

Power Politics in *Julius Caesar*

The present research seeks to prove that the catastrophic end of the character Julius Caesar in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* is ambition for power. Everything ends with the denouement of play because of the ambitious struggle among the characters. The tragic flaws that they bear ultimately take them to the tragic fall. It is story of man's personal dilemma over moral action, set against a backdrop of political drama. Julius Caesar, a valiant general and a conqueror returns to Rome amidst immense popularity after defeating the sons of Pompey. The people celebrate his victorious return and mark Antony offers him the crown which he refuses. Jealous of Caesar's growing power and afraid that he may one day become dictator, Cassius instigates a conspiracy to murder Caesar. He realizes that to gain legitimacy in the eyes of Romans, he must win over the noble Brutus to his side for Brutus is the most trusted respected in Rome. Brutus, the idealist, joins the conspiracy feeling that everyone is driven by motives as honorable as his own. Ironically, Caesar is murdered at the foot of Pompey's statue. The tragic end of Caesar is because of his ambition for power to some extent and Brutus' desire to replace his power. In one sentence ambition of the characters lead them to their own doom.

Julius Caesar is a dramatization of actual events, Shakespeare drawing upon the ancient Roman historian Plutarch's Lives of Caesar, Brutus, and Mark Antony as the primary source of the play's plot and characters. The play is tightly structured. It establishes the dramatic problem of alarm at Julius Caesar's ambition to become "king" (or dictator) in the very first scene and introduces signs that Caesar must "beware the Ides of March"(44) from the outset. Before its midpoint, Caesar is assassinated, and shortly after Mark Antony's famous funeral oration ("Friends, Romans, and countrymen ... "(180), the setting shifts permanently from Rome to the battlefields on which Brutus and Cassius meet their inevitable defeat. Julius Caesar is a tragedy;

but despite its title, the tragic character of the play is Brutus, the noble Roman whose decision to take part in the conspiracy for the sake of freedom plunges him into a personal conflict and his country into civil war. Literary scholars have debated for centuries about the question of who exactly is the protagonist of this play. The seemingly simple answer to this question would be Julius Caesar himself—after all, the play is named after him, and the events of the play all relate to him. However, Caesar only appears in three scenes (four if the ghost is included), thus apparently making him an unlikely choice for the protagonist who is supposed to be the main character. Meanwhile, Brutus, who is in the play much more often than Caesar (and actually lasts until the final scene), is not the title character of the play and is listed in the *dramatis personae* not only after Caesar but after the entire triumvirate and some senators who barely appear in the play. Determining the protagonist is one of the many engaging issues presented in the play.

The action begins in February 44 BC. Julius Caesar has just reentered Rome in triumph after a victory in Spain over the sons of his old enemy, Pompey the Great. A spontaneous celebration has interrupted and been broken up by Flavius and Marullus two political enemies of Caesar. It soon becomes apparent from their words that powerful and secret forces are working against Caesar. Caesar appears, attended by a train of friends and supporters and is warned by a soothsayer to "beware the ides of March" (44) but he ignores the warning and leaves for the games and races marking the celebration of the feast of Lupercal. In the next scene, it is revealed that the conspiracy Cassius spoke in the veiled terms is already a reality. He has gathered together a group of disgruntled and discredited aristocrats who are only too willing to assassinate Caesar. Partly to gain the support of the respectable element of Roman society, Cassius persuades Brutus to head the conspiracy, and Brutus agrees to do so. Shortly afterward, plans are made at a secret meeting at Brutus' orchard. The date is set: It will be on the day known as the ides of

March, the fifteenth day of the month. Caesar is to be murdered in the Senate chambers by the concealed daggers and swords of the assembled conspirators. Caesar's wife Calphurnia, terrified by horrible nightmares persuades Caesar not to go to the Capitol convinced that her dreams are portents of disaster. By prearrangement, Brutus and the other conspirators arrive to accompany Caesar, hoping to fend off any possible warnings until they have him totally in their power at the Senate. Unaware that he is surrounded by assassins and shrugging off Calphurnia's exhortations, Caesar goes with them. Despite the conspirators' best efforts, a warning is pressed into Caesar's hand on the very steps of the Capitol, but he refuses to read it. Wasting no further time, the conspirators move into action. Purposely asking Caesar for a favor they know he will refuse, they move closer, as if begging a favor, and then, reaching for their hidden weapons, they killed him before the shocked eyes of the senators and spectators. Hearing of Caesar's murder, Mark Antony, Caesar's closest friend, begs permission to speak at Caesar's funeral. Brutus grants this permission over the objections of Cassius and delivers his own speech first, confident that his words will convince the populace of the necessity for Caesar's death. After Brutus leaves, Antony begins to speak, the crowd has been swayed by Brutus' words, and it is an unsympathetic crowd that Antony addresses. Using every oratorical device known, however, Antony turns the audience into a howling mob, screaming for the blood of Caesar's murderers. Alarmed by the furor caused by Antony's speech, the conspirators and their supporters are forced to flee from Rome and finally, from Italy... Months pass, during which the conspirators and their armies are pursued relentlessly into the far reaches of Asia Minor. When finally they decided to stop at the town of Sardis, Cassius and Brutus quarrel bitterly over finances. Their differences are resolved, however, and plans are made to meet the forces of Antony, Octavius and Lepidus in one final battle. Against his own better judgment, Cassius allows Brutus to overrule him: Instead of

holding to their well- prepared defensive positions, Brutus is visited by the ghost of Caesar." I shall see thee at Philippi"(244) the spirit warns him, but Brutus' courage is unshaken and he goes on. The battle rages hotly. At first the conspirators appear to have the advantage, but in the confusion, Cassius is mistakenly convinced that all is lost, and he kills himself. Leaderless, his forces are quickly defeated, and Brutus finds himself fighting a hopeless battle. Unable to face the prospect of humiliation and shame as a captive (who would be chained to the wheels of Antony's chariot and dragged through the streets of Rome), he too takes his own life. As the play ends, Antony delivers a eulogy over Brutus' body, calling him "the noblest Roman of them all"(284). Caesar's murder has been avenged, order has been restored, and, most important, the Roman Empire has been preserved.

Shakespeare's Julius Caesar has been interpreted from different analytical eyes. Critiquing on the aesthetic aspects of the play Harold Bloom says:

The tragedy of Julius Caesar is very satisfying play as a play and is universally regarded as work of considerable aesthetic dignity. We tend to read it first when we are in school because it is so clear and simple a drama that our teachers find suitable for us there. I have seen it only once as a film, and found none of these presentation quite adequate, the problem in each case being with actor who misplayed Brutus. (3)

Similarly commenting from the Marxist point of view Paul N.Siegel:

The play's language imagery and course of action indicates clearly enough how he fall of its title character should be regarded. Caesar is representative of the monarchical principle necessary for the well-being of Rome. Just before Caesar

assassination there are earthquakes, fearful storms, and other prodigies, prefiguring the civil wars to come on earth. (56)

Likewise, Bulman James talks about heroism in this play:

The idioms of Shakespeare employed delineate heroism in his early plays were too restrictive to allow a personal signature. It is not by chance that these plays for years were thought to be the work, or at least to contain the work....His new heroes were characterized by their awareness of conventional expectations and their tragedies arose from their failure to live up to them—from their inability to wear hand-me-down roles with any comfort or conviction.

Commenting on Shakespeare's characterization of Caesar H.N. Hudson says:

Shakespeare understand Caesar thoroughly; and he regarded him as “the noblest man that ever lived in the tide of times....”He proves far mightier in death than in life; as if his spirit were become at once the guardian angel of his cause and an avenging angel to his foes. . . his greatness brought forward in full measure, would leave no room for anything else, at least would preclude any proper dramatic balance and equipoise. It was only as sort of underlying potency of a force withdrawn in to the background that his presence was compatible with that harmony and reciprocity of several characters which a well-ordered drama requires. (234)

Presenting the literary criticism on the rhetoric of the dramatic play *The Tragedy of Julius Caesar* Anne Barton highlights that:

Public oratory in the play is slick and professional. The art of persuasion has come to permeate life that people find themselves using it not only to influence

others but to deceive themselves. This is true, above all, of Brutus is competent enough as public orator, although he lacks the fire and subtlety of Mark Antony, but his real verbal ingenuity declares itself only when he is using the techniques of oratory to blind himself and his friends. (79)

In this way this play has been analyzed from various perspectives but the real cause behind/underlying the catastrophic end of main characters is ambition for power. I have tried to prove the theme of pay based on characters' inability to live up with the help of theoretical tool tragedy to have critical analysis.

Tragedy: A Discursive Strategy

Tragedy is simply the oldest form of literature. It is a kind of drama which brings sad endings of the character to get sympathy from the spectators. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* defines tragedy as “a serious play with sad ending, especially one in which the main character dies...” (1397). Tragedy ends in the catastrophic end of the incidents and characters. The protagonist dies because of his own frailty and inability to cope with the situation of the time.

Before Aristotle, tragedy was confined to a goat song in Greek tradition. It was ritualized as choral song to be sung in the honor of Dionysus, the god of fields and vineyards. Tragedy grew to be important literary genre and a combination of many heterogeneous literary interpretations. Tragedy as a dramatic form owes to Greek literary figures in its form as literary genre.

Aristotle is the canon to theorize tragedy for the first time. He defines:

Tragedy, then is the imitation of an action that is serious and also, as having magnitude, complete in itself; in language with pleasurable accessories, each kind brought in separately in the arts of the work; in a dramatic; not in a narrative form; with incidents arousing pity and fear wherewith to accomplish its catharsis of such emotion.(15)

Imitation of an action of a certain type is the prime object of a tragedy. The action should be not ludicrous or morally trivial but noble and of great consequence such that it has relevance for wider humanity. The imitation is strengthened in beauty by language with verse and song. The dialogue is spoken in verse and choral parts are rendered in lyrical song. That its form should be

dramatic not narrative excludes all epic poetry and modern novel from the domain of tragedy. Pity and fear are the effects of the dramatic imitation on the audience.

According to Aristotle, tragedy has six formal constituents- plot, character, thought, diction, and spectacle and so on. Plot, character and thought, which are objects of imitation, are intrinsic to tragedy. Diction and song, which are means of imitation, and spectacle, which is manner of imitation, are external to it. Diction means the imitation of action. Character and thought are the distinctive qualities the personal agents undergoing the action possess. They are the natural causes from which actions spring.

Aristotle ascribes plot the highest place in the hierarchy of the relative importance of the six constituents of tragedy, and the place of character according to him, comes only next as secondary or accessory to action. Discussing the proper structure of plot, Aristotle says that it should be complete, whole and of certain magnitude. An action is complete of the particular cause of events which it dramatizes come to a situation of rest. The whole is that which has a proper beginning, middle and an end. Elaborating this S.H. Butcher says,

A beginning is that which doesn't follow anything by causal necessity, but after which something naturally is or comes to be. An end, on the contrary, is that which itself follows some other things, either by necessity, or as rule, but has nothing following it. A middle is that which follows something as some other thing follows it. (29)

That is, a beginning should be such that it should be able to stand in its own and, for its full understanding, should not demand of anything preceding it. This means not that there is nothing antecedent to a beginning but that the beginning is in itself so arresting that it convinces us fresh and independent start. The point can be illustrated with the example of King Oedipus. The play

opens with the plight of plague that has wrecked Thebes with pestilence, death and infertility. In actual chronological sequence this is nearly the end of the action. But despite it, the opening situation is such that it absorbs our whole attention, independent of anything preceding it. Actually, what has happened before, Oedipus's past guilt is unraveled in the course of dramatic action. Likewise, an end is that which completes a dramatic action and has nothing following it. This "has nothing following it" again needs explanation because if it were literally true, Sophocles' Oedipus at Colonus would not have been possible. When we say that the self-blinded Oedipus ruined by a crime he committed in ignorance, soon to be banished from the city, is the end of King Oedipus, we mean that the dramatic action that started with plague in Thebes comes to its 'middle' of a play can be any point between the beginning and the end, and the significance of adding 'middle' in the definition of the 'whole' is that every action in the play is tightly connected in a causal sequence according to laws of probability or necessity. This is the principle of unity of plot, which Aristotle says consists in the unity of action, not in the unity of the hero. The events that happen in the life of a person are usually so multifarious that they do not form in a tragedy. Aristotle explains, "the plot, being an imitation of an action, must imitate none other than a whole, the structure union of the parts being such that if any one of them is displaced or removed, the whole will be disjointed and disturbed"(35).

Aristotle excludes all double plots and episodic plots from being suitable tragedy. The double plots violate the concentration of effect possible in the imitation of one complete action. The episodic plots do not follow the causal link where in lies the meaning of the tragic action. The two laws that govern the principle of unity in the dramatic action are the laws of probability or necessity, which Aristotle is never tired of repeating in his discussion of tragedy. These laws require the incidents of the plots to be organized in a tight network of cause and effect. Though

many events in actual life occur accidentally poetry has no room for the accidental. Even if the accidental or the coincidental is to be put to heighten the tragic effect, by catching the audience with surprise, the must have an “air of design” (39).

The laws of probability and necessity are also the principles of poetic truth as opposed to historical truth. Poetic truth aims at the universality and typicality. Aristotle says, “For poetry tends to express the universal, history the particular. By the universal I mean how a person of a certain type will on occasion speak or act, according to the laws of probability or necessity” (35). The poet can choose his subject from history and legend or invent his own, what is important is the unity of action, and events that have actually happened in history, if they conform to the laws of probability or necessity, can be the fit subject for tragedy. Not the subject matter as such but the arrangement of incidents in the plot judges the merit of the dramatist.

According to Aristotle, plots are of four types, simple complex, pathetic and ethical. The best type of plot is the complex one, which has the elements of the reversal and the recognition in it. Reversal of the situation is “a change from ignorance to knowledge, and thus to either love or hate, in the personages marked for good or evil fortune.,.The finest is one attended by reversal, like that which goes with the discovery in Oedipus” (19).

Aristotle gives example of king Oedipus where the messages to cheer Oedipus free him from fear of his guilt but by the revelation of his true identity produces the opposite effect.

Recognition is a change by which the action veers round to its opposite. The best form of recognition is that which coincides with the reversal of the situation. This again is the case in Kin Oedipus, when Oedipus recognizes that Jocasta, his wife, is his mother and the person whom he murdered on the way to Thebes was Lauis, his own father. Reversal and recognition, Aristotle emphasizes should not be imposed from outside but arise out of the internal structure of the plot.

A simple plot imitates an action without the elements of reversal and recognition. In pathetic tragedy the motive is passion, where as in ethical the motives are ethical. These types of plot are not rigid watertight categories and an ideal tragedy is one that combines them into an organic unity.

There are two parts in a plot: complication, and unraveling or denouement. Explaining these, Aristotle says “By the complication I mean all that extends from beginning to the part which marks the turning point to a good or bad future. The unraveling is that which extends from the beginning of change to the end” (65). In tragedy the turn is always from good to bad fortune. In Sophocles’s King Oedipus, the complication constitutes the development of events till Oedipus’s realization of true parentage, while the unraveling or denouement includes the punishment Oedipus heaps upon himself.

The percept of “magnitude”, which Aristotle includes in the definitions of tragedy, is closely related the principle of organic unity, and is necessary on both practical and aesthetic of living organism, Aristotle illustrates the point thus:

a very small animal organism can not be beautiful: for the view of it is confused, the subject being seen in an almost imperceptible moment of time. Nor again can one of vast size be beautiful; for as the eye can not take it all in at once, the unity and the sense of whole is lost for were one thousand miles long. (32)

That is, the appropriate length of plot is one that can be “easily embraced by the memory”, so that the relation of the parts and the whole is not missed.

Aristotle has emphasized only the unity of action. It was the Neo-Classic poets and scholars who extended it in to “three unities” using Aristotle as their authority. The only line in Poetics to support the “unity of time” says, “for tragedy endeavors, as for the single revolution of

the sun or but slightly exceed this limit (23). This is only a rough generalization from the practice of the Greek stage and Aristotle does not intend it as perspective rule. As he himself, the earlier tragedies ignored this time limit. In Aeschylus's *Agamemnon*, for instance, at least a few days pass between the fine signals announcing the fall of Troy and the return of Agamemnon. The percept of the unity of place states that the setting of a play should be one and if more, then sufficiently close to each other to maintain the dramatic illusion. This was again a general practice Greek drama—Aristotle nowhere mentions it in *Poetics*—and a deduction by later scholars from the unity of time.

The prime function of tragedy according to Aristotle is the arousal of the two kindred tragic emotions of pity and fear in the audience and by their arousal, affecting their proper catharsis. Pity, Aristotle says, springs from unmerited “misfortune”(45) and fear “by the misfortune of a man like ourselves(45). The awareness that the tragic protagonist suffers inconsiderably more than he deserves makes us feel pity towards him, and the intimation that it could happen to us, which is brought about by our emotional identification with the protagonist, arouses fear in us. Though these tragic emotions can also be evoked by pure spectacular means, Aristotle says, it is of inferior sort. The superior and genuinely artistic way is to arouse them by the inner structure of the plot:” for the plot ought to be so constructed that, even without the aid of eye, he who hears the tale told will thrill with horror and melt into pity at what takes place”(49).

But tragedy doesn't only arouse pity and fear; it also affects the “catharsis” of these emotions. Unfortunately, what “catharsis” actually means is a problematic issue. Aristotle himself uses the word only once in *Poetics* and it's none of his works is the word adequately explained. Scholars, poets and critics down the ages have quarreled long over the precise

meaning of the word. S.H. Butcher in *Aristotle's theory of poetry and Fine Art* writes of a century's long tradition which found in the word "a reference to a moral effect" and interpreted it as purification. Purification is a religious or spiritual metaphor, which means the cleansing of the soul from its impurities. Such an interpretation of catharsis sees in drama an ethical intention to make a man morally good. The other tradition Butcher says regards "catharsis" as a medical metaphor and translates the word as "purgation". The word in this sense denotes a pathological effect of pity and fear which is excited by the tragic spectacle and by exciting them it" affords their relief" (245). Butcher agrees to this interpretation but finds it incomplete. The "reference to the simple idea of an idea of an emotional relief a pleasurable vent for overcharged feeling" (252) is too limited an interpretation for him as it misses "the full aesthetic significance of the term" (253) to which Aristotle's original metaphor guides us. Taking cue from the languages of Hippocratic school of medicine, Butcher argues that "the feeling pity and fear in real life contain a morbid and disturbing element" (254). Tragedy, Butcher says, purges this morbid element in the emotion of the audience and brings about a qualitative transformation of the lower forms of emotions into higher and more refined forms. The medicinal tranquilizing influence follows it as its immediate accompaniment. Based on Aristotle's definition of pity and fear in *Rhetoric* as two closely related terms, Butcher calls fear "the primary emotion from which pity derives its meaning" (257), the basis of which is "a self regarding instinct" (257). This differentiates pity from the pure altruistic instinct, in Butcher views, the ideal distance of the tragic protagonist from the spectator makes the latter disengage him from the pressure of immediate reality (261) and, lifting him out of himself brings him face to face with the universal law of human destiny.

The tragic emotions are “disengaged from the petty interests of the self” (261) and are universalized. The tragic fear becomes an almost impersonal emotion and fear is removed simultaneously with the removal of the “self regarding instinct”. As Butcher puts it, “the sting of pain, the disquiet and unrest, arise from the selfish element which of reality clings to these emotions. The pain is expelled when the taint of egoism is removed” (268).

Humphrey House in his Aristotle’s Poetics agrees to the point that both pity and fear spring from the “self regarding instinct” in the spectator but argues the theories that tragic spectacle purges this “self-regarding instinct” or the “morbid” or “painful element” in the emotions, as Butcher has maintained. The idea of pity and fear are transformed from self regarding emotions into altruistic ones, House argues, can not be maintained because “that would sweep away the very possibility of any sympathy... for pity is based on fear which is , though not for ourselves, yet as if for ourselves.”(103). Likewise, the theory that pity and fear have a painful element which is purged off by tragedy holds no water because, house emphasizes, for Aristotle both are species of pain and to get rid of the pain would mean to get rid of the emotions altogether”(102). This would go against Aristotle’s ethical theory because “there are things which the good and wise men ought to fear” (102) and to deprive him of the emotion would mean depriving of even the potentiality of goodness. As to the dilemma whether catharsis is a metaphor derived from medicine or religion, House answer that “It would mean to ask the question in wrong form because it is not a metaphor derived from either” (108). Rather it refers to the Aristotelian principle of “mean” “harmony” and “balance” the connotations of which are quantitative and qualitative both. Both the too much and too little of pity and fear are physically and spiritually unhealthy and as House cites Aristotle from Nichoachean Ethics, “to feel them at the right times,

with reference to the right objects, towards the right people, with the right motive, and in the right way, is why it is both intermediate and best and this is the characteristic of virtue” (110).

For House, this training of the emotion to the just measure is what is brought about by tragedy:

A tragedy rouses emotion from potentiality to activity by worthy and adequate stimuli. It controls them by directing them to the right object in their right way and exercises them, within the limits of the plays as the emotions of good men would be exercised when they subside to potentiality again after the play is over. It is a more trained potentiality than before as our responses are brought near to those of the good and wise men. (Draper 110)

In Aristotle's view that tragic protagonist is ideal whose misfortune rouses the maximum degree of pity and fear in the audience. In Poetics, he defines the tragic hero as one “ who is not eminently good and just” yet whose misfortune is brought about “not by vice or depravity but by some error or frailty” and who is “highly renowned and prosperous”(33)

The tragic hero should not be “eminently good and just” because the suffering such as wholly virtuous person arouses neither pity nor fear but shocks our moral sense .nor should he be an outright villain because neither his prosperity nor his adversity arouses the tragic emotions, which is the true object of tragedy. The tragic personage should be a man between these two extremes. He should be superhuman in his moral elevation so that we can admire him and feel pity and fear for him in his downfall. At the same time he should have sufficient human frailty so that we can identify with him and feel fear for us. A martyr like Thomas a Becket is not a suitable Aristotelian tragic hero because he is only superhuman and has no human frailty to allow for our emotional identification with him. The tragic fear is not aroused in such case and the object of tragedy is not achieved. The “error of frailty” which brings about the tragic downfall

is problematic issue because, as Butcher says, Aristotle's Greek word for it "hamartia" allows different shades of meaning. It could mean a single act committed unintentionally in ignorance of certain facts. The character in such case would be held morally responsible if the facts could have been known and act avoided, and not responsible if it was something that couldn't have been known and avoided. It could also mean a defect of character, distinct both from an isolated error and a willful vice, resulting in such acts as those committed in anger or passion. Abraham Edel wrote of Aristotle's concept of "Hamartia":

...if we are to identify with a person, that is to feel fear and pity then he has to be sufficiently like us, and his suffering has to be underserved. If he is very good we will simply be outraged and if he is very evil we will feel that it served him right. Our best choice is neither: there remains the intermediate kind of person, a man not outstanding in virtue and justice, nor falling into misfortune through evil and wickedness, but by some error (or flaw:hamartia).(357)

This is by later theorist called "tragic flaw", character may of course have flaws nor amounting to vice such as Oedipus is stubborn Agamemnon is proud and Julius is ambitious and proud both. It is a fault of character's judgment resting on some factual ignorance. Fear is created out more readily by our seeing when the more fortunate are afflicted.

Robert W. Lorrain who is essentially attempting to update Aristotle's theory of tragedy, believes that the best way to define tragedy is by its spirit; the heroic struggle of its characters against a force that they can not beat. To put his own words:

The spirit of tragedy, then, is not quietistic, it is a grappling spirit. And while the nature and terms of the struggle vary in direct relationship to the individual dramatist's belief in the meaning of the struggle, in every great tragedy we sense

the validity of a meaningful struggle and the real possibility of it. Thus, tragic characters may win or lose; or more precisely, they win in the losing and lose in the winning. But it is the struggle itself that is the source of the dramatic significance, and it is out of this struggle with necessity that heroism is born. (7)

To expect that Aristotalian concept would hold an unfailing formula to explain all the tragedies of all time is not only naïve but even dangerous. It is because his discussion of tragedy rests of the examples of the Greek dramatists, especially of Sophocles. With such rigid expression fixed in our minds, we become unable to see the worth of those works which fail to conform to the Aristotalian standard but in themselves are genuinely powerful tragic expressions of their time. Juidin from Aristotalian canon, Shakespeare's works can hardly be called good tragedies because they allow for plots, indulge in mixing tragic with the comic and explore the inner recesses of the human mind making character often predominant over action. By the sheer mass of his works and their timeless appeal Shakespeare set a new standard, in rivalry to the Greek tragedy. If we come to modern dramatists like Strindberg, Ibsen, Ionesco, Chekhov or Beckett, we find Aristotalian percepts more deficient at explaining their works. With these dramatists drama moves inwards, the plot is often discarded as useless, and there is an unusual emphasis on the perfect intelligibility of plot is no loner relevant when the modern tragedy emphasizes precisely on the unintelligibility, irrationality or absurdity of the universe or the human condition.

Aristotle's concept of tragedy is deficient at explaining not only Shakespearean and modern tragedy but also Greek tragedy. There are many facets of Greek drama, which Aristotle ignores. For instance, the element of irrational, which Aristotle says should be outside the dramatic action but nonetheless it plays a vital role in effect they exercises upon us. If the play's spectacle chills our spine, it is due to the irrational that peeps through breaking that superficial

causation. The secret of the play's effect upon us lies in the fact Oedipus was fated to do what he did and that despite his conscious efforts to evade the oracle he actually fell into its trap. The effect springs from the intimation that reason and common sense can not always save man. That is, the irrational preys man both from within and without, and even our good intentions can ironically lead us to damnation. It is the irrational again that informs the ten years absurd war in Euripides' *The Trojan Women* or that puts Agamemnon in an awkward position where he must sacrifice his daughter to pursue the war for the nation's cause.

Aristotle also ignores the big question tragedy raises. Surely the function of tragedy is not only the catharsis of emotions. Tragedy is also concerned with the vindication of human dignity: it tries to define what is called the human conditions and attempts to give suffering a meaningful context. Aristotle's theory is equally blind to the creative potential of double plots, where the subplot is linked to main action. Nor does Aristotle's theory account for the aesthetic transformation of a react crime where given the topic treatment. However, Aristotle's emphasis on causality hints at the guilt-suffering-knowledge-affirmation pattern in tragedy, which is the underlying structure of many tragedies of both past and present.

The medieval concept of tragedy through crude in its quasi-religious formulation points to an important tragic fact that human destiny is beset with insecurity or uncertainty. If fortune is wayward and capricious, and if rise in worldly success is necessarily a preparation for a wretched fall, it becomes inevitable that man is a plaything in the hands of fate which is irrational, illogical and inexplicable in its workings in relation to man. Geoffrey Chaucer in his prologue to *The Monk's Tale* gives the characteristic of medieval definition of tragedy:

Tragedy is to sewn a certain stories,
As older books makes us memories.

Of hymn that stood in great prosperities,
 And is fallen out of high degree
 Into miseries, and end etch wretchedly. (235)

The primary focus of tragedy for Chaucer is a story of change of worldly condition, from prosperity to adversity.

Neo-classical concept of tragedy arose out of the imperfect reading of Aristotle and Horace by the renaissance poet-scholars and critics. The closet dramas of the Roman playwright Seneca was the current model for writing tragedy. Despite the rich legacy of anti-medieval drama and despite the powerful examples set by the works of Marlowe and Shakespeare, the fascination of Neoclassicism was strongly felt from Renaissance on till the wake of Romanticism. The chief ideas advocated by Neo-classicism are: a) Observance of unities of time, place and action b) decorum in language and characterization of reward and punishment to virtue and vice. Sir Philip Sidney's *Defence of Poesy* gave memorable expression to neo-classicism in England. According to him,

The light and excellent tragedy the opened the greater wounds and showed forth the ulcers threat are covered with Tissue ; that maketh kings feare to be Tyrants, and Tyrants manifest their tiranicall humans; that with sturring the affects of admiration and commiseration, teacheth the uncertainty of this world and upon how weake foundation guilden roofs are builded.(draper 69-70)

In Sidney, we find both the medieval emphasis on the uncertainty of the world and the Renaissance interest in methods and effects of tragedy, Sydney strongly attacks the Elizabethan practice of mixing the tragic with the comic-matching "horn pipes with funerals" (draper 70) –

and the jostling of king's with the clowns , which says has neither decency nor discretion. Because the Greek tragedies themselves were not fully adhere to three unities.

The romantic view of tragedy show marked departure from the narrow parochialism of Neo-classicism. With the onset of Romanticism we see a vital resurgence of reassessment in the theories and practice of tragedy. Lessing's quote-Jean-Francis Marmontle(Draper98) that the misfortunes of common people can also move us deeply, and can be the fit subject for tragedy marks a new shift in the concept of tragic protagonist must be a person of exalted rank goes unquestioned in classical, Elizabethan and Neo-classical tragedy alike. It is only in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that we see the lives of the common becoming subjects of tragedy. Such a shift in the concept of tragic hero and the subject of tragedy is indication of the romantic reassessment of what is meant by the dignity of man Wordsworth saw enough dignity in the likes of the rustics and their common language to make them subjects of his poetry and the nineteenth century novel also saw in the stories of the common lot of the general humanity. In Shegel's account of tragedy, the stature of the tragic hero counts not from his rank but from his courage to accept the blows of fate. The nobility of his hero is the mobility of his soul, rich inner resources to fall back upon in the moments of crisis. Shegel's point is that the unity in tragedy doesn't consist in the unity of action but in the underlying idea is a significant reinterpretation of a concept of unity, such of concept of unity can justify and explain not only the tragedies of the past but also the modern where the outward action is reduced almost to stasis and the psychological complexes and metaphysical issues become the major subjects of drama.

August Von Schegel denies that the pleasing-pain paradox of tragedy is rooted in the spectators' secret comparison of his own relative safety with calamities on the stage. The affirmation of the dignity of man and the divine order of things to which he comes face to face is

the controlling purpose behind any genuine tragedy. The conflicts of duty and passion the unexpected reversal of situation and the horrible catastrophe etc which are commonly held as characteristic feature of tragedy, lie, flat as useless if the controlling purpose underneath is missing. That's why we can say that essential unity of tragedy lies not in unity of action but sequence of events. In other word, tragedy represents not only human characters but human destiny. So, Schlegel says the secret of tragedy lies in disclosing the dignity of human nature and supernatural order of things:

What makes us feel, when we are spectators of a good tragedy, a kind of fundamental satisfaction arising from our sympathy with the violent situation and afflictions represented on a stage is either the sense of the dignity of human nature aroused in us by great examples of humanity, or the intimation of an order of things which is supernatural, imprinted and, as it were, mysteriously revealed, in the sequence of apparently disconnected events, or the combination of these two causes(Draper 103).

For Nietzsche, tragedy is the Apollonian embodiment of Dionisiac reality. Apollonianism and Dionianism “two formative forces of nature” are opposite and hostile to each other, but in a well-lived life as in a sublime art, I. e. tragedy, they are forged into a delicate balance. In Greek myth, Dionysius as a boy was torn to pieces by the titans. Nietzsche says Greek tragic hero is this dismemberment of Dionysius. As a dismembered part, he suffers and his death is their affirmation of the joyful union with the primordial one. The appeal of tragedy, despite the painful realization of the horrible truth it imparts to us, lies in this glimpse of the end of individuation and the mystic oneness of existence. As Nietzsche explains:

This view of things already provides us with all the elements of a profound and pessimistic view of world, together with the mystery doctrine of tragedy: the

fundamental knowledge of the oneness of everything existent, the conception of individuation as the primal cause of evil, and of art as the joyous hope that the spell of individuation may be broken in augury of a restored oneness.

That is, the death of hero is merely the destruction of appearance and thereby, affirmation of primal unity and joy of life. Without Apollo, Dionysius can not take form. Tragedy without Dionysiac element can not exist which means that mere representation can not make a tragedy. The disruptive Dionysiac music, which reached its highest manifestation in tragedy, Nietzsche says, can invest myths with a new and most profound significance Nietzsche explains:

It is only through the spirit of music that we can understand the joy involved in the annihilation that we can see clearly the external phenomenon of Dionysian art, which gives expression to the will in its omnipotence, as it were, behind the principium individualitatis, the external life beyond all phenomena, and despite all annihilation. (Draper 133)

For Nietzsche, the aesthetic pleasure we derive from a tragic myth does not lie in its morality. Though tragedy often gives us moral delight under the form of pity and moral triumph, it should not be confused with the purely aesthetic delight. To the satisfaction of the external appearances are made and dissolved into itself, and tragedy is an illustration of this phenomena.

Freudian concept of tragedy relies on the ideas of pleasure principle. He says that tragedy involved in pleasure is ambiguous. The cathartic feeling is roused by traumatic neurosis of the hero. According to Freud, tragic hero is a neurotic patient who wants to relive his painful experience of his time and again because by reliving it controls it and become its master.

Furthermore, he relates pleasure principle to the aesthetic aspect of a tragic drama “pleasure” and “unpleasure” are complimentary parts. They make a potential zone of the psychic

state of tragic hero. In other words, the tragic drama presents the cause of suffering in the mind of the tragic hero. So, the dramatic function of tragedy” as it were, a rising rebellion against the divine regulation of the universe, which is responsible for the existence of suffering. (qtd in Drakakis 4)

According to Freud, their hero is associated with sacrificial rituals; and the sacrifice further nurtures a rebellious attitude in the hero. This revolt rises in the mind of the tragic hero due to universal cause and neurotic fluxes inside him and is torn on to different poles. Then various psychic complexes collide with each other like a series in a chain of event. Freud says different impulses of mind comprise a neurotic level of the character’s mind and such impulses are divided into two poles: repressed materials and consciousness which further instigates tragic struggle in the mind of the hero. This division of impulses characterizes the tragic hero as psychic patient because his suffering becomes an allegorical form in the state of pleasure and reality. Moreover, the objective social world, on the one hand, and the inner psychic stages on the other hand; determine dialectic conflicts between consciousness and unconsciousness. In other words, the social and historical relations occur in the consciousness and the hero’s inner conflict takes place in the unconsciousness mind. The struggle outside is the symbolic of the struggle inside. The expression of this struggle is vehicle for the writer’s tragic views. In this sense, tragedy reflects all the repressed materials in displaced forms through the medium of the neurotic conditional mind of the tragic hero to which Freud describes as “neurotic on stage”(qtd in Drakakis 4).

As drama is the most social of literary forms tragedy is also the product of the social structure of the time in which it is written and performed. Equally formative in shaping a particular tragedy are the intellectual milieu of the time and peculiar temperament of the

dramatic genius. So in Greek, Elizabethan and Neo-classical tragedy is due to partly the feudal structure of society and partly a different concept of the tragedy. Given the aristocrat-menial-structure of society, the menial's life in fifth century BC could not be regarded as serious enough for tragic imitation.

Furthermore, as Greek tragedy implicated both the social and metaphysical dimension, the kings, princes and legendary heroes, who stood between the common man and gods, were assumed ideal to be protagonists. Medieval tragedy was mainly the exemplification of the hard blow of fate on those who rise high in fate on those who rise high in worldly prosperity. As only the nobility could enjoy such prosperity in the given structure of the medieval society, it became inevitable that the protagonist should be of high rank. In Renaissance, the growing interests in humanism and individualism brought about the shift of emphasis from the tragic action to the tragic hero. Given the feudal structure of society, the protagonist was still a man of high rank but tragedy was not rooted protagonist's character but in the nature of his action in Elizabethan tragedy it is rooted precisely in the individual character of protagonist. Tragedy for the Elizabethans meant the conflict between the upsurge of an individual energy to transcend human limits and the absolute that resists the individual's aspiration and destroys him. With the rise of the humanitarian call for sympathy into the common lot, the bourgeois tragedy that arose in the Eighteenth century becomes a tale of private woe. The regal pomp and show became things of the past and the misfortunes of the common lot become pre-requisites for active sympathy and sharing. Romantic tragedy retained the renaissance assertion of individual energy. Tragedy in the romantic age meant the conflict between the intense desire of the individual and the inhibiting conventions of the society. This inevitability led to frustration, remorse, alienation, and perverted

desires. For the spectacle of such a vision, the man of the rank was not a necessity. What was required was an individual intense in his desires to defy the limiting conventions of society.

Any attempt to find the common definition of tragedy must take into account the various modalities and their combinations possible within the genre. Tragedy differs from age to age and another to author to author both in tragic vision and the dramatic form. Plot, character, dialogue and setting, which mainly constitute the dramatic form, are manipulated variously as the vision changes, such that no rigid set of rules can be accepted as prescription for all types of tragedy. Greek tragedy focused on action at the expense of character because in Greek tragic vision tragedy springs not from the human character but from the operation of the cosmic moral laws on man. Character assumes an unprecedented focus in Elizabethan tragic vision tragedy springs from human actions or the inner recesses of the human mind.

Therefore, in the midst of these variations, tragedies down the ages share certain concerns and characteristics, which we can regard as the common ground of tragedy. These common concerns and characteristics are:

- a) Preoccupation with the human condition: Tragedy of all ages has tried to define or at least question what it is to be a human being. Tragedy delineates the insecurity inherent in the human condition. The cosmic moral laws in Greek tragedy do not care a jot about human beings, who appear mere victims rather than agents in the grand cosmic framework. In the character of tragedies of Elizabethan period, human beings are only superficially agents. The passions or the characteristic traits which bring down the tragedy upon the characters are what they are born with and can not dispense with by conscious effort.

- b) Suffering as an inescapable part of the human condition: Tragedy dramatizes the truth that being human means to suffer in this way or that, and attempts to provide a meaningful context for this truth. Usually guilt precedes suffering becoming a prime cause for the latter's eruption. In Shakespearean or Greek tragedy, guilt involves a conscious or unconscious breach of some moral code. The intensity of suffering usually leads to an awareness of its cause on the part of the protagonist; if not, the knowledge is at least unmistakably communicated to the audience.
- c) Guilt-Suffering-Knowledge-Affirmation Pattern: All tragedies more or less observe this pattern. In one type of tragedy (usually Shakespearean and Greek), an act of guilt brings disorder in an otherwise healthy universe. In another type of tragedy (usually with Strindberg and Beckett), guilt and disorder are not acts and results but something fixed as ineradicable part of existence. The disorder brings suffering, the intensity of which leads to a painful insight into the horror of existence. The disorder may or may not have a cause behind it, but when it comes, it asserts itself as absolute truth, as something which was always there behind the self-projected flimsy and illusory façade of order and rationality. The affirmation is usually held as the affirmation of some cosmic order or moral law, but this is not much so. It is rather the affirmation of the horrible truth of existence and of the human dignity that embraces this bitter truth with the hallowed illumination of a saint. That is why the spectacle of tragedy rather than leaving us in despair emboldens us to face the truth.
- d) Vindication of human dignity: Tragedy vindicates human dignity. The omnipotent and inscrutable power that rules the tragic world may crush the protagonist's body, but not his spirit, which shows an usual heroic courage in facing his destiny and embracing the

abysmal vision that enlighten him. Watching a tragic spectacle, we become aware of the Sisyphian pride and defiance that protagonist asserts against the forces that destroy him and seem to rejoice in his destruction. The suffering and misfortune then becomes tests of human mettle. They open man's eyes to that truth which lifts him high above the mundane world around him.

- e) The play of the irrational: without a certain sense of the irrationality and injustice in the way calamities strike man, tragedy would not produce that chilling horror in us, which is an essential part of tragic experience. Even when the universe is imagined as an ordered one functioning with cosmic laws, the irrationality CAN be seen its indifference to man, in the way it puts man in an awkward position where he does what he is fated to do. Irrational assign him such a position and bestows him such traits that there is left no other road to him than that which leads to his doom.
- f) Evil-the root cause of suffering: Tragedy sees evil as the prime cause of suffering consciously or unconsciously characters trample on some moral code, and this breach of law initiates the course of action that results in massive suffering and usually deaths in catastrophe.

This point doesn't contradict our earlier idea about irrationality that holds sway in the main cause of suffering and though an idea of order is implied by it, irrationality is seen in the way the evil is part of existence and can not be done away with. Man has to take full responsibility for actions that he does in his blindness and helplessness. The irrational is appearance in the way evil becomes unavoidable and brings suffering that can not be fully explained by the acts of evil characters do. Characters of tragedy are seen enmeshed

on evil not with their own deliberate choice but under the dictate of a cruel force they can neither understand nor control.

- g) Inevitability: Inevitability is another permanent feature of tragedy. Tragedy loses its intensity if the course of action dramatized looks like something that could have been avoided. Under the given circumstances and the character with given traits, the course of action should run on its own to its horrible catastrophe like wild river mad to reach the sea. Such is the force of necessity that nothing on the way becomes able to check or avert the course of action. It is due to this feature of inevitability that tragedy has an air of finality about it. The truth tragedy conveys loses its convincingness if this feature is missing. Whether it be in the guise of some cosmic moral order or fate or history or human psychology or the fate or history or human psychology or the ultimate metaphysical absurdity of existence, inevitability always plays a major role in accounting for our tragic experience.
- h) Universality: This is another permanent feature of tragedy. The interpretation of the human condition a tragedy gives may differ from age to age and author to author but each interpretation, in its relevance is free from the limitations of time and place. The Greek tragic vision is relevant not only for the Greeks but for the whole of humanity. This is so because tragedy passes beyond merely personal and social, and embraces the psychological and /or metaphysical, which gives the tragic truth absoluteness.

The next chapter will follow the applications of all these theoretical tools of tragedy in William Shakespeare's play *Julius Caesar*. The chapter will try to prove that *Julius Caesar* as tragedy is successful to arouse pity and fear in us because of the protagonist's ambitious behaviors

Ambition for Power as Cause of Tragedy in *Julius Caesar*

From the very beginning of the play, ambition instigates the characters to arise the complications. Ambition is the motive inside people's mind to get achievement in their life. But sometimes this ambition guides people to wrong motives. Then this becomes the tragic flaw of character in the play. Consequently, this leads to the tragic end of the character. The person who bears such flaw is taken as tragic hero in dramatic reading.

In Aristotle's view tragic hero an ideal person whose misfortunes rouses the maximum degree of pity and fear in the audience. In *Poetics*, he defines the tragic hero as one who is not eminently good and just. Yet whose misfortune is brought about "not by vice depravity but by some error or frailty" and who is highly renowned and prosperous. Julius Caesar a character is a best example of tragic hero in the play *Julius Caesar*. His character and dignity is such which sufficiently arouses our pity and fear. He is super human in his moral elevation.

Shakespeare's portrayal of Caesar is renowned and dignified but with some frailty. His tragic end is borne with his ambitious motives. Shakespeare has presented Caesar of the play in direct contrast to the Caesar of the history. Actual Caesar of the Roman history was dignified, majestic and great where as this Caesar is simple aging man, deaf in one ear and subject to epilepsy. He is reduced to a Caesar, old and decaying, failing in body and mind. But Caesar is much ambitious character. He has already begun to believe in and live through his own legend before his death. It is revealed when he deliberately speaks of himself in the third person thereby creating an artificial distance between himself and other mortals. It is, as if, Caesar stands for some God far removed from ordinary beings. Caesar speaks, "Speak Caesar is turned to hear"

(Act I, SCII,44). And again, a person who speaks his name is boastful one. He uses this kind of language in various scenes. His strong character traits revealed from his dialogue.

Caesar's character is nearly of the dictator. He is determined in his decisions and behaviors. He never thinks of how those decisions will affect others. He claims himself as northern star which can never be shaken of by any kinds of storm. He says:

Caesar. I could be well moved, if I were as you:

If I could pray to move, prayer would move me;

But I am constant as the northern star,

Of whose true-fixed and resting quality

There is no fellow in the firmament.

The skies are painted with unnumbered sparks,

They are all fire, and everyone doth shine

But there is one in all doth hold his place.

So in the world: it is furnished well with men,

And men are flesh and blood, and apprehensive;

Yet in the number I do know but one

That unassailable holds on his rank,

Unshaked of motion; and that I am he,

Let me a little show it, even in this:

That I was constant Cimber should be banished,

And constant do remain to keep him so. (Act III, SCI, 152)

To talk about Caesar, he is proud enough, boastful of his achievements and arrogant. He proclaims that he is more dangerous than danger itself. Danger and he are "...two lions littered in

one day” and he “the elder and more terrible” (Act III, ScII, 128). In his arrogance he describes the senators as “greybeards” (56). When Metellus Cimber pleads on the behalf of his banished brother Caesar answers him.

Caesar. . . . Thy brother by decree is banished:

If thou dost bend and prey and fawn for him,

I spurn thee like a cur (dog) out of my way.

Know, Caesar doth not wrong, nor without cause

Will he be satisfied. (ActIII, ScI, 148)

Caesar is such a proud ruler that he never cares any hurdle in front of him. Calphurnia insisted him not to go out of house on the ides of March. Caesar says he never fears of anything rather things fear of him when they encounter him. He says:

Caesar. Caesar shall forth. The things that threatened me

Ne'er looked but on my back; when they shall see

The face of Caesar, they are vanished.(Act II, ScII,124)

Caesar is such superstitious man that he believes in rites and begs Antony to touch his wife during the holy chase of Lupercal so that she might shake off the sterile curse and bring forth children.

Caesar. Forget not, in your speed, Antonius,

To touch Calphurnia; for our elders say,

The barren touched in this holy chase shake off their sterile curse.

[Act I, Sc II, 44]

Caesar suffers from a number of physical ailments. He is deaf in one ear and victim of epileptic fits. Caesar threatens Cassius to compete on swimming because he thinks himself immortal who

can't be defeated by anyone. Caesar's pride led him to accept a swimming challenge beyond his powers which ended up in his being rescued by Cassius himself. So, Cassius describes him as 'a man of feeble temper' [Act I, Sc II, 56] and relates an incident in Spain when Caesar suffered from a fever during which he groaned like a sick girl.

Caesar refuses the crown thrice when Antony offers him. It is only pretension to show that he is not ambitious. But it is his political strategy to impress the Roman people. Casca says:

Casca. [. . .] then he offered it to him again; then he put it by again; but to my thinking, he was very loath to lay his fingers off it. And then he offered it the third time; he put it the third time by; and still as he refused it, the rabblement (mob) hooted, and clapped their chopped hands, and threw up their sweaty night-caps, and uttered such a deal of stinking breath because Caesar refused the crown, that it had, almost, choked Caesar; for he swooned and fell down at it [. . .]. (Act I, ScII, 66)

Despite the staunch warning of soothsayer and his wife Calphurnia and the teacher (Artemindorus) he stiffens to go senate on 15th March. But as per conspirators scheduled program Caesar was assassinated on the presence of senators. The reason behind Caesar's untimely death is his own ambition for power. His ambition took away his own life. On the verge of last breath of his life Caesar spoke to Brutus "Et tu Brute? (ActIII, SCI, 152)" thinking he was killed conspicuously. But Cinna said tyranny was dead. And Brutus said Caesar's death is payment of his ambition. He says:

Brutus. People and senators, be not affrighted.

Fly not; stand still; ambition's debt is paid. (Act III, ScI, 152)

Caesar is the most influential character of the play. Although Caesar died in Act III (middle of the drama) but his influence hangs all over the play either in the disguise of ghost or in the disguise of love for him. Caesar appears on the stage in act IV scene III as ghost and threaten Brutus ghost to tell “thou shall see me at Philippi” (Act IV, Sc III, 244).

These enemies of Caesar, Cassius and Brutus die with his name on their lips. But play’s title character Caesar has ended his life before the end of the play because of his ambition. The major function of tragedy according to Aristotle is the arousal of the two kindred tragic emotions of pity and fear in the audience which brought proper catharsis. Pity is our awareness that the tragic protagonist suffers inconsiderably more than he deserves. It makes us feel pity towards him. In this play we identify ourselves with Julius Caesar when he was stabbed by his own senators. When we witness the assassination of Caesar we think that it could happen to us. We feel pity towards Caesar with other Plebeians when Antony narrates the real scenery of ideas of March.

Antony. O, now you weep, and I perceive you feel

The dint of pity. These are gracious dry drops.

Kind souls, what weep you when you but behold

Our Caesar’s vesture wounded? Look you here,

Here is himself, marred, as you see, with traitors.[Act III,sceneII,190]

Antony with his oratorical skill delineates the pitiful murder scene of Caesar. It makes the tears roll down from the eyes of spectators and readers as well. Though Cassius realized his mistake of plotting against Caesar. Poetic justice is given to Caesar and Cassius respectively. Both got death for their ambitions. Cassius says:

Cassius. Here, take thou the hilts,

And when my face is covered, as it is now,

Guide thou the sword-Caesar, thou art revenged,

Even with the sword that killed thee.[Act V, Sc II, 266]

Aristotle ignores the big question tragedy raises which is the indication of human dignity. Nor does his theory account for aesthetic transformation where given the poetic treatment to its characters. However, Aristotle's emphasis on causality hints the guilt-suffering-knowledge-affirmation pattern in tragedy also uses such a sequence when Cassius utters these words in his last moment of life. Cassius says:

Cassius. Come, Antony, and young Octavius, come,

Revenge yourselves alone on Cassius,

For Cassius is a weary of the world;

Hated by one he loves; braved by his brother;

Checked like a bondman; all his faults observed.

Set in a notebook, learned, and conned by rote,

To cast into my teeth, O I could weep

My spirit from mine eyes! There is my dagger,

And here my naked breast; within, a heart

Dearer than Pluto's mine, richer than gold:

If that then be'st a Roman, take it forth.

I, that denied thee, didst at Caesar; for I know,

When thou hate him worst, then lovedst him better

Than ever thou lovedst Cassius. (Act IV, ScIII, 224)

The aesthetic transformation that occurs inside the heart of Cassius is noteworthy. He appeals his friend Brutus to take dagger and plunge it into his precious heart. The real nature of Brutus is disclosed by Cassius at last. He discloses his realization that Brutus loves Caesar more than Brutus loves him.

Schlegel also says that secret of tragedy lies in disclosing the dignity of human nature and supernatural order of things. We feel a kind of fundamental satisfaction arising from our sympathy with the violent situation and afflictions represented on a stage. The sense of dignity of human nature arises in us by great examples of humanity. To clarify the cause of murder of Caesar Brutus says serpent's egg must be killed before they are hatched .He is killing Caesar for public good not for personal cause. He says:

Brutus. It must be by his death; and for my part,
 I know no personal cause to spurn at him
 But for the general- He would be crowned.
 How that might change his nature, there is the question.
 It is the bright day that brings forth the adder,
 And that craves worry walking. Crown him- that!
 And then, I grant, we put a string in him
 That at his will he may do danger with.
 Th' abuse of greatness is when it disjoins
 Remorse from power; and, to speak truth of Caesar,
 I have not known when his affections swayed
 More than his reason. But 't is a common proof,
 That lowliness is young ambition's ladder,

Where to the climber-upward turns his face,
 But when he once attains the upmost round,
 He then unto the ladder turns his back,
 Looks in the clouds, scorning the base digress.
 By which he did ascends: [. . .].

(Act II, Sc I, 92)

Brutus has a strong stand to assassinate Caesar. He foregrounds the necessity to kill him. His point is that Caesar's nature is problem because if he is crowned he may misuse the power. It is the common political motive Caesar must be assassinated. Ambitious man like Caesar may reaches to the highest point of his aim but he immediately scorn the steps through which he climbed to power.

Marcus Brutus is a noble character. It is the conspirators who killed Caesar not Brutus. Brutus becomes the victim in the hands of fraud conspirators. He is confined to his belief that republicanism is sacred cause behind the murder of Caesar. He can't endure the idea of there being a king in Rome because he is a staunch republican. He joins conspiracy not because he wanted to be king but because he wanted to liberate Rome from a tyrant. He discloses the conspirator's plot. He believes they must be against the tyrannical spirit of Caesar not with personal prejudice of Caesar. claim this when Antony calls him ". . .the noblest Roman of them all" (Act V, ScV, 284). He addresses:

Brutus. Let us be sacrificers, but not butchers, Caius.

We all stand up against the spirit of Caesar,

And in the spirit of men there is no blood.

O, that we then could come by Caesar's spirit,

Let's kill him boldly, but not wrathfully;
 Let's carve him as a dish fit for the gods,
 [. . .] This will make
 Our purpose necessary, and not envious;
 Which so appearing to the common eyes,
 We shall be called purgers, not murderers.

(Act II, SCI, 106)

His dignity is such high that he believes roman citizens will take them as healers of the disease of the state and not the murderers. He is not malice for power. Brutus was capable of enduring the hardest trials of life calmly and patiently.

Nietzschean belief of tragedy bases on two segments of human psyche: Apollonianism and Dionianism. Apollonianism refers to order, rationality, calmness and individual whereas Dionysianism holds intoxication, disorder and irrationality and mob. He takes tragedy as sublime form of art because it finely yoked these two forces of human nature into a delicate balance. Human mind has two sides working together. The same Plebians who applauded Brutus earlier and condemns Antony turn upside down within a moment. Earlier they were ready to crown Brutus in place of Caesar but after listening Antony's speech they become ready to take revenge with the traitors. On the course of taking revenge the mob killed Cinna the poet instead of Cinna, the traitor. They pushed him to death even after Cinna disclosed about his real identity. He repeatedly said that he was not Cinna the conspirator but the Plebians don't listen to him. Rather fourth Plebian says; "It is no matter, his name's Cinna; pluck but his name out of his heart and turn him going" (Act III, Sc III, 200).

It is like Nietzschean thought that conception of individuation as primal cause of evil, death of Cinna is merely the destruction of appearance and thereby affirmation of primal unity and joy of life. Cinna's death is due to mob psychology not because of personal grudge. This glimpse of the end of individuation and the mystic oneness of existence is what tragedy appeals in us.

The cathartic feeling is roused by traumatic neurosis of the hero. Freud calls tragic hero a neurotic patient. For him, a neurotic patient is one who wants to relive his painful experience of his time and again because by reliving it in imagination he wants to control it and become its master. "Pleasure" and "unpleasure" are two complimentary parts which make a potential zone of the psychic state of tragic hero. He clearly says tragic drama exhibits the cause of suffering in the mind of the tragic hero. Caesar and Brutus are two tragic heroes who express their personal grudge in public affair.

Brutus' suffering is the manifestations of the tensions inside his mind. When tussle occurs during battle between Cassius and Brutus he apologizes to be rude with Cassius. Brutus calls himself man of endurance when he tells Cassius about his wife Portia's death. But he says:

Brutus. Speak no more of her; give me a bowl of wine.

In this I bury all unkindness, Cassius. (Act IV, SCIII, 230)

A man who takes help of wine to relief from tensions is no more than psychic patient. Brutus is highly depressed because of his wife's death. His suffering is the manifestations of his psychic tensions repressed inside his mind. This is his inside out. The struggle outside is the symbolic of the struggle inside.

In this way, Julius Caesar as tragedy reveals all the repressed materials in displaced forms through the medium of neurotic conditional mind of the tragic heroes. To take another example Julius Caesar is mighty king outwardly but a feeble husband inside the heart. Although he refused the crown but longs to be father of his children. For that he urges Antony to touch his wife Calphurnia. He says:

Caesar. Forget not, in your speed, Antonius,
 To touch Calphurnia; for our elders say,
 The barren touched in this holy chase,
 Shake off their sterile curse.

(Act I, SCII, 44)

Caesar's longing for shaking off the barrenness of Calphurnia is his longing for personal life. He is sonless father so desires to be father of his own child.

In tragedy evil is the main cause of suffering. Consciously or unconsciously characters trample on some moral code, and this breach of law initiates the course of action that results in massive suffering and ultimately deaths in catastrophe. In this play *Julius Caesar* Caius Cassius is the evil tempered character-his seeming refusal to acknowledge his sensibilities or to the nature his spirit. Such a man, Caesar fears with his ambition, is harmful. He is main among the conspirators who stabbed Caesar. The jealousy of Caesar is the main motive which compels him organizing the plot and assembling others in his mission. Caesar takes his unattractive appearance as dangerous signs. He says, "Yond Cassius has a lean and hungry look; he thinks too much; such men are dangerous" (Act I, SCII, 63). It is not also secret that Caesar doesn't like Cassius and vice-versa. Cassius can be seen as a man who has gone the extreme in cultivating his public persona. Caesar, describes his distrust of Cassius, tells Antony that the problem with

Cassius is his lack of private life. Cassius considers himself to be braver and more capable than Caesar and can not tolerate the idea of occupying an inferior position. He says,

Cassius. . . . And this man

Is now become a god, Cassius is

A wretched creature, and must bend his body

If Caesar carelessly but nod on him.

(Act I, SCII, 54)

He is successful to win the heart of Brutus on the pretext of republicanism. But he is narrow in his creed and fails to achieve his dream. He is moody passionate and impulsive. He was trapped into his own short-sightedness. He allows his servant Pindarus to plunge sword into his body.

As critic Robert W. Lorrain who updates Aristotle's theory of tragedy believes that the best way to define tragedy is its spirit; the heroic struggle of characters against a force that they can't beat. The tragic struggle gets birth to heroism. The character involves in tragic struggle where they never lose or gain. Thus, tragic characters may win or lose; or more precisely, they win in the losing and lose in the winning. But it is the struggle in itself that is the source of the dramatic significance, and it is out of this struggle with necessity that heroism is born. Brutus loses Caesar as friend but gains power to be leader of traitors. But it soon vanishes he wins on lose. Brutus defeats Octovious's army but his company Cassius loses battle with Antony. The struggle between armies of Octovious and Cassius is not merely a fight between two parties. It is heroic struggle between republican sentiments and monarchical power. In this way, the battle fought from Sardis to Phillipi is not only long physical journey of violence but it is a war between public motive and personal motive. The very theme gives heroic height to Shakespeare's play *Julius Caesar*.

Conclusion

Julius Caesar is a tragedy by William Shakespeare about a political conspiracy against Roman leader Julius Caesar, and the events surrounding and following his assassination. Shakespeare wrote *Julius Caesar* after he had completed a series of English political histories, and though the play is set in ancient Rome, it isn't without sixteenth century English political considerations. The play deals with the importance of upholding the ideals of the Roman Republic, but these were fairly contrary to monarchical rule in contemporary England.

The tragedy of Julius of Julius Caesar is as the result of tragic flaw of its characters. Tragic flaw of each character is only driving force that leads them to their own doom. The political theme of the play has been served because of the ambitious natures of the main character. The power-politics between and among the protagonists' results into catastrophic end of them. *Julius Caesar* thus offers important insights into the relations of public and private life, of great historical events and the movements' individual conscience and decision. The assassination of Caesar was a major event in the political history of Rome and western civilization, an event of enormous political consequence. Shakespeare, however also depicts the little twists and turns of private relations and internal arguments that contribute to such great events. Great political events such as assassination of Caesar by Brutus emerged from and in important ways depend on these private restlings that are not always marked by certainty and clear reasoning. Caesar represents entire self promotion and ruled by divine kings where as Brutus, as we have seen, represents the old republican tradition, the Roman emphasis on honor and service to the common good. He is disciple of the philosophy of stoicism, according to which one should live by reason and not by passion. One of the contentions of the play is the tension between personal and public love for the person of Caesar and love for the city of Rome.

With the leadership of Antonio, Octavianus Caesar, Marcus Antonius and Lepidus are in the first line that is love for Caesar as a king. On the other side with the leadership of Marcus Brutus, there are Cassius Casca, Trebonius, Ligarius, Decius Brutus, Metellus Cimber and Cinna who loved Rome there by conspire against tyrannical spirit of Caesar.

Therefore the play depicts a shift from the public devotion, characteristic of republican Rome to the personal devotion of imperial Rome. The play reflected the general anxiety of England over the succession of leadership. At the time of its creation and first performance, queen Elizabeth a strong ruler, was elderly and had refused to name a successor, leading to worries that a civil war similar to that of Rome might break out her death. The play focuses on the question of whether rulers who take the crown are fit for it, especially in the eyes of the people (the ruler's subjects). However, the play isn't an anti-monarchy tirade. Shakespeare doesn't object to coronation; rather, he implies that those crowned should be good leaders. *Julius Caesar* is a play about power, but it's also Elizabethan England's answer to ancient Rome. It argues that power concentrated in capable hands is not an affront to the common good, but in fact, its only guarantor.

Works Cited

- Interacting in English literature Reader revised edition,published by Central Board of Secondary Education Preet Vihar ,Delhi-110092 Hudson.
- H.N.,Bloom's Notes :Julius Caesar. Infobase publishing 1996.
- Barton,Anne. "Rhetoric in Ancient Rome." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations:1988*,p79-89.
- Bloom, Harold. "The Aesthetic Dignity in Julius Caesar." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Julius Caesar* 4.5(1998): 1-4
- Bulman, James C. "*Ironic Heroism in Julius Caesar: A Repudiation of the Past.*" Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Julius Caesar 4.5(1998): 121-32.
- Corrigan,Robert W. Theatre in Search of a fix ,New York :Pelcorde, 1973.
- Draper,R.P.ed.Tragedy:Development in Criticism:HongKong:Macrillion, 1980.
- Eeles,Abraham. Aristotle and his philosophy,Chapel Hill:University of North Carolina Press,1982.
- Hornby, A.S..Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English Editors ,Sally Wehmeien and Michael Ashby :New Delhi ,2010.
- House,Humphrey. Aristotle's Poesics.London:Hart-Davies,1956.
- Sgiegel, Paul N. "Caesar as Representative of the Monarchical Principle." *Blooms Notes: Julius Caesar* 5.6 (1996):55-57.
- Thomas, McAlindon. "The Numbering of Men and Days: Symbolic De Sign in the tragedy of *Julius Caesar.*" *Studies in Philosophy* 81.3(Summer, 1984):372-94.