

Introduction

Julius Caesar's sensational action, straightforward characters, and absence of sex have long made it a popular school text; so much so that hardly a literate member of English-speaking society can claim ignorance of it, even if 'Friends, Romans, countrymen' constitutes his only sure recollection. Critics, however, have been less taken with it than educators. As early as the seventeenth century Thomas Rymer brought Shakespeare to book for sinning 'not against nature and Philosophy only, but against the most known History';¹ while as late as the end of the nineteenth, Shaw indicted him for 'this travesty of a great man [Caesar] as a silly braggart, whilst the pitiful gang of mischief-makers who destroyed him are lauded as statesmen and patriots'.² Yet from the moment the Globe actors first spouted and jiggered for Thomas Platter, *Caesar* has been, save for a couple of brief interludes, a perennial hit at the box-office and a challenge to most major performers – with the notable exceptions of Garrick, Kean, Irving, and Olivier. And this in spite of grave theatrical drawbacks: a titular hero who dies before the play is half over; three other roles of greater interest competing one with another for a share of the audience's sympathy; a mob which if small or inactive saps the play's vitality, but if large or boisterous swamps the action; two final acts which threaten momentarily to dwindle into anti-climax; and little feminine interest to balance its defects.

Neither critics nor men of the theatre would deny that the play bristles with difficulties. From the late seventeenth century until the work of Ulrici, Hudson, Gervinus, and Moulton two hundred years later, study and stage regarded the piece as successful merely in parts. Only in this century has there been a widespread academic recognition of *Caesar's* wholeness, and a willingness on the part of the theatre to offer more than piecemeal solutions to its problems.

The play and its critics

Predictably, the prime concern of neo-classical commentators was the title role – the unhistoric figure Caesar cuts, and the relatively brief period in

which he cuts it. Rymer thought it downright ‘Sacredge’ on the part of the dramatist to put Caesar and Brutus in ‘Fool’s Coats’, to reduce titans of antiquity to mere ‘Jack-puddens in the Shakespear dress’.³ John Dennis, scandalized at Shakespeare’s ‘gross Mistakes in the Characters which he has drawn from History’, asks caustically, ‘How could it be that seeing *Caesar*, we should ask for Caesar?’⁴ Even Mrs Montague, Shakespeare’s defender against the censure of Voltaire, conceded Caesar’s ‘historical character . . . ought certainly have been more attended to’.⁵ In the first decades of the nineteenth century, sporadic outcries were still heard. Hazlitt, for example, regretted to find the ‘mighty Julius’ unworthy of his admiration and unfaithful to the portraits of him in his *Commentaries*.⁶

Dissatisfaction with Caesar’s dramatic inconsequence, as distinct from his historic inaccuracy, took its rise with Charles Gildon’s complaint that ‘*Caesar* is the shortest and most inconsiderable Part . . . and he is killed in the beginning of the Third Act.’⁷ ‘How could [Shakespeare] have made so very little of the first and greatest of Men’, demanded an outraged Dennis, ‘as that *Caesar* should be put a Fourth-rate Actor in his own Tragedy?’⁸ A century later Leigh Hunt remarked only that ‘*Caesar* appears but in two short scenes and is dismissed at the beginning of the third act.’⁹ So minor a character seemed to him unworthy of further comment.

Once Caesar had been judged inadequate, critics cast about for another hero. Rymer was dissatisfied with all the candidates, but Gildon plumped solidly for Brutus. In fact, maintained Gildon, the play is not Caesar’s tragedy at all, but that of Brutus; and consequently should bear his name. ‘Brutus’, he contended, ‘is plainly the shining and darling Character of the Poet; and is to the end of the Play the most considerable Person.’¹⁰ Mrs Montague agreed that ‘the principal object of our poet was to interest the spectator for Brutus’;¹¹ and Coleridge came to the same conclusion, although he confessed he could not see ‘into Shakespeare’s motive, the *rationale* – or in what point he meant Brutus’s character to appear’.¹² For Hunt Brutus’ primacy was unequivocal. ‘Brutus’, he insisted, ‘after his interview with *Cassius* in the commencement of the play is the arbiter of all that succeeds, and the predominant spirit to the last.’¹³ And his view remained the popular one throughout much of the nineteenth century. Swinburne’s notion of him as the ‘very noblest figure of a typical and ideal republican in all the literature of the world’¹⁴ would have met with little opposition, except for Rymer and Shaw, until comparatively recent times.

Although most critics awarded Brutus the palm, the decision for neo-classical critics was tantamount to indicting the play’s structure. A drama in which the titular hero gets only a few lines could hardly be judged well-wrought. ‘If it had been properly call’d *Julius Caesar* it ought to have ended at his Death’, declared Gildon, ‘and then it had been much more regular, natural and beautiful.’¹⁵ David Erskine Baker’s lament in 1782 that

the piece failed to close 'with the most natural and affecting catastrophe, viz. the death of Caesar'¹⁶ is one of the latest survivals of this objection. It need hardly be added that Shakespeare's neglect of the unities in *Caesar*, as elsewhere, was relentlessly scolded.

The mob offered another target for Augustan displeasure. Gildon concluded that the dramatist had limned 'the Commons of Rome' as if they were 'the Rabble of an *Irish* Village, as senseless, ignorant, silly and cowardly, not remembring, that the Citizens of *Rome* were the Soldiers of the Common-wealth, by whom they Conquer'd the World; and who in Julius Caesar's time were at least, as Polite, as our Citizens of London'.¹⁷ Dennis objected not so much to the historical misrepresentation of the mob as to their presence in the play at all, including it among the things '*Shakespear* has introduced . . . into his Tragedies, which are against the Dignity of that noble Poem.'¹⁸ Mrs Montague found the 'mechanics' altogether 'too loquacious' and wished that 'the part of the mob had been shorter';¹⁹ while Francis Gentleman, although he guardedly approved the 'pathetically persuasive' speeches of the tribunes, dismissed the crowd sequences as 'ludicrous matter'²⁰ which the tragedy might well have been spared.

An age as conscious of language as of history and rules was hardly likely to find *Caesar*'s idiom entirely as it ought to be. Rymer contended that the 'Language which Shakespeare puts into the Mouth of Brutus would not suit, or be convenient, unless from some son of the Shambles or some unnatural offspring of the Butchery.'²¹ Gentleman concurred with Ben Jonson's dictum that the 'quaint remark upon the leanness of Cassius deserves to be sneered at' and termed Caesar's allusion to his deafness 'unessential and ridiculous'. He similarly disparaged the reference to 'sweaty nightcaps' and the 'bashaw stile' of Caesar's reply to Metellus in the Assassination scene, and asked why the dictator should speak English elsewhere and yet say '*Et tu Brute?*' at his death.²² Examples could be multiplied.

Throughout the eighteenth century, then, and well into the nineteenth, *Caesar* was regarded less as a unified work of art than a series of loosely-connected episodes featuring inaccurate portraits of Roman historical figures, the chief of which is Brutus. Certain scenes, however, were wholeheartedly admired. Charles Gildon's enthusiasm for the Quarrel scene initiated a century and a half of critical eulogy.²³ Dryden shared Gildon's excitement, comparing the quarrel with the confrontation of Agamemnon and Menelaus in Euripides' *Iphigenia* to the advantage of Shakespeare.²⁴ Dr Johnson, no great admirer of the play, grudgingly conceded that 'the contention and reconcilment of *Brutus* and *Cassius* is universally celebrated',²⁵ while Baker demanded rhetorically whether there could be 'a finer scene of resentment and reconciliation between friends' than this.²⁶

Hazlitt warmly applauded the scene's construction, and Coleridge lauded it on all counts. 'I know of no part in Shakespeare', he maintained, 'that more impresses on me the belief of his genius being superhuman than this scene.'²⁷

Next in order of popularity was the Forum sequence without, of course, for all but Romantic critics, the unapt mob. Gildon included this scene with the quarrel as 'the two best things in the play'. Although, in Gildon's view, the orations of Brutus and Antony 'have nothing (in a Dramatic Sense) to do with the Death of *Caesar* which is the first Action', he accorded strong praise to the speeches themselves, especially Antony's: 'What *Mark Antony* says to the imaginary people of *Shakespeare's* Rome, are so artful, so finely taken from the very Nature of the thing, that I question whether what the real *Mark Antony* spoke cou'd be more moving or better calculated to that Effect.'²⁸ Mrs Montague, if reluctant to commend the episode in its entirety, was nonetheless captivated by Antony's astuteness. 'Is there any oration extant', she asked, 'in which the topics are more skillfully selected for the minds and temper of the persons to whom it is spoken?'²⁹

Hazlitt gave his blessing to two further scenes relatively unpraised heretofore – 'the well-known dialogue between Brutus and Cassius, in which the latter breaks the design of the conspiracy to the former', and the 'short scene . . . when *Caesar* enters with his train'. The latter Hazlitt judged 'more expressive of the genius of *Shakespeare*' than almost any other passage in his work.³⁰

In general the neo-classical critic tended to censure *Caesar* more severely than did his Romantic successor. Gildon concluded that if the play were revised to give *Caesar* his proper place and regularize the design 'there cannot be so much of this [*Shakespeare's* play] remaining as to rob the Alterer of the Honour of the whole'.³¹ And his verdict epitomizes the Augustan viewpoint. The more liberal Romantic assessment is typified by Hazlitt's estimate that although *Caesar* is 'not equal as a whole to either of his other plays taken from Roman history', 'it . . . abounds in admirable and affecting passages'.³² Hunt found himself charmed by the richness of individual personalities which 'seem to bring at once before us the result of a thousand different educations, or of a thousand different habits, induced by situation, passion, or reflection'.³³ And Coleridge and Hazlitt echoed his sentiments. In essence, however, neo-classical and Romantic reaction to *Caesar* differed more in degree than in kind. Both schools of criticism admired the play in part rather than as a whole; and neither was prepared to allow it any measure of dramatic unity.

Dr Johnson, it should be noted, challenged two of the charges against *Caesar*: (1) its historic inaccuracy and (2) its want of classical structure. In answer to the first objection Johnson insisted that *Shakespeare* 'always makes nature predominate over accident, and, if he preserves the essential

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-13550-4 - Julius Caesar on Stage in England and America, 1599-1973

John Ripley

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Introduction

5

character, is not very careful of distinctions superimposed and adventitious. His story requires *Romans* as kings, but he thinks only on men.³⁴ *Caesar*, he suggested, is not a dramatized historical document, as the Augustan commentators argued, but a study of human kind and its relationships. The fact that the locale is Julian Rome is of relatively minor significance. Johnson's defence of *Caesar*'s irregularities was hardly less radical. In his opinion, 'a play written with a nice observation of critical rules is to be contemplated as an elaborate curiosity . . . by which is shown, rather what is possible than what is necessary'. While, he argued, the observation of the unities 'may sometimes conduce to pleasure, they are always to be sacrificed to the nobler beauties of variety and instruction'.³⁵ Unfortunately Johnson stopped short of spelling out *Caesar*'s design; but at least he asserted with all the authority at his command that lack of classical form did not necessarily imply formlessness.

How much Hermann Ulrici owed to Dr Johnson is unclear; but knowingly or not, he took up the cudgels on *Caesar*'s behalf in 1839 exactly where the Great Cham had dropped them seventy-five years earlier. Ulrici found himself not only convinced of the play's wholeness, but prepared to define its nature. 'The want of unity of interest is the common objection that has been most frequently brought against *Julius Caesar*', he began.

Now if the unity of interest ought to centre entirely in one *personage* of the drama, then no doubt the objection is just, for it is divided between Caesar, Brutus and Cassius, and Antony and Octavius. But we cannot for a moment concede that poetical interest is invariably personal; we believe rather that it attaches as frequently to an idea . . . Now in 'Julius Caesar' this interest is one throughout, and possesses a true and organic unity.³⁶

For Ulrici *Caesar*'s unifying theme was the idea of history in 'its despotic power and energy of development' and the attempts of individuals to tamper with it, a viewpoint one need not profess to appreciate its landmark importance.

Once the play was allowed to have a form, a fresh examination of the characters and their relationship to it naturally followed. In the third quarter of the century, Gervinus, Lindner, and Dowden took a close look at Caesar himself, and argued his claim to the title role with varying degrees of enthusiasm.³⁷ H. N. Hudson's support, however, was wholehearted and unequivocal. 'Caesar', he contended, 'is not only the subject [of the play] but also the governing power of it throughout'.

He is the centre and spring-head of the entire action, giving law and shape to every thing that is said and done. This is manifestly true in what occurs before his death; and it is true in a still deeper sense afterwards, since his genius then becomes the Nemesis of retributive Providence, presiding over the whole course of the drama.³⁸

With the role of Caesar to some degree clarified and a unifying principle of one kind or another admitted, Victorian scholarship embraced *Caesar* with

relative ease as a political and personal study as distinct from a mere dramatization of history, as an ensemble drama rather than a hero-play, and as a carefully-contrived work of art instead of a flawed collection of bravura scenes. Richard G. Moulton's 1885 analogy between *Caesar's* form and grouping techniques in painting and sculpture represents a culmination toward which criticism had been groping for over a century. 'The four leading figures', he argued, 'all on the grandest scale, have the elements of their characters thrown into relief by comparison with one another, and the contrast stands out boldly when the four are reviewed in relation to one single idea.'³⁹

Moulton's confident assertion of *Caesar's* structural soundness was but the first swallow in a century-long summer of critical admiration; and there is as yet no sign of wane. Reckoned for generations among the most straightforward of Shakespeare's works, *Caesar* in our times has acquired a reputation for complexity. Roman history, Renaissance politics, and Elizabethan stage practice have all been pressed into service to reveal its subtle splendours and resolve its enigmas. There are, however, a fair number of critics who dissociate themselves from attempts to unravel the play's mysteries by any means whatever; ambiguity, they contend, is used by Shakespeare as a deliberate artistic device.⁴⁰ A detailed survey of contemporary *Caesar* criticism is beyond the scope of this study; but a few landmark works may serve to illustrate the major approaches canvassed.⁴¹

M. W. MacCallum's *Shakespeare's Roman Plays* (1910), this century's first important *Caesar* critique, examined at length Shakespeare's debt to Plutarch and his transmutation of his source material into the makings of dramatic conflict. Granville-Barker, in his 1927 Preface, was little interested in the play's historical basis or lack of it.⁴² As a playwright and director he set himself to peer over Shakespeare's shoulder as he worked, to recapture *Caesar's* form and flow as revealed in the Elizabethan playhouse. His findings take the form of a running commentary on the play's structure and characters, almost as if given to actors at rehearsal. Wilson Knight's *Wheel of Fire* (1930) and *The Imperial Theme* (1931), R. A. Foakes's 'An Approach to *Julius Caesar*' (1954),⁴³ and Maurice Charney's *Shakespeare's Roman Plays* (1963) all probe *Caesar's* central issues through its language and images. D. A. Traversi's *Shakespeare's Roman Plays* (1963) espouses no single methodology but reflects discursively on the play in a manner at once wonderfully catholic and individualistic. Traversi addresses us as unashamedly from the study as Granville-Barker does from the stage. All the above critics, however divergent their methods and conclusions, share the conviction that *Caesar's* apparent confusions are susceptible of clarification and resolution. Adrien Bonjour (*The Structure of Julius Caesar*, 1958) does not; and asks us, on the contrary, to accept *Caesar's* ambiguity and ambivalence as calculated dramatic devices (p. 24).

No serious twentieth-century critic would deny Caesar's pivotal position in the dramatic action or dispute his claim to the title role; but his character remains a vexed topic. Sir Mark Hunter argued in 1931 that 'the personality of Julius moves before us as something right royal; a character, not indeed immune from calumnious stroke, but sufficiently great to render the impassioned eulogy of Antony and the calm tribute of Brutus not inconsistent with what we have actually heard and seen of the object of their praise.'⁴⁴ John Dover Wilson took a diametrically opposite view. In his introduction to the New Shakespeare edition of *Julius Caesar* (Cambridge, 1949) he imagined Shakespeare putting the final touches to 'a Roman Tamburlaine of illimitable ambition and ruthless irresistible genius; a monstrous tyrant who destroyed his country and ruined "the mightiest and most flourishing commonwealth that the world will ever see" – one feature remained to add before the sixteenth century stage-figure of the great dictator was complete, that of a braggart'. More recently Ernest Schanzer suggested, diplomatically enough, that Shakespeare's Caesar may be both or neither of these figures. What, he asked, if the dramatist was consciously ambiguous? It is just possible that 'there is no real Caesar, that he merely exists as a set of images in other men's minds and his own'.⁴⁵ Most modern commentators take their bearings from one of these three compass points.

The critic's notion of Caesar inevitably conditions his reading of Brutus. Hunter firmly pooh-poohed the Romantic image of Brutus as a gentle idealist; here was no 'nobly-natured mistaken man', but an 'intellectually dishonest' one. John Dover Wilson, predictably enough, found Brutus the altogether heroic and ill-fated defender of Rome against Caesarism. Most modern critics have sided with Hunter rather than Wilson, with the result that Brutus has been thrust from his pedestal to rub elbows with flawed humanity. 'The fine man is a coarse thinker, the saint of self-denial has very little self left to deny', jibed Mark Van Doren.⁴⁶ 'Brutus' faults are seated at the very heart of his character', asserted Gordon Ross Smith. 'Although his behaviour, even to himself, is clothed in the habit . . . of virtue, his basic motivation is egotistical satisfaction of his will.'⁴⁷ William R. Bowden considered him 'the self-righteous, opinionated, humorless, intellectually limited do-gooder in public life'.⁴⁸ Ernest Schanzer's conclusion that he is 'a bad judge of character but by no means devoid of political shrewdness and practical wisdom'⁴⁹ represents an unusually charitable assessment for these times.⁵⁰

Antony and Cassius have enjoyed nothing like the attention lavished upon Caesar and Brutus. Both remain substantially as the Romantic commentators left them, save perhaps for some elaboration of their imperfections. The majority of critics cited above have something worthwhile to say about them, but Granville-Barker's remarks have become classic.

Undoubtedly the most productive approach to *Caesar* since the Second

World War has been its analysis in the context of Elizabethan conceptions of Roman politics. As T. J. B. Spencer reminds us, 'Caesar and Brutus in the play are not merely dramatic creations; they were also historical figures which were firmly established in the popular imagination. Shakespeare's audience inevitably brought pre-conceptions which guided their impressions from the play.'⁵¹ Major insights in this area have been provided by J. E. Phillips, Brents Stirling, T. J. B. Spencer, Geoffrey Bullough, Northrop Frye, and L. C. Knights.⁵²

Most of *Julius Caesar's* stage history has been shaped and coloured by the Augustan and Romantic notion of the play as seriously defective overall, although thoroughly fine in parts. The fondness for particular scenes which dominated criticism from Gildon to Montague is paralleled by a similar emphasis in the theatre from Betterton to Quin. Nineteenth-century productions reflect the impact of Romantic character-analysis. One figure or another is forever highlighted at the expense of the rest, although the predilection for individual scenes continues. The new-found respect for Shakespeare's craftsmanship characteristic of Ulrici, Hudson, and Gervinus touches other plays in the late nineteenth century via William Poel, but fails to influence *Caesar* productions to any degree until Bridges-Adams's first full-text revival at Stratford-upon-Avon in 1919.

No sooner had *Caesar's* theatrical unity been recognized and demonstrated during the 1920s and 1930s at Stratford and the Old Vic when the rise of director's theatre contorted it anew; and critics have offered little opposition to the trend. Indeed, apart from a common tendency to downgrade Brutus and upgrade Caesar, the contemporary stage and study show little awareness of each other, Scholarship pays scant heed to the play in performance; and directors seem content to be their own critics.

The play in the theatre

From the late seventeenth century onwards, managers prepared to stage *Caesar* faced a choice: on the one hand, the script might be rewritten; on the other, the text might be retained and its faults camouflaged by cuts, role-manipulation, and ingenious stagecraft.

The only attempts to rewrite *Caesar* date from the first half of the eighteenth century; and none had any success. Early in the century Thomas Killigrew, a minor playwright, attempted a rough adaptation which was never published or acted.⁵³ John Sheffield, Duke of Buckingham, rewrote the tragedy as two plays, with Caesar as the hero of the first and Brutus as protagonist of the second. Both were published in 1723 to hoots of critical derision, and neither was staged.⁵⁴ Voltaire's *La Mort de César* (1736) was published and performed in Paris,⁵⁵ and would find no mention in this study save that it outraged Aaron Hill sufficiently to prompt his own version titled

Caesar's Revenge (c. 1738). Despite Hill's importunity, Garrick fought shy of the piece; and after an uneventful première at Bath it disappeared.⁵⁶

These alterations were one and all mere exercises in possibility, not products of necessary dramatic truth. Form was arbitrarily imposed upon theme; theme did not dictate form. And in every case the theme suffered. It is to the credit of theatre managers from Shakespeare's time to our own that they were shrewd enough to recognize that the power of the text lay in its purity; and, although they cut it severely, they did not, save for the Dryden–Davenant version and its aftermath, permit interpolations.

For almost four hundred years, in defiance of critical sniffs, *Caesar* has kept the English and American boards; and its chequered history illuminates both the play and the theatres which staged it. At one moment it has served as a star-vehicle; at another, a clothes-horse for pageantry; at still another, a political medium. The script has been endlessly chopped and changed; individual roles have been adjusted up or down to suit the whims of stars; and spectacle has been added or subtracted as fashion dictated. Yet audiences remained consistently loyal, whatever its form. Early seventeenth-century theatre-goers were ravished by the play and left the theatre in wonder, Leonard Digges tells us. Three centuries on, their successors made it the most frequently-requested item in the Old Vic repertoire.

My reasons for organizing the tale chronologically should be self-evident. The relative importance, or lack of it, accorded particular productions requires perhaps a word of clarification.

The seventeenth century receives only one chapter because that is all our scanty knowledge can provide. The eighteenth century, an era of frequent performances and mediocre interpretation, merits no more than a chapter. The nineteenth century saw most leading actor-managers bring their talents to *Caesar's* service; and the contributions of Kemble, Young, Macready, Phelps, Tree, and Benson deserve extensive discussion.

Some of the most colourful interludes in *Caesar's* stage history are American. Throughout the first hundred years of the new republic audiences packed playhouses in Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and elsewhere to revel in its libertarian sentiments. In the second half of the nineteenth century, when the play was a virtual stranger to London, Edwin Booth and Lawrence Barrett took it to every corner of America by rail. Their respective interpretations of Brutus and Cassius challenge comparison with the finest of all time. In 1937 Orson Welles's anti-Fascist revival achieved a New York run of 157 performances, the longest on record; and its influence on later productions is well-nigh incalculable. *Caesar's* transatlantic career, then, receives substantial attention.

During the first half of this century, *Caesar* enjoyed a more than moderate popularity in England. Bridges-Adams, the first director of the play in the

modern sense of the term, pioneered at Stratford between 1919 and 1934 the application of Elizabethan theatre techniques to commercial productions of it.⁵⁷ London performances prior to the Second World War, although perhaps better acted, represented little advance on Bridges-Adams's innovations. I have accordingly given Bridges-Adams's revivals an entire chapter, and surveyed the work of his metropolitan contemporaries in another.

The past few decades have had their splendid moments, beginning with Gielgud's Cassius in 1950; however, since most modern interpretations have been widely seen and well documented, I have treated them in outline rather than in detail. I have, nevertheless, tried to highlight the salient features of each. Today the theatre is not so much a national as an international phenomenon; consequently, I felt no useful purpose would be served by separating contemporary English and North American revivals.

My approach is the same for all productions. I have attempted to determine what text was spoken, to record distribution of speeches, reduction of cast, major cuts and their impact on theatrical form, and additions on the rare occasions when they occur. Stagecraft receives equal attention – settings, costumes, stage business, crowd scenes, and lighting when it is noteworthy. The interpretation of the four major roles – Caesar, Brutus, Cassius, and Antony –⁵⁸ constitutes a third area of interest. The prominence given to each feature naturally varies from revival to revival: Macready's productions, for example, were *tours de force* of acting, while Beerbohm Tree's were marvels of stagecraft.

No performance, of course, takes place in a vacuum, but is profoundly conditioned by its physical environment, the aesthetic notions of its actor-manager or director, and the tastes of its audience. These factors all constitute collateral interests in the reconstruction of any given production.

Wherever possible I have relied upon promptbooks and other theatre documents as prime sources of information. All too often, however, promptbooks are silent upon what we most need to know – exactly how an actor looked or sounded at any particular moment. Inevitably I have been obliged to draw upon secondary sources – letters, diaries, reviews, and interviews – with the ever-present risk of seeing not the performance itself but what some eyewitness thought he saw. Whenever I could I have attempted to correlate the testimony of several witnesses and to weigh their findings against the overall tone of theatre documents. Although one can never catch the stage moment exactly as it happened, I hope that my reconstructions, if sometimes inadequate, are not seriously inaccurate.

The general reader may find the detail excessive, while the specialist may wish for more. I have tried to reconcile the need for a readable narrative with the awareness that much of the raw material of this study is not easy to come by. To include as much detail as seemed relevant without being over-tedious has been my aim, if not always my achievement. The non-specialist