus in Rome. After few months Brutus and casius in Asia going to prepare for war. That’s why in 44 B.C. Antony and Octavius cross to Greece leaving Lepidus in Rome and held was at Philippi against Brutus and Cassius verses Antony and Octavian. In the first battle Brutus is victorious but Cassius kills himself; in the second war 20 days later, Brutus is defeated and kills himself. In 42 B.C. they did so on the field of philipp Antony controlled the eastern of Greek and Octavian controlled the west. Antony had the advantage of the riches of the east, Octavian held Rome and Italy the best recruiting ground for the legions.

As a ruler of the east Antony had to supervise the many petty rulers who were subject to Rome- of this the most important was cleapatra the Queen of Egypt. Even today the name of Cleopatra has a strange fascination, she was of a Macedonien line decended from one of Alexander’s generals, at the age of 29 she first met Antony, she was already experienced in the use of her attractions. Indeed she has borned Julius Caesar, a son and possibly dreamed of becoming Caesar’s queen in Rome. Within a few years time she married Antony.

She brought Antony the fine fleet and money to pay his troops, in the long run she was source of weakness to him after that Octavian succeed to organise propaganda to represent the civil war between Rome and a queen Cleopatra. This feeling spread to Roman legions in Antony’s army and held battle in 31st B.C. between the two rivals- a naval engagement off Activium in, Greece – a large part of Antony’s army had melted away. Octavian after his success pursed his opponent to Egypt, and their Antony and Cleopatra committed suicide.
Octavian was now supreme over all the Roman dominiance, also he was most skillful politicians history has ever known. He knows well how to control of the army and avoiding himself the fate of Caeser. So he was respected in all republican forms.

First century A.D. starts from Augustus: A great era starts from Augustus, ageneius emparor

After all one new person met the Octavian named Augustus. Everybody knows him Gods gift. Comparatively he came to be mean “Prince and emperior reckoned as the first Roman emperor. Augustus take care of army and command of a legion well at Rome. Augustus spread the army colonies welfare for a Roman civilization. In his period he developed engineering, sculpture, cultivation of land and roads, water storage drainage and public and private paths are founded a great structure of Roman civilization. So people of Rome presumed to him as a god for Rome. The kings, Popes and barrons of the middle ages lived in a squalor that would have seemed in credible to the subjects of Augustus. The great achievement of the early empor Augustus made internal peace better. It is bad for Roman public Augustus died in A.D. 14

Tibberius a great grandson of Augustus aged 25 and knows a a cligula his accession to the throne went to his head after his 4 years reign, a riot of imperial extravagance, wild living, and murder was mercifully terminated in A.D. 44 by his own officers who killed in his palace. Then after Claudius succeeded as an unimpressive ruler and came in force the second desastrus ruler as young stepson Nero in A.D. 44 to 68 who was devoted to the Arts and musical contest and even competed for public prizes in singing, dancing and chariot racing, governed not unreasonably then, he had banished his mother and his advisor, the philosopher and tragedy writer Seneca, he gave himself over to wild extravagance and cruel tobehaviour even causing his own mother and his wife to be put to death after the great fire in Rome during his region and his subsequent perciction of the christains. The senate condemned him and deserted his guard, Nero finally commited suicide in A. D. 69.

The emperors of A.D. 69 to 138:-

Within a year of Nero’s death one of the generals Vespasian who had a very strong following of troofs, was declared emperor by the senate. Vespasian and his son’s Titus and Domition and the two Spanish generals Trajan and Hadrian – all these consolidated and extended
the empire during the hundred years that followed the death of Nero. Near about 69 to 169 A.D. and gave a second century to the Roman world, and the development in the government and law. They carried the emperor to its highest point of perfection.

**Literature of the Early Empire:**

The great achievements of the early empire it is to be remembered that it was an age which produced much of the best Latine literature and much of the finest Roman architecture. On the whole the Romans could not compare with the Greeks as philosopher or scientist, but they produced a nobly literature and they were certainly among the worlds greatest builders. Among the literature poets who flourished in the reign of Augustus and who have also delighted latter generations include Horace, Ovid and Vergil [whole great epic the Aenieid depict’s the wanderings of the tregon prince. Aeneus to Italy, there to found royal line of Latium.] Among the histotians there was livy, who spent 40 years writing a great history of Rome from earliest times to Rain of Augustus.

2.B (ii) Impact of Rome on Britain

The over look of the Ethnic complex to understand England and the English of great Britain. “It has been said of Europe in general and particularly of western Europe, that it constituted a cul-de-sac, in which masses of immigrants succeeded and were hipped up upon each other.” so with Brion The ocean lay beyond her, Britonians could not go no futher, and layer after layer of the travelling tribes piled themselves upon her showers.

It is the rapid glance back to the beginning to dawn of things in these island—a long journey as “the Romans gave glory to Briton and not Briton to the Romans.” :- how accounts for its two thousand years of subsequent and barron history. The early history of Roman have to consider both nature and nurture The original basis of tribes and the superstructure of lives stressed upon the customs institutions, beliefs or a people; to whatever causes it may be focused scenens first century B.C. the Roman’s in Briton. Their culture, customs, beliefs, traditions—indispatability fused the factors which go for to mould the type to go further to fix it, to give it a recognizable and distinct character, than original physical particularities, It is to noted that, inrespect of literature and art, and it is not so much blood that tells us the influences brought to bear upon a folk, that the influences of soil and history are chief account of the early history.
There is no denying that both in respect of blood and culture. The English provide a magnificent field for study and speculation. These elements are called a glorious amalgam. History has much to say of the mixture of races, but the mixture was there before the dawn of history. The island of Briton appears to have been very early inhabited indeed before it was an island, the prehistoric ancestors told that the south of the thems and severn. Briton still formed part of the main land of Europe.

Till about 600 B.C. Briton appears to have been occupied by two races, one long headed, one short headed, usually spoken of as the Mediterranean and Alpine races, which probably fused to become one people. Their culture—customs, beliefs, traditions— indisputably fused. They formed a single community. The bronze age talk by many authorities now called, “the beaker folk” pictured as men of rugged countenances irregular features, deepset eyes under over hanging brows, large mouths and what archbishop whateby colietly styled “Anticognitative noses”. Then came the man of iron, advancing in two waves—The Gauls bringing with them wholly dissimilar habits and tradition, people of Nordic character moving by the way of the Alpine plateau into North Eastern France. They are not as usual as folk and touched with southern and some extent Eastern England, but did not reach Scotland. Southern Scotland and Northern England, between the Scotts and English are the racial issues in the border countries.

Before the christian era the, or the Roman occupation, Ere even Caesar’s galleys (victory over Briton) came to land from this. It is the evidence of three races over on Briton—the mediterranean, the Alpine and the Gaulish (Nordic) folk. These three made up the composite nation as Briton as resisting Caesar of whom the Romances of king Aurther and the nights of the round table tale the ancient Britons.

As for the Romans, that three races people left Briton as whatever they went, the impress of their power and policy. Hard upon the Romans came the folk who were posses the land and make the nation Saxons, Angles and Jutes. They erected the line of the reverse they penetrated deep into the island all along the watered valleys their graves are found. During the luckless Britons before them, they seized the rich lands and made their settlements. What become of the ancient Britons before the advance of the seafairy adventures and It is a point of importance, but a point in dispute. It is to be sure that if they did not altogether perish out of the land, as some suppose, they were certainly not left in possession of the best of it, but lived when they did live,
obscure and hidden in fens and forests or fled ot the mountains of walls. Doubtlessly they defeated themselves as best they could—under king Author. As legend tells.

It was familiar here in Roman times and applied to know to the coast between the wash and soolent, the hunting ground of the earliest pirates against whose raids a Roman officer stood on guard—the coast of the saxion shore.

The beginnings of Roman town life in Briton. Swiftly the Romans began to impose the pattern of their way of life upon the half-conquered island. To the Romans civilization meant living in town-proper towns like Pompeii with regular ‘greed of streets, a forum with large public building and rose of brick for stone houses. The settlements at camulodanum (Colchester) and verulamium (sent st Albans) where the largest ‘towns’ the Romans found in Britain and they must have seemed to the invaders like an untidy collection of hovels. Indeed, the huts of the Belgae with their volves of wattle and daub were so flimsy that few traces remain of them for archalogist to study. The Romans took over camuladamum for the chief city of new provincie. Large public buildings in a Roman style soon bring up, the most important being the temple of the emperor Claudius. The vetaraus from the legions were settled in the town and it received the status and previlliges of the Roman colony Verulamium a Roman gate—A largest town gate focuses a Romans reconstruction became a centre of Romans administration. Its population increased rapidly result of the great new road, latter called loatling street which Roman military engineers constructed within a few years of the incasion. This Road was built to link the armies in the centre of the country.

The cost of protecting Britain was high. The walls and fortresses had to be constantly manned and defended against restless and ruthless enemies. Thirty to forty thousand men were parmanantly stationed in the north of the provience, and all had to be and paid. What were these soldiers defending, and why did Roman government think it worth the effort? To these questions there are three answers, all equally true. The first may be the fruits of conquest. Land, raw materials, tribute, taxation, jobs, recruiting grounds for the army—conquered foreign territory offered all these. The second answer is that the defence of Gaul was easier. If the island of Britain on the flank of Gaul was also in Roman hands. The third answer is a more idealistic one’s. The Romans would have said that they were extending and defending civilization. By third answer Romans would have meant that they were making it possible for people to build
towns and to live in them. The very word civilization comes from civis, a citizen, and in the
Roman view town life was the only life fit for civilized men. So they encouraged the Britains to
imitate the Roman way of life and in general the Romans had prestige of military success, the
towns of Italy and southern France, housed a way of life much more elaborate and comfortable
than anything till then seen in Britain. It was not long before the Britains. Particularly the
British nobles, wanted to be like the Romans – and to do that they had developed the Britain as it
is the town, colonies and tribal capitals, local governments, taxes paid both in cash. London
bridge over the Thames made, London port for merchants. Further London 4th A.D. became the
official capital. It was finally about 325 Acres the biggest and the most Romanised of the towns
of Britain it was also swiping business new tribal capitals were built, grand Roman master plan
of city way and also planned public buildings walls, entertainments, the temple theatre at
Verulamium in A.D. 130, Most of shops were built, arrangement of grand town houses. Roman
times bath was an international reputation in second century A.D.

The religion in Roman Britain identified with Palas, Athene, Patron, -goddess of Athens.
They were Romanised the other religion which came to Britain was under the Romans was of
course Christianity. They honoured Christianity and built a small church chapel, tombstones and
christain symbols worked into a few mosaics or scratched on spoons. All the same we know
from christain writers that missionaries came to Britain in the second century A.D.

2.B (iii) Shakespeare’s treatment of Roman history

Shakespeare’s plays dealing with Roman history were frequent on the Elizabethan stage.
It is to be apt at first sight wonder many points of different language and its meaning it is to be
observed that it compare with the English historical play. Shakespeare, who always took care to
sail with the popular wind, he has also left behind him. Four plays based on Roman history. It
will be noticed that Shakespeare’s interest in Roman history began only with the turn of the
century. As a historical dramatist he was subordinated to his subject much in the same way as
the portrait painter. He could choose his point of view and manage the lights and shades and
determine the pose with the professedly authentic records whether England or Rome. Shakespeare
felt that he had to do with the actual with what definitely had been; and he did not
concive himself to give invention. The rein, as when with a light heart he reshaped the caprices
of a novel or the pervergence of a legend. He wrote four Roman plays.
When he turned to the records of antiquity the conditions were very different. He has considered the history of his own land and went outside his own England in search for historical things. He studied as a technical scholar the history of Rome had far more familiar charm than the history of Greece. He was still addressing the general heart with Roman History and showed himself in passed out the four play based on Roman history are

1] Julius Caesar (1601)

2] Timons of Athens (1607)

3] Anthony and Cleopatra (1608)

4] Coriolanus (1609)

SOURCES OF THE PLAY

In his plays from English History Shakespeare chiefly followed Holinshed. In his three plays on Roman subjects –Julius Caesar, Antony and Cleopatra, Coriolanus and Timons of Athens he made still greater use of Plutarch. Plutarch wrote his Parallel Lives of noble Greeks and Romans in Greek about the end of the first century A.D.; they were translate into French by Amyot in 1560, and from the French version into English by Sir Thomas North in 1579. The printer, Field, was a native of Stratford–on–Avon and may possibly have put his fellow townsman in the way of acquiring the book either in its first or second edition (1595). Plutarch was born at Choeronea in Boeotia, and was a contemporary of Tacitus and the Plinys. The precise dates of his birth and death are unknown, but it is probable that from 50 to 100 A.D. include the best years of his life. His popularity is founded mainly on his parallel Lives, written, it is thought in his latter years.

In his successive books, a Greek and Roman generally with some wellmarked resemblances in political career, being selected as the subject of each. The ‘Lives’ are works of
great research. He is known as a historian. Mr. George Long observes that ‘we must expect to find him imperfectly informed on Roman institutions, and we can detect in him some errors yet on the whole, his Roman lives do not often convey erroneous notions: if the detail is in correct, the general impression is true.’ They are, moreover, “written with a graphic and dramatic vivacity, such as we find in few biographies ancient or modern,” and the authors aim throughout appears to have been to enforce a high standard of morality.

**Sir Thomas North**

Sir Thomas North was the second son of Edward North. The dates of his birth and death are unknown; he was alive to see the third edition of his Plutarch published in 1603. His first literary work was a translation of Guvvara’s Diall of Frinces which appeared in 1557 as his shown by the little page to his Plutarch’s Lies. North used the French version of the Greek Historian from which to make his translation “As a strict and accurate version it may,” says Skeat and also he pointed out, “have been suppressed in some points by others extent in English, as for example by the wellknown edition by John and William Langborne, and by A. H. Clough; yet it has merits of its own which must not be hastily overlooked. In particular it must be observed that the translation by Amyot was very faithful spirited and well executed and though North fail into some mistakes which Amyot had avoided, his English is especially good, racy and well expressed. He had the advantage of writing at a period when nervous and idiomatic English was well understood and commonly written.

So that he constantly uses expressions which illustrates in a very interesting manner, the language of our authorized version of the Bible.”

**Shakespeare’s Plutarch**

How closely Shakespeare followed Plutarch can only be made evidence by a careful comparison of the play with the original number of extracts from historians illustrating Shakespeare’s method will be found on PP 123-160, where points of closest resemblance are clearly shown it should refer more particularly to page 126 to 239.

“Page after page out of the ‘lives’ of Caesar, Brutus, Antony and Coriolanus is with curiously slight modifications transposed by Shakespeare into dramatic form. His genius finds
his scope not in invasion, but in animating Plutarch’s narrative with the vivid life and play of dialogue “BOAS.

North’s translation is one of the greatest monuments of Elizabethan prose and it is not surprising that Shakespeare often followed it even verbally for Julius Caesar he used the lives of Caesar and Brutus, and to a slight degree that of Antony it is not certain that Shakespeare used any other source for this play he may drown slightly on Appian’s history of the civil war (translated 1578) for Antony’s speech to the crown and on Garnier’s Cornelie (1574 translated by Kyd 1504) for the first conversation of Brutus and Cassius and even on Belle forestes history of Hamlet for the speech of Brutus to the crown (though this remained in French till 1608)

Shakespeare’s debt to Plutarch in his three Roman plays for exceeds his debts to his sources in any of his other plays, and the reason is not typical to find North’s Plutarch is it self great literature, No one reads Holinshede’s chronical for its own sake, but Plutarch’s lives have fascinated men of all countries, and North would be read even if Shakespeare had never used him. Shakespeare followed North Plutarch still more closely in Coriolanus and Antony and Cleopatra than in Julius Caesar.

The play of Coriolanus is an admirable example of Shakespeare’s method of transforming history into drama and prose into poetry without changing the story in any important degree the main outlines of the man’s characters and also the principal actions ascribed to him, are copied faithfully from the historian, while those outlines are filled up and finished with a wealth of invention and a death of judgement which the poet has perhaps now he a surpassed.”- HUDSON.

Plutarch wrote biography, Shakespeare wrote plays. Narrative must be turned into drama Shakespeare’s fuses material from four separate lives, he throws much of the narrative into action ad dialogue. (e.g. the death of Cassius) And, most important of all, he has to seize upon what he considers the central situation, the high lights of the story and group other events round them. He may have from dramatic purposes, to enlarge on or to pass over some aspect of character. He carries further, eg. The idealization of Brutus ignoring a fault which Plutarch mentioned only to excuse, and omitting to mention that Brutus had been produced by Caesar for taking part with Pompey against him.
The dramatist naturally adds many touches of detail such as the naked sword in Casca’s hand in (Act I scene iii) or the presence of Calphurnia in (Act I scene ii) or again a whole scene may be built up out of one sentence in Plutarch as is the opening scene of the play it is because the process throws so much light on Shakespeare’s dramatic art.

Treatment of histories: Roman Plays comparison with English plays:

The Roman plays differ from the English histories both in the selection of their material and in the treatment of the selected material. selection of themes for the English History plays was influenced by contemporary historical interests. All the ten plays on English history deal with rivalry for the throne the struggle with the pope of Rome, and the success or failure of the English in France. Even minor episodes and events apparently of little dramatic value were selected and the dramatist deals the national history familiar to the people at large.

While dealing with Roman history the circumstances were different. Despite keen interest in antiquity. Roman history was known to the people only in the mass, and impressed only by the outstanding features. He therefore, selected episodes of more silent interest and more catholic appeal. The fall of Caesar, the throwing away of the world for love, are events fraught with tragic possibilities and bound to excite the interest and wonder of the audience. They are momentous events not only of national but of international interest and significance. Further, the treatment, too, of this material is different.

The Roman plays are compared with the tragedies in which the genius of Shakespeare had quite unimpeded sway. Mr Bradley’s attention, thus there is in the middle of Antony and Cleopatra, owing to the undramatic nature of the historic material, an excessive number of brief scenes, “in which the dramatis personae are frequently changed as though a novelist were to tell his story in a succession of short chapters in which he fitted from one group of his characters to another.” In Coriolanus, “If Shakespeare had made the hero persist and we had seen him amid the flaming ruins of Rome awaking suddenly to the enormity of his deed and taking vengeance on himself….. that would merely have been an ending more strictly tragic than the close of Shakespeare’s play. It is in the technical sense. Of course Mr. Bradley is quiet aware that as it stands Coriolanus is, “A much nobler play.” It is right to add that he expresses no opinion
whether the actual close of Shakespeare’s play “was the simply to his unwillingness oto contradict his historical authority on a point of such magnitude.”

There was much less between Elizabethan life and Greek life, so Timon and Troilus and Cressida, though true as human documents have almost nothing Hellenic about them. Even in then Roman plays, so soon as there is anything that involves a distinctive difference between Rome and London Shakespeare is sure to miss it. In Julius Caesar there are clacks that strike, and the crowd throw up their swealy nightcaps. The Elizabethan stage furnish Cleopatra and communius with similies. Minenius is familiar with funeral knells and batteries and Galen’s priscRIPTIONs. English history that were partly alien to the spirit of the time of this king John furnishes the grand example. King John through very true to human nature and even to certain aspects of the period, plays no heed to the aspect which other generations have considered the most important of all, all one which on any estimates is not to be overlooked.

It is the closest, antony and Cleopatra. It that there is hardly a personage or circumstance for which he had not some sort of a clue. He knew about soldiers of fortune like Enobarbus and pirate-adventures like Menad; a ruler like Henry VII, had in him a touch of Octavius, there were not few nobilities in Europe who carried a suggestion of mark Antony the orgies of Cleopatra’s court in Egypt were analogous to those of many an Italian or French court at the Renaissance.

On the other hand, he is least capable seeing eye to eye the primitive republican life which on Plutarch’s evidence he has to depict in Coriolanus. The shrewd resolute, low-abiding commons, whom some of the traditions that Plutarch worked up seen meant to exalt; The plebs that might secede to the holy mount but would not rised in armed revolt; the secured the tribunate as its constitutional lever with which it was by and by to shipt the political centre of gravity, this was like nothing that he knew or that anybody else knew about till half a century had elapsed he could only represent it in terms of contemporary city mob; and the consequence is that though he has given asplendid picture that satisfies the imagination and even realizes some of Plutarch’s hints, It is not true to the whole situation and envisaged by Plutarch of course Shakespeare could not be expected to anticipate the later theories and researches that go to prove that the political power of Plebs and tribunate has been considerably antedated.
Thus Shakespeare in his picture of Rome and Romans, does not give the notes that mark of Roman from every other civilization, but rather those that it possessed in common with the rest and especially with his own mind from his own point of view with all the powers not only of his reason but of his imagination, emotion, passion and experience.

Lessing's view of the heroic drama is therefore (and there is no doubt that he thought he was describing the method of Shakespeare) that it is a free work of fiction woven around characters familiarly wellknown. He was certainly wrong about Shakespeare and his theory strikes us now as strangely inadequate, but it had very important results. It directly influenced the dramatic art of Germany, and it would be hard to overestimate the share it had in determining Schiller's method of composition. It was in the air at the time of the Romantic movement in France, and is really the Principal on which he goes constructs his more important plays in this kind.

Schiller's treatment of history is very free; he invents scenes that have no shadow of foundation in fact, and yet are of crucial importance in his idealized narrative. Probably little was known in England of this theory of Lotze's thought utterances to the same effect occur in Carlyle especially in his remarks on Shakespeare's English history; it seems to give a correct account of the way in which most English historical dramas were constructed in the 19th century. Sir Henry Taylor while calling Philip Van Artevelde "A dramatic Romance" is careful to state that "Historic truth is preserved in it as far as the material events are concerned." Mr-Swinburne, in his triology on Mery stuart, versifies whole pages of contemporary writers (e.g. In the interview of Mery and Knox taken almost verbatim from Knox's history of the reformation, (his prose essay seems specially to value himself on his exact delineation of her career and his solution of the problem of her nature, But the prerogative instance is furnished by Tennyson. In his dedication of Herold he writes to Lord Lytton. "after old world record like the Beyeus Tastetry and Roman Berou Edward free mans history of the Norman conquest and your fathers historical movements treating of the same thing have been mainy helpful to me in writing this drama"

People like Lucius in Julius Caesar or Nikanor in Coriolanus, or Cilius in Antony and Cleopatra do not interfere in political story. They are present to make or to hear comment or at most to assist the inward interpretation. No unhistorical person has historical work to do. And no unhistorical episode affect the historical action. Even the invention of the Bastard in King John
was guaranteed by the old play and was doubtless considered authentic by Shakespeare. Macbeth, Antony and Cleopatra and Coriolanus resemble one another in that in each case a man possessing all the possibilities of greatness and endowed with much nobility of nature is brought to ruin by some moral flaw. Antony by his sensuousness and love of luxary Macbeth is ruined by the possession of an imagination Coriolanus “does not violence to his soul and to his country through his sin of hautiness, rigidity, and inordinate pride “(DOWDEN)

Coriolanus indignation against the citizens and later against all Romans may be compared with Timons passionate hatred of all mankind .

Now, above all proceeding in this way it is clear that while in every case Shakespeare’s indebtedness to his historical sources must be great, it will very greatly in quality and degree according to the material delivered to him

In sharply Plutarch’s ‘Lives’shakespeare for the first and almost the only time was the masterpiece of genius who stood at the summit of his art.

2.B (iv) Conclusion-

Everything in the world has a history . Before two thousand years ago Roman history was known to all of the people in the world . The early history of Rome have to consider both nature and nurture. The original basis of races and the superstructure of lives, traced upon the customs institutions, beliefs if a people to whatever causes it may be focused in first century B.C. The Romans, their culture- customs, beliefs traditions- indisputability fused the factors which go for to mould the type to go further to fix it, to give it a recognizable and distinct character than original physical particularities. It is to be held that, in respect of literature and art, it is not so much blood heredity that tell us influences brought bear upon a folk in its early history, that the influences brought bear upon a flock in its early history.

It has been noted that Romans made first contact with Greece in 260 B. C. and great literature raised from this period. The beginning of the Roman literature and religion was the foundation of Roman development. In 168 B.C. the Roman power spreaded over the east. Before 133 B.C. Romans spread their expire side wide well, But after 133 B.C. to 31 B. C. ,the consuler Tiberius Gracchus to Octavius, saw rioting and bloodshed in the streets of Rome. It saw the end
of a long period of calm in Roman politics and the beginning of more than a hundred years of futile and often blood-thirsty civil strife. Octavian was one of the most skilful politicians history has ever known, he kept control on Rome well avoiding conspiracy.

In bad time the prince Augustus born for Rome as gift of God. Roman might well think of about their god Augustus, when he reckoned first. Roman Emperor, the gross of developments was focused in his empire. The army colonel to common man’s cottage to developed better living of common people. He was respected in all republican forms in 1st century A. D. with his great development like engineering, sculpture, cultivation of lands, development of roads, water storage and drainage, public and private baths etc. are founded a great structure of Roman civilization. After his period A. D. 44 to 68 was a bad period of Nero. He was devoted to Arts and musical contest, competed for public prizes in singing, dancing and chariot racing governed not unreasonably after.

Then after 69 to 138 A. D. Nero’s death senate declared emperor Vespasian then his Titus and Domition and the two Spanish generals Trajan and Hadrian all these consolidated and extended the empire during the hundred years 69 and 169 A. D. and gave a second century to the Roman world and the development in the government and law they carried the emperor to its highest point of perfection. In this period the great achievements of the beginning of Latin literature and much of the finest Roman architecture, philosopher were certainly among the world’s greatest builders as to be remembered till now.

Impact of Romans is also very grand near about five hundred A. D. on Britain. There is no denying that both in respect of blood and culture, the Roman provided a magnificent field for study and speculation. These elements called a glorious amalgam. History has much to say of the mixture of races, but the mixture was there before the dawn of history. Before the christian era, Britain was the composition of races and their different lives. Usually as far as the Romans came the folk who were possess the land and made the nation. Above all focused Romans reconstruction of society and structure of Britain mostly all the developments were in their empire till reputed as omnipotent valied till today as international standard.

Shakespeare’s contribution to the Roman historical plays are also a very grand interest subordinated to his subject writing with different languages. It is called the skill of portrait
painter. He could choose his point of view and manage the lights and shades, and determine the pose with portrait records. He used this records with the professedly authentic manner whether England or Roman. Shakespeare felt that he had to do with the actual with what definitely had been so he invented his own skill to reshaped the caprices of a legend. So he has also left behind him four plays based on Roman history:-


In his plays from English history Shakespeare chiefly followed Holinshad. In his four plays on Roman subjects, he made still greater use of Plutarch. Plutarch wrote his ‘parallel Lives’ of noble Greeks and Romans in Greek. About the end of the 1st century A.D. They were translate into French by Amyot in 1560, and from the French version into English by Sir Thomas North in 1579. The Briner, field was a native of Stratford-on avon and may possibly have put his fellow towns man in the way of acquiring the book either in its first or second edition. (1595) North’s translation is one of the greatest monument of Elizabethan prose and it is not surprising that Shakespeare often followed it even verbally. Shakespeare’s debt to Plutarch in his four Roman plays for exceeds his debts to his sources in any of his other plays. Shakespeare followed North Plutarch still more closely in Coriolanus and Antony and Cleopatra than in Julius Caesar.

It is the dramatist business to sustain interest; he ignore the delays and dull patched of ordinary life. This usually involves in a play based on history some speeding up of events. Shakespeare ignores, e.g. The meeting of the senate on the day after Caesar’s murder and takes us straight forward to the funeral speech which was really several days latter. Between the events portrayed in scene ii and scene iii of Act I a month elapsed in reality; the two battles of Philip were separated by an interval of 20 days, and so on.

While dealing with Roman history, the circumstances were different. Roman history was known to the people only in the mass and impressed only by the outstanding features. Shakespeare was influenced by contemporary historical interest which belong to the same period of composition as Julius Caesar, Timons of Athens, Antony and Cleopatra and Coriolanus.
Macbeth, Antony and Cleopatra and Coriolanus resemble one another in that in each case a man possessive all the possibilities of greatness and endowed with much nobility of nature is brought to the ruin by some moral flaw. Macbeth is ruined by the possession of an imagination which he has not strength of character enough to control. Antony by his sensiousness and love of luxury. Coriolanus, “does violence to his own soul and to his country throw his scene of haughtiness, rigidity and inordinate pride.” (DOWDEN)

‘Coriolanus’ indignation against the citizens and latter against all Romans may be compared with Timon s passionate hatred of all mankind. In Antony, the faithless rapture of old and newly- formed political, friendly, and neptual ties, in order to keep faith with an unworthy paramour, is represented as the catastrophe in the hero. Coriolanus defection from his country falls move remotely under the same category. On the other hand the subject of Timon the distrustful ingratitude of friend against friend in the other, rank entirely under this head. “(GEEVINDS)

Thus, Plutarch was of great help to Shakespeare while writing the Roman historical plays.