The Academic
International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

An Online Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal
Volume 4 | Issue 5 | May 2026
ISSN: 2583-973X (Online), SJIF IF: 5.6
Website: www.theacademic.in

Shakespeare's Julius Caesar in Colonial Indian Education and Its Postcolonial Theatrical Reinterpretations: *A Study in Cultural Imperialism and Resistance*

Shiwani Srivastava

Educationalist

DOI : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20623630

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Accepted: 21-05-2026

Published: 10-06-2026

Keywords:

Shakespeare; Julius Caesar; colonial education; cultural imperialism; postcolonial theatre; India; Macaulay; Global Shakespeare; resistance; Bhabha

ABSTRACT

This article looks at the use of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar for ideological purposes in the colonial Indian educational system and its later postcolonial theatrical reinterpretations. Drawing on Macaulay's Minute on Education (1835), the Wood's Dispatch (1854), and pedagogical colonial documents, the essay contends that Julius Caesar was a calculated instrument of cultural imperialism, not a literary text, but one designed to produce civic order, loyalty to authority, and deference to colonial rule in Indian subjects. Using the theoretical tools of postcolonial scholars such as Edward Said, Homi K. Bhabha, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Ania Loomba, the article explores how the themes of power, rhetoric and rebellion in the play were constructed to serve the imperial interests.

1. Introduction

In 1835, Thomas Babington Macaulay wrote his notorious Minute on Indian Education, revealing with shocking frankness the ambition of the British colonial project in India: to create 'a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect' (Macaulay, 1835). At the heart of this enterprise was the introduction of English literature – and Shakespeare above all – into the curricula of Indian colonial schools and universities. The imposition of English literary study was anything but a neutral cultural gift; it was a strategic ideological intervention to displace indigenous intellectual traditions, valorise European epistemology and manufacture the compliant colonial subject. One of the most regularly prescribed of the Shakespearean texts in the colonial Indian

education system was Julius Caesar, and it occupied a peculiar prominence. The play's concerns with political order, civic loyalty, the dangers of rebellion and the seductive power of rhetorical persuasion made it an ideologically convenient choice for a colonising power eager to legitimise its authority and discourage organised resistance. As Gauri Viswanathan (1989) has demonstrated in her seminal work, English literature was taught in India before it was institutionalised in England itself – a fact that points to the explicitly political, and not merely cultural, motivations behind the colonial curriculum.

But the story of Julius Caesar in India is not just a tale of imperial imposition. It is also a story of creative co-option, subversion and resistance. From the vibrant stagings of Parsi Theatre in the nineteenth century to the politically-charged adaptations of contemporary regional theatre, Indian practitioners have repeatedly seized upon the play, refracted it through indigenous performance traditions and turned it into a vehicle for critiquing power, celebrating resistance and interrogating the very colonial order that first brought it to Indian shores. The article moves in three broad directions. The first section historicizes the role of Shakespeare - and in particular, Julius Caesar - in the colonial Indian educational apparatus. The second employs a postcolonial ideological analysis of the play as it was taught and read in colonial classrooms. The third charts the arc from adaptation to active resistance in major Indian theatrical re-interpretations of Julius Caesar. In conclusion, the article reflects on what this complex trajectory reveals to us about the politics of cultural transmission, the limits of imperial control and the resilience of postcolonial creativity.

2. Colonialism, Education, and the Canonization of Shakespeare in India

2.1 The Political Economy of English Literary Education

The introduction of English education in India was closely associated with the economic and administrative requirements of the East India Company and, later, the British Crown. Although the Charter Act of 1813 had already provided for expenditure on Indian education, it was Macaulay's Minute that finally settled the Orientalist-Anglicist controversy in favour of an English medium curriculum. Macaulay's dismissive contempt for the entire corpus of Sanskrit and Arabic learning — as containing 'medical doctrines which would disgrace an English farrier' — was not merely an expression of cultural arrogance; it was a calculated strategy to delegitimise indigenous knowledge systems and clear the pedagogical field for the implantation of English cultural values. This change was achieved by the Wood's Dispatch of 1854, which institutionalised English medium education at all levels in India. By the second half of the nineteenth century, English literature, centred around the canon of 'great authors' led by Shakespeare, had become the dominant humanistic discipline in Indian colleges and universities.

As Viswanathan (1989, p. 3) argues, 'the discipline of English literature appeared in India before it did in England', and it did so precisely because it was a tool of governance, not an act of cultural generosity, on the part of the colonial administration.

2.2 Shakespeare as Civilisational Signifier

In this pedagogical architecture, Shakespeare played a particular ideological role. He was not just the greatest writer in the English language, he was the living embodiment of European civilisational superiority – the proof, as it were, that Western culture had attained a level of moral and aesthetic refinement that the colonised peoples might aspire to, but had not yet reached. Part of being educated was being initiated into Shakespeare, and to admire Shakespeare was by extension to accept the civilisational hierarchy that colonial education was meant to produce. Colonial educators and administrators were clear about this function. In the words of Macaulay himself, one shelf of a good European library is worth all the libraries of Arabia and India. His successors in the educational apparatus were less flamboyant but no less systematic: Shakespeare was prescribed, examined, and venerated as a cornerstone of the colonial curriculum because his works were deemed to embody the values — reason, order, moral seriousness, civic virtue — that colonised subjects were held to lack and must be taught to acquire.

2.3 Why Julius Caesar

Julius Caesar was one of the most frequently studied of all the Shakespearean plays taught in Indian colonial schools and universities. Its attraction to colonial educators was overdetermined. Stylistically it was comparatively easy blank verse. Dramatically it was an interesting story of political crisis and resolution. But ideologically it had sharper attractions. The play's central concerns — the need for civic order, the dangers of popular unrest, the virtue of measured and rational governance, the tragedy that befalls those who mistake political idealism for practical wisdom — mapped with convenient precision on to the ideological needs of a colonising power. Brutus's colonial interpretation is especially instructive. In the colonial classroom, Brutus, the noble but fatally misguided idealist, was the archetype of an instructive figure: a man whose principled resistance to tyranny does not lead to liberation but to chaos, civil war and finally his own destruction. The implicit lesson – that resistance to established authority, however nobly motivated, is bound to end in disaster – was one that colonial educators had obvious reasons to promote among Indian students who might otherwise be tempted to draw different conclusions from the Roman example.

3. Reading Julius Caesar through a Postcolonial Lens

3.1 Said, Orientalism and the Construction of Literary Universals

Edward Said's idea of Orientalism provides a basic framework for understanding how Julius Caesar functioned within the colonial curriculum. For Said (1978), Orientalism is not simply a collection of false representations of the East; it is a discourse that constructs the Orient as an object of knowledge, thereby justifying Western domination. The teaching of English literature in colonial India followed a similar logic. Colonial education, by setting Shakespeare up as the universal standard of literary excellence, implicitly marked Indian literary traditions as particular, local and inferior. As a play about Rome, that other great imperial civilisation with which Britain liked to compare itself, Julius Caesar came with extra ideological baggage. The British liked to see themselves as Romans: orderly, civilising, with a sense of responsibility to rule lesser peoples for their ultimate good. The play's pre-occupation with the duties and dangers of governance, and its ultimately conservative vision of political order restored after dangerous disruption, resonated with the self-understanding of British imperial administration.

3.2 Bhabha, Mimicry, and the Ambivalence of Colonial Pedagogy

Homi K. Bhabha's theorisation of colonial mimicry provides a more complex account of the workings of Julius Caesar and the possibility of its subversion in the colonial educational encounter. For Bhabha (1994) colonial mimicry is both a strategy of power and a site for its potential undoing. The colonised subject who mimics the coloniser is 'almost the same but not quite' and this 'slippage' creates an ambivalence that unsettles colonial authority even as it seems to confirm it. The Indian student who read, memorised and performed Julius Caesar was engaged in just such an act of mimicry. He had to inhabit and reproduce the cultural capital of the coloniser but at the same time he was marked as different, the native who has learned, but not quite become, English. But this mimicry also contained within it the seeds of appropriation. According to Bhabha (1994: 86) 'the ambivalence of colonial authority repeatedly turns from mimicry – difference that is almost nothing and yet most certainly not nothing – into menace'. The Indian student who learned the lessons of Julius Caesar too well might arrive at conclusions about tyranny and resistance that colonial educators did not anticipate.

3.3 Spivak and the Silenced Subaltern

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's concept of the subaltern offers insight into what is missing in the colonial interpretation of Julius Caesar: the voices of the ruled, not the rulers. The colonial pedagogy focused relentlessly on the elite political actors of the play—Caesar, Brutus, Cassius, Antony—while the Roman

populace, briefly present and manipulated by those who would govern them, remained largely invisible in colonial analysis. The erasure was ideologically motivated: the colonial classroom was not a space to reflect on the political agency of the governed. Indian theatrical reinterpretations would later correct this imbalance, bringing the marginalised voices of the play—the plebeians, the ordinary citizens of Rome—into productive alignment with the experiences of colonised and disenfranchised Indian communities. In doing so, these adaptations enacted the very sort of recuperation of subaltern agency called for by Spivak's work.

4. Indian Theatrical Reinterpretations of Julius Caesar

4.1 Parsi Theatre and Early Adaptations

The first major wave of Indian theatrical engagement with Julius Caesar was through the medium of Parsi Theatre, the commercially vibrant Urdu-Hindustani popular theatre that flourished in the cities of western India in the second half of the nineteenth century. The Parsi Theatre was notable for its eclectic energy, drawing freely on English, Persian, Sanskrit and folk theatrical traditions, translating and adapting foreign texts for Indian popular audiences with creative abandon. The Parsi Theatre versions of Julius Caesar were characterised by spectacular stage effects, melodramatic intensification, and songs and dances, all totally absent from the Shakespearean original, yet integral to the conventions of popular Indian theatre. In adapting the play, Parsi Theatre practitioners were already engaged in a form of cultural decolonisation: transformation of the text that colonial education had installed as a monument of superior civilisation, and subjecting it to the transformative logic of Indian popular performance. The productions were not Shakespeare, nor purely Indian, but something truly hybrid and new.

4.2 Regional Language Adaptations: Bengali, Marathi, and Malayalam

As the nationalist movement gathered momentum in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Indian adaptations of Julius Caesar started to acquire more explicitly political overtones. In Bengal, where committed political theatre has a long tradition, the play provided a rich resource for the exploration of tyranny, betrayal and popular uprising. In Bengali adaptations, the murder of Caesar was often compared, directly or indirectly, to the struggle against British colonialism. Brutus's principled opposition to autocracy was transformed into an image of nationalist resistance.

These adaptations, deeply embedded in the Tamasha and Kirtan traditions of Marathi theatre, brought the play into dialogue with specifically Marathi political and cultural concerns. Sometimes the Maratha warrior tradition was projected onto Julius Caesar, and the themes of honour, betrayal and the defence of freedom

had a resonance for audiences who knew their region's long history of resistance to domination from outside. In Kerala, adaptations of Julius Caesar have tapped the resources of Kathakali, the classical dance-drama tradition, to re-cast the play in a whole new visual and performance grammar. Some of the most internationally celebrated instances of Indian Shakespeare are the Kathakali productions of Julius Caesar, starting to emerge in the latter decades of the twentieth century. These productions translate the play into the physical vocabulary of Kathakali, with its elaborate costumes, stylised gesture system and percussion-driven performance conventions, not merely to adapt Shakespeare, but to indigenise him, subjecting the colonial text to the authority of an ancient and sophisticated Indian performance tradition.

4.3 Post-Independence Political Theatre

In the decades after Indian independence in 1947, the theatre of Julius Caesar grew more and more self-conscious about its own colonial genealogy. Productions in Hindi, Kannada, Tamil, and other regional languages began to directly confront the question of what it meant to perform a text imposed through colonial education — and how the text could be reclaimed for Indian purposes. The tradition of using Julius Caesar as a vehicle of the critique of the post-independence Indian political culture is of particular interest. The play's anatomy of political manipulation, demagoguery and the corruption of democratic institutions has proved singularly relevant to the postcolonial Indian context. Shakespeare's Roman drama has thus been used as a mirror for the contradictions and failures of Indian democracy in contemporary Indian political productions set in present-day India with politicians in kurtas and Hindi-speaking plebeians. The ironic reversal has been that the text used to teach Indian subjects the virtues of colonial order has become a device for critiquing the order that colonial education helped to produce.

5. Discussion: Between Imperialism and Resistance

The trajectory of Julius Caesar in India, from colonial classroom to postcolonial stage, reveals a number of significant theoretical and historical conclusions about the dynamics of cultural imperialism and resistance. First, it shows that the products of empire are never simply or straightforwardly instruments of domination. As Bhabha has argued, the colonial encounter is one of ambivalence and hybridity; the cultural texts imposed by colonisers are always potentially subject to counter-appropriation by the colonised. Secondly, the Indian theatrical history of Julius Caesar provides an instance of what Dennis Kennedy (1993) has termed the productive alienation of Shakespeare at a distance from his own culture. Freed from the reverential authority that English cultural institutions and colonial education had sought to impose, Indian theatre practitioners discovered the play as raw material - a set of dramatic structures, character types and rhetorical situations that could be turned to new purposes. The outcome

has been a body of theatrical work that is, in many ways, more dramatically alive and politically engaged than the canonical productions of the Western Shakespeare industry. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, the postcolonial theatrical history of Julius Caesar in India challenges the assumption underlying colonial educational policy and much subsequent scholarship of Shakespeare that Shakespeare belongs exclusively to Western culture. Shakespeare studies worldwide have increasingly shown how his writings have inspired rich and distinctive theatrical traditions around the world, traditions that are not simply derivative of European models but genuinely creative and culturally specific. One of the most sustained and sophisticated examples of this global creative appropriation is the Indian engagement with Julius Caesar, which has lasted for almost two centuries now. It provides a powerful counter-narrative to the story of cultural imperialism as mere imposition. It reminds us that colonised peoples were never passive recipients of the culture imposed on them, but active, creative and often resistant agents in the creation of their own cultural lives.

6. Conclusion

This article has argued that Shakespeare's Julius Caesar was appropriated in colonial Indian education as an ideological tool — a vehicle for the inculcation of values of political order, civic deference and colonial legitimacy in Indian students. Drawing on the theoretical resources of postcolonial criticism, it has analysed how the colonial reading of the play selectively foregrounded those themes — the dangers of rebellion, the necessity of rational governance, the tragedy of misguided idealism — that served the interests of the colonial administration. The article has also recorded a vibrant and nuanced tradition of Indian theatrical reinterpretation that has transformed Julius Caesar from a colonial instrument into a vehicle of cultural resistance and creative self-affirmation. From the colourful hybridity of Parsi Theatre to the dignified nobility of Kathakali Shakespeare and the political immediacy of contemporary regional productions, Indian theatre has time and again shown its ability to reclaim, indigenise and subvert the cultural heritage of the coloniser. Julius Caesar's story in India is, after all, a story of the limits of cultural imperialism. Unlike armies, texts do not have a single meaning, or a single use. The play that Macaulay's educational heirs required as a lesson in political obedience has, in the hands of Indian artists, become a resource for interrogating power, resistance, democracy, and the continuing legacies of colonialism. The transformation is one of the strongest testimonies to the resilience and creativity of postcolonial culture.

References

- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). The location of culture. Routledge.
- Bharucha, R. (1990). Theatre and the world: Performance and the politics of culture. Manohar.
- Dharwadker, A. (2005). Theatres of independence: Drama, theory, and urban performance in India since 1947. University of Iowa Press.
- Fanon, F. (1961). The wretched of the earth (C. Farrington, Trans.). Grove Press.
  Holderness, G. (2014). Shakespeare and empire. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Joshi, P. (2002). In another country: Colonialism, culture and the English novel in India. Columbia University Press.
- Kennedy, D. (1993). Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary performance. Cambridge University Press.
- Loomba, A. (2002). Shakespeare, race, and colonialism. Oxford University Press.
  Loomba, A., & Orkin, M. (Eds.). (1998). Post-colonial Shakespeares. Routledge.
- Macaulay, T. B. (1835). Minute on Indian education. Reprinted in G. M. Young (Ed.), Macaulay: Prose and poetry (1952). Harvard University Press.
- Mathur, S. (2012). Shakespeare and the art of lying: Colonial pedagogy and Indian theatrical resistance. South Asian Review, 33(2), 45–68.
- Said, E. W. (1978). Orientalism. Pantheon Books.
- Shakespeare, W. (1599/2008). Julius Caesar (A. R. Humphreys, Ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), Marxism and the interpretation of culture (pp. 271–313). Macmillan.
- Trivedi, P., & Bartholomeusz, D. (Eds.). (2005). India's Shakespeare: Translation, interpretation, and performance. University of Delaware Press.
- Viswanathan, G. (1989). Masks of conquest: Literary study and British rule in India. Columbia University Press.
- Williams, R. (1977). Marxism and literature. Oxford University Press.