



Conspiracy and Punishment in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*

Dr: Mahmood Hasan Zghair Al-khazaali.

General Directorate of Education-Al-Rusafa the Third. Ministry of Education. Baghdad, Iraq.

mahmood.hasan@dr.com

Abstract:

This study is devoted to discussing the phenomenon of “Conspiracy” and “Punishment” in *Julius Caesar* (1599) according to Shakespeare's canon. William Shakespeare has attributed to dealing with some of the concepts that confirm his piercing insight into human nature. He considers the man to be instinctive with exaggerated passion, if not guided by reason, leading to unexpected consequences affecting both the individual and the community. This study also is an attempt to deal with how the individual and society are affected by the inability of the man to deal rationally with his divided nature. It shows how men cannot mitigate the consequences of their anti-social actions because justice must be on the path. The study helps to discover the political conflicts in our present-day through reconsidering Shakespeare's political texts and referring to a “Conspiracy Theory” which leads to political and moral troubles at all times and everywhere. Thus, it is axiomatic that law needs the support of the human moral faculty as called by psychologists a “Superego” specifically when the law fails to obtain maximum assistance, crime increases, unrest spreads, the law and order prove difficult if not impossible.

Keywords: Caesar, conscience, conspiracy, punishment, Shakespeare.

المؤامرة والعقاب في يوليوس قيصر لشكسبير

م.د. محمود حسن زغير الخزعلي

وزارة التربية | مديرية العامة للتربية الرصافة الثالثة

mahmood.hasan@dr.com

الملخص:

هذه الدراسة مخصصة لمناقشة ظاهرة "المؤامرة" و "العقوبة" في مسرحية يوليوس قيصر (١٥٩٩) حسب شريعة شكسبير. ينسب ويليام شكسبير إلى التعامل مع بعض المفاهيم التي تؤكد رؤيته الناقبة في الطبيعة البشرية. إنه يعتبر الرجل غريزياً بشغف مبالغ فيه، إذا لم يكن موجهاً بالعقل، مما يؤدي إلى عواقب غير متوقعة تؤثر على كل من الفرد والمجتمع. هذه الدراسة هي أيضاً محاولة للتعامل مع كيفية تأثير الفرد والمجتمع بعدم قدرة الرجل على التعامل بعقلانية مع طبيعته المنقسمة. هذه الدراسة هي أيضاً محاولة للتعامل مع كيفية تأثير الفرد والمجتمع بعدم قدرة الرجل على التعامل بعقلانية مع طبيعته المنقسمة. إنه يوضح كيف لا يستطيع الرجال التخفيف من عواقب أفعالهم المعادية للمجتمع لأن العدالة يجب أن تكون على الطريق الصحيح. تساعد الدراسة على اكتشاف الخلافات السياسية في يومنا هذا من خلال إعادة النظر في نصوص شكسبير السياسية والإشارة إلى "نظرية المؤامرة" التي تؤدي إلى مشاكل سياسية وأخلاقية في جميع الأوقات وفي كل مكان. وبالتالي، من البديهي أن القانون يحتاج إلى دعم القوة الأخلاقية البشرية كما يسميها علماء النفس "الأنا العليا" على وجه التحديد عندما يفشل القانون في الحصول على أقصى قدر من المساعدة، وتزداد الجريمة، وينتشر الاضطراب، ويتبين أن القانون والنظام صعبان إن لم يكن مستحيلان.

الكلمات المفتاحية: قيصر ، ضمير ، تأمر ، عقاب ، شكسبير .

1.1. Introduction:

Accordingly to *Julius Caesar* (1599), Shakespeare deals with the criminal conspiracy against Caesar, stressing that crime cannot lead to good even if committed for noble reasons by Brutus and Cassius were punished for the murder of Caesar who did not commit a punishable crime. In fact, Shakespeare is considered a controversial playwright in various fields who reflects the extent of his extensive knowledge of human behaviour, what is



surrounding him, and reveals inner intentions through psychological struggles by main and minor characters whether, in comedic or tragic plays besides, the critics have considered him a brilliant political writer especially in what relates to roles of law, authority, political relations and political conflicts such as crime, legality issues, conspiracy and punishment under the authority of the law. Thus, this study tries to answer the question of what is a conspiracy and punishment of conscience and what is the relationship between them. A conspiracy is considered “an agreement between two or more persons to commit a crime at some time in the future” (qtd. in Lyman, 2014:463). Indeed, conspiracy leads to several crimes according to Iyengar, it is a tainted action and its grave consequences to others, an evil act which is born of sin. While the idea of punishment had its origin before human existence on Earth. It is unanimously agreed that nothing comes out of nothing. Thus, the human's fall is a natural consequence of the sin of disobedience which is often referred to as “original sin”. This original sin expresses the nature of the man who can be disassociated, his inability to rid himself of the weakness of his thought, and the justification of some punishment.

As common law is well known in Shakespeare's plays is that an initial crime or worse generates more harm and carries with it the suffering or the death of other innocent victims before the offender receives the final punishment. In his plays also, the evil of all kinds reaches the physical and emotional suffering which is difficult to separate from each other such as emotional suffering arises from frustration and anticipating frustration: thwarted, ambition, unrequited love, the disappointment of all kinds, sadness, jealousy, envy, and hatred. As these forms of suffering are common, the man also suffers from fear or fear is acuter because man cannot always be certain regarding when and how evil will befall him. Any uncertainty is appropriate and a form of suffering to some extent these forms of suffering will exist even if each of them is moral ideal but, of course, suffers in part from a violation of moral standards, such as disloyalty and implicit trust. From Shakespeare's view, passion is a prime mover of sin and crime, the mere thought of crime is regarded with as much horror as the crime itself. The passions are represented to show the confusion and misery to which they led.



Shakespeare does not see reason as a kind of antithesis to passion but, he has seen the reason and passion as two complementary aspects of humanity. Hence, it is necessary to look briefly at the motive of revenge, because it is a stepping stone to our understanding of many subsidiary passions.

Shakespeare has embodied in most of his plays the concepts of both “conspiracy and punishment” according to the circumstances of crime including the motives which led to the crime through several themes such as jealousy, revenge, envy, conspire, ambition and hatred. While punishment in Shakespeare’s view is showing the psychological conflicts and punishment under the authority of law on the one hand and in emotional distress and revenge under the authority of conscience in case of the absence of the law on the other hand. One can note that throughout Shakespeare’s plays such as the types of crimes as a result of, jealousy in *Othello* (1604–1604), ambitions in *Macbeth* (1606) conspiracy in *Julius Caesar* (1599), pride in *King Lear* (1605–1606), revenge in *Titus Andronicus* (1591–1592) and *Hamlet* (1599–1601), ... etc. Thus, the punishments under the authority of law whether executions or imprisonment but, in another the kind of punishment follows there is a justice of the court in the human mind which has been stressed upon it by psychologists. This is a righteous court and it is the voice of God in the human mind, while there is the conflict of psychology among “Id”, “Ego” and “Superego” and in the human mind according to Freud’s *psychoanalytic theory of personality* (1923). Whatever concepts may lie under the surface of Shakespeare's drama, which allows addressing questions like the relationship of citizens to the rule of the king with relative resistance to the kind of force that official Tudor ideology had imposed upon them. Upholding the kingship's ideal while continuing the narrative of English history is one thing, yet searching the republican contentions that influence a character like Brutus of the rightness of killing is another. Shakespeare has depicted the act of assassination of the ruler or the king on various events, such as the assassination of Richard II, and Duncan. Shakespeare tries to explore Brutus’s conscience in terms of regret as in *Macbeth*, he finds comparative freedom from the handcuffs of guilt as a grave mistake. However, Themes of conspiracy and punishment themes in *Julius Caesar*



make for a more open description of conspiracy than in either of Shakespeare's tragedies.

It is generally accepted that Shakespeare focuses on the psyche of the human for dealing with some of the concepts that confirm his piercing insight into human nature throughout the Seven Deadly Sins (pride, greed, lust, envy, gluttony, wrath and sloth), which are leading the man to make grave mistakes in various cases especially, if the man ignores his conscience that is considered as a high court in inner mind which will lead to struggle among the three parts of the human personality are "Id", "Ego" and "Superego". They are responsible to give orders to do good behaviours and bad behaviour like kill, conspire, penalty, such as sinfulness and the catharsis that mean a suicide or purity that also called "in its origin and essence catharsis had nothing whatever to do with morality or with what we should call the voice of conscience" (Vickers,1985:139). Thus, the crime sinful is lead to the flaw of morality. One can find the concept of crime and punishment had embodied in the literature of the world within different depictions in general but especially in Fyodor Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment* (1866), the matter is very clear when the young man Raskolnikov (Rodion) is the protagonist of the novel who was surrounded by the difficult circumstance and motives to kill an old woman to get rid of her but, he guides to do second crime when he had killed her sister. The protagonist of the novel lives in a terrible psychological struggle which is a psychological punishment on the one hand and the pursuers of the law toward him to achieve justice by the legal authorities for discovering the crimes on the other hand. As a result, it is impossible to escape from the law to achieve justice by punishing or escaping from the conscience of the protected divine justice in the human mind. (Hasan, 2019).

Thus, the matter is not different from the tragedy of *Julius Caesar* (1599), Paolucci has asserted that the play "is regarded as an archetypal pattern of crime and punishment since it comprise the assassination of Caesar and the entailing consequences of such a horrible deed, through the punishment of the conspirators" (1960: 329). Positively, Caesar is a good man who appropriately deserves to ascend the throne of Rome on the evidence that the people of Rome love and respect him to the extent that they acclaim him as a

ruler over them. However, he has his own personality flaw which unconsciously moves him towards implanting the seeds of his own destruction. Moreover, there are two tragic heroes in this play Brutus and Caesar, even though one is treated more fully than the other. Each one brings about Caesar's destruction simply because they are wholly convinced of their infallibility, the killing of Caesar and the extinction of Brutus form a closely inter-linked double tragedy. Brutus thinks that by killing Caesar he will save Rome from a possible dictatorship thus his justification for the decision involves murder as a solution although murder is a terrible deed and a crime, thus, the crime of conspiracy in *Julius Caesar* (1599) begins out of jealousy and envy until it reaches to the conspiracy against Caesar for killing him under the pretext of the general interest of the country. Generally speaking, Shakespeare in *Julius Caesar* shows all the weak points of the human such as ambition, disobedience, discord, treachery, jealousy, and envy. "All these things are helping for giving the motivation which led a person to seek revenge on others even on his dearest and nearest relatives" (Al-khazaali, 2017:111). Herein, according to Virgil, has asserted that lies the most obvious weakness of *Julius Caesar* from the moral point of view.

While O'Dair believes that Cassius is the co-hero of the play, because of flaming jealousy consuming him to destroy Caesar. The reason for his hatred is simply jealousy. Brutus is also disturbed by Caesar's growing ambition and is ready to consider Cassius's hints. As an initial step, Cassius unflinchingly determines to convince Brutus of his criminal conspiracy against Caesar because Brutus's character ensures the success of the scheme. Through his wide knowledge of the psychology of the man, Cassius is made capable of winning Brutus over to his side. Before listening to Cassius' plan. Brutus never shows any symptoms of criminal trends. On the contrary, he is a man universally recognized to be good while he has tended Machiavellian thoughts which raised his criminal tendency.

Shakespeare raises the issue of conspiracy in the opening of the first scene in Act II of *Julius Caesar*, and deals with it as the main thematic and highlights upon it especially when Brutus was waiting at his house for the appearance the other conspirators, he presents the conspiracy through a soliloquy for achieving the goal of the assassinate act against Caesar:



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's the question.
It is the bright day that brings forth the adder,
And that craves wary walking. Crown him that,
And then I grant we put a sting in him
That at his will he may do danger (II.i.10–17)

Brutus's speech draws his intention to participate in the crime. The critics have seen that Brutus decides to act only on the theoretical assumption that Caesar will become tyrannical and through his words, hints to the same thoughts of Hamlet's even more famous soliloquy in which he also notices a violent act. In spite of the resemblance with Hamlet's soliloquy, Brutus's speech is filled with repugnance. Nevertheless, one can understand from the perspective of political analysis in this action but be aware of what kind of decision is being put ahead particularly, when Brutus declares his personal passion for Caesar but determines that this shall not be an obstruction. Besides, Roe has referred to the dramatization of Brutus when he meets the other conspirators at his house who meet in such an undertaking inevitably seem to smack of villainy:

The word conspiracy too easily summons the image of the popular theatrical 'Machevil', the assassin who lurks in the dark and boasts, as in *The Jew of Malta*, of poisoning wells at midnight. Notwithstanding, the atmosphere of conspiracy in Brutus's house could hardly be less like this Marlovian example. Shakespeare establishes Brutus's difference from the popular image of conspiratorial villainy by having him stand aloof from, and even appear to reproach, his fellow conspirators. (2010:75–76).

The scholars and critics have noted that the language of Brutus is calm. Thoughtful, and judicious which is certainly his manner in practice throughout his speeches in the length of the play. Conspiracy must in its



plans appear hidden, and although this is to belie the good intentions that accompany it, thus, most historians and critics have observed that not every conspirator's intentions may have been good, even Brutus was prepared to his enemy by making an exception act:

Let 'em enter.

They are the faction. O conspiracy,
Sham'st thou to show thy dangerous brow by night,
When evils are most free? O then by day
Where wilt thou find a cavern dark enough
To mask thy monstrous visage? Seek none, conspiracy:
Hide it in smiles and affability;
For if thou path, thy native semblance on,
Not Erebus itself were dim enough
To hide thee from prevention. (II.i.76-85)

But, one can note the conspirator Cassius has manipulated Brutus's feelings begin with Brutus's open admission that he is "with himself at war" (I. ii. 52). The burden of such a moral misjudgment is so lucidly shown through the disruptive pricks of Brutus's conscience which weigh so heavily on him before, during and after the assassination of Julius Caesar. Although, all conspirators have met a sad end, it might still be regarded as a satisfaction for the treasonable bravura of putting on the history play, which might have been indicated to illustrate the impossibility of a just revolt in the England of Shakespeare's era. Yet, before the conspirators explain the finalization of the conspiracy arrangements, Brutus describes the psychic state that shines in him as a result of his decision to get rid of Caesar:

Since Cassius first did whet me against Caesar,
I have not slept.
Between the acting of a dreadful thing
And the first motion, all the interim is
Like a phantasma or a hideous dream:
The Genius and the mortal instruments
Are then in council; and the state of man,
Like to a little kingdom, suffers then
The nature of an insurrection. (II. i. 64-72)

Also, When Brutus hears people acclaiming Caesar king over them, he does not hesitate to show his profound concern over this important matter, “I do fear the people,/ Choose Caesar for their king” (I. ii. 85-86), a reaction which makes Cassius reply with great care, “Then must I think you would not have it so”. It seems quite clear that Brutus like Cassius, has his own ambition in mind. A reaction that makes Cassius respond with great interest, “Then must I think you would not have it so” (I. ii. 88). As Brutus expresses his constant readiness to offer the supreme sacrifice to Cassius, he immediately begins to seduce him to make Brutus raise to the bait:

Brutus: If it be aught toward the general good,
Set honour in one eye and death in the other,
And I will look on both in differently;

.....
Cassius: I know that virtue to be in you, Brutus,
As well as I do know you outward favour.
Well, honour is the subject of my story. (I. ii. 92-94; 97-99).

In general, Cassius is seen as a man who possesses a penetrating insight into human nature, and he is enabled to convince others of what he considers to be absolutely true. Brutus, Casca and other men are seduced into the line of the criminal conspiracy by Cassius’s evil adroitness. In the Orchard scene II. i. Brutus reveals to us the reasons behind his decision to join the criminal conspiracy against Caesar. He intends to justify what can not be justified. His decision is based on the common belief that Julius Caesar is an ambitious man and therefore must be killed. He begins with a final decision “It must be by his death” (I.ii.10.). He emphasizes that he has “no personal cause to spurn at him, / But for the general” (I.ii.11-12), he is ready to do anything whatever the cost may be. He further acknowledges that Caesar is a man of highly good characteristics, a man whose reason overwhelms his passions “I have not known when his affections swayed / more than his reason.” (II.i.20-21). Nevertheless, he allows himself to be persuaded into killing Caesar to have his ambition destroyed.

Undoubtedly, the conspiracy would be failed if Caesar believed his wife's dream because his wife Calpurnia had seen a nightmare on the night



before during the storm about Caesar was being killed, and she had persuaded him to stay at home. But, Decius has succeeded in achieving the conspirators' plan by persuading Caesar that he had misinterpreted his wife's dream. In fact, Shakespeare in *Julius Caesar* refers to gender-inclusive so that the issues the play raises are not necessarily exclusive to conspirators men but there is another very influential minor conspirator named Cinna, who assisted in persuading Brutus to join the conspiracy. Engaging Brutus in the conspiracy was essential because of his confidential relationship with Caesar and his influence on both the senators and the common people. Cinna was elected, by Cassius, to take the task of producing a flattering letter to Brutus to which he replied, "Well, I will hie, /And so bestow thesee papers as you bade me" (I. iii. 150-151).

Also, the tragic dilemma of Brutus is that he is deeply involved in a situation that completely contradicts his nature and compels him to behave in a manner that is completely alien to his way of thinking. It is generally accepted to be a man of good nature and noble. However, he is a criminal, in the end, Brutus, Cassius and Casca crowd in to carry out their criminal scheme. Then Casca strikes the first-dagger blow at the back of Caesar's neck. He bungles his aim through excitement, but the others press and stab Caesar repeatedly who sees Brutus among the conspirators, ceases to resist and takes the blows. His dying words are viewed as a strong blow directed against Brutus, "Et tu, Brute? – Then fall, Caesar!" (III.i.85). Brutus's deed is "almost worse than a crime, it is a hideous blunder" (Iyenga, 1984:392).

Brutus by his sin seems to be inevitable because Antony's sense of public responsibility has moved him to reveal the criminal mechanics of the conspirators. Although he is warned by Brutus, in order not to reveal anything that may cause trouble for them, Antony is determined to take revenge on the conspirators. Charney has commented on his behaviour through refereeing to his success in accomplishing this task which depends heavily on his ability to communicate with his feelings of anger, and he has succeeded in doing so. Anthony begins his inflammatory speech by raising doubts about the sincerity of the conspirators. He describes the killers as men of nobility, honourable and repeats the word "honourable" until the use of irony is made from him has penetrated the hearts of the public. He informs



them “For Brutus is an honourable man; / So are they all, all honourable” (III.ii.91-92). His insistence on the words ambition and ambitions goes in the same vein, thus attempting to arouse the emotions:

He [Caesar] hath brought many captives home to Rome,

.....;

Did this in Caesar seem ambitious;

When that the poor have cried, Caesar hath wept;

Ambition should be made of sterner stuff.

Yet Brutus says he was ambitious;

And Brutus is an honourable man.

.....

I thrice presented him a kingly crown,

Which he did thrice refuse: Was this ambition?

Yet Brutus says he was ambitious;

And sure he is an honourable man. (III.ii.97; 99-103;106-109)

Through his grief, Anthony seems to allow the crowd to see him appear to be fully saddened by Caesar's murder. Citizens believe there is much reason in what he says, and that there's not a nobler man in Rome than Antony. Their statements during his pause for the effect assure him that they are with him now. It remains only for him to ignite them on the verge of madness and this is achieved when he reveals the fact that Brutus is deeply implicated in the criminal conspiracy against Caesar. In reaction to what Antony has said, the citizens demand revenge upon the conspirators, “Revenge! About! Seek! Burn! Fire! Kill! Slay! Let not a traitor live!” (III.ii.216-217). Now Antony gets the first instant result of his emotional speech which is unleashing mob rage. “Go, fetch Fire, / Pluck down benches. / Pluck down forms, windows, anything” (III. ii. 270-273). Anthony's speech, according to Iyengar said that “a perfect sonata upon the instrument of the human emotions” (1984:390). While in Act III, scene iii, there is a dramatization of human fallibility. Being excited by Antony's impressive speech, the first act of the mob, their emotions inflamed and their reason obscured, is the senseless murder of an innocent man, which is an act of



violence that is released as a consequence of the criminal conspiracy against Caesar (Hawkins,1972).

In short, Antony has shown his ability as a practical politician by his impressive rhetoric. His success in getting the sentiments of his fiery auditors shows us a man who carefully follows the fine details of his plan. So, he does Richard III, Edmund in *King Lear* (1605), and Iago in *Othello* (1603). But, one does not lead to the end up that Anthony is intended to be as evil as these characters: this would be meaningless. Richard III, Edmund, and Iago are evil characters, Anthony was sophisticated and cunning, but away from evil, who reveals the criminal role of conspirators that is leading them to their inevitable destruction. Likewise, Critics have also observed relationships between Julius Caesar and Elizabeth I, both of them are strong and popular but both of them are prone to personal weaknesses, he is physically weak, she is ageing, and each one of them has precipitated a crisis in political affairs on the one hand and others critics and scholars have seen how far Shakespeare refers to pursuing the similarity is difficult to say the parallel by recognizing those Catholics who wished to assassinate Elizabeth 1 and replace her with Queen of Scots, Mary on the other hand. Nevertheless, this produces a similarity with the succession crisis rather than with republicanism that tended to interpret Shakespeare's view which is conceivable to see the play as being worried about the political crisis in future of the kingdom after the death of the queen. "Yet a third way is to see Julius Caesar as a work that refuses to be bound by contemporary issues and that reflects in a more disinterested way on the conflict between political imperatives and the individual conscience." (Roe, 2010:68).

Thus, the theme of Portia's death is highly effective and adds to our knowledge of Brutus's personality. This knowledge is conveyed to us by Cassius' surprise at driving Brutus's self-news in Portia's death. This incident expresses in particular, the philosophy of Brutus's distinguished, he is a stoic that is to say, he believes that one of the most important attributes of man is self-mastery in the face of difficulties and this welcome attribute generally requires the constant discipline of emotions. Despite his deep love for Portia, Brutus does not show his grief over her death because he has "the patience to endure it now" (IV.iii.220). For him, the suppression of his

suffering must take precedence over the profound love he bears for his dear wife, Portia. After the loss of Portia as well as Caesar by a terrible criminal scheme, Brutus feared losing Cassius as well. If Cassius is actually “hot friend cooling” (IV.ii.22), then Brutus stands tirelessly lonely. Brutus now begins to understand that like Cassius he cannot live without their mutual love. The love that now flies to them is also impending death”. (Dove & Gamble, 1979:552).

Additionally, the spiritual punishment of Brutus deepened the sudden appearance of the ghost of Caesar. One of the effects of supernatural accidents is to give the public a sense of impending disaster, and that is what stealth does here. Brutus enjoyed a period of rest and serenity, but knowing that he had killed Caesar and that his crime has not achieved any of its noble goals, could never be far from his mind. Regardless of the nature of this supernatural power whether it is to have objective reality or to be just creating the troubled Brutus's mind, the spectre of Caesar has a great influence on Brutus psychological state. It also creates the impression that the ghost has a strong appearance which is felt continuously in the last half of the play. It proved that Caesar is more important dead than living. It is important to recall Brutus's assertion that he wanted to destroy the “spirit of Caesar” (II.i.180). Ironically, Brutus has not been able to destroy the spiritual existence of Caesar, but the reverse is true. As he sees the Ghost, he so agonizingly exclaims:

I think it is the weakness of mine eyes
That shapes this monstrous apparition.
It comes upon me. Art thou anything?
Art thou some good, some angel or some devil,
That mak'st my blood cold and my hair to store?
Speak to me what thou art. (IV.iii.219- 224)

Here, Brutus attacks psychologically the spirit of Caesar that comes to demand revenge against the criminals. The ghost of Caesar reminds us of Banco that appears before Macbeth. *Julius Caesar* and *Macbeth* parallel studies can be considered in “conspiracy and punishment” in that they both deal with the moral law thus, “cold blooded murder is an abnormal crime, and

the expected punishment for such a crime is death without death” (Iyengar, 1984:393). The desperation of the cause of Brutus and Cassius and the inevitability of their punishment are compounded by a series of ominous speeches in which the two tragic people appear to mean that the end is the most imminent. Both men were ahead of the possibility of defeating them. They do not mention it directly, but this feeling of defeat is tacitly reflected in the speeches in which they say farewell “forever and forever” (V.i.127). As is already mentioned, Brutus and Cassius have agreed that both will commit suicide on the field rather than be taken as prisoner.

As a result, Cassius kills himself, believing that Brutus’s men are out of hand and that Tintinius has been arrested. Pandarus, Cassius’s devoted bondsman who holds the sword his master falls on, refuses his own enfranchisement and decides to leave his country because he feels aggrieved at assisting his master in killing himself. Brutus’s heart-rending loneliness is deepened by the news that Cassius has committed suicide. He pays Cassius what tribute time allows. He designates Cassius “The last of all the Romans” (V.iii.111), and he promises a time for tears “ I owe more tears, To this dead man..., I shall find time, Cassius; I shall find time” (V.iii.114-116). Brutus now weeps for the pain-causing departure of his friend Cassius. His thoughts are concentrated on Cassius. He weeps the tears he has promised Cassius, who died for him as he must die for Cassius. In the meanwhile, an important transformation has taken place. Brutus’s criminal faction which sacrificed the individual for the good of the general has become, at the moment of his death, “a Comitatus, a loving band united in one aspiration: the loyalty of man to man” (Dove & Gamble, 1979:554). To them, Brutus declares his apocalypse, “Countrymen/ My heart doth joy that yet in all my life/ I found no man, but he was true to me” (Shakespeare, 2009:77). It is quite plain that this dying happiness converts his losing day to glory. The dying Brutus is nobler than ever the living Brutus had been. Strato, holding the sword on which Brutus runs himself, sees this death as freeing his master from his life’s bondage, “For Brutus only overcame himself” (V.v. 62). This abandonment of the difficult principles by Brutus undoubtedly reflects the intensity of the cumulative effects of his successive heavy losses. He is well aware of the belief that suicide is the supreme symbol of the ability of a wise man to be the



sole judge of his fate. It is the noble nature of Brutus who took him to suicide to atone for his crime, a blatant violation of human morality. Finally, it is Mark Antony who finds the accurate and right description to praise Brutus's nobility:

This was the noblest Roman of them all.
All the conspirators save only he,
Did that they did in envy of great Caesar;
He only in a general honest thought
And common good to all made one of them.
His life was gentle ; and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world 'This was a man! (V. v. 74-81)

Antony admits implicitly that the appellation 'noblest' qualitatively transcends Caesar's 'great' the reader needs to face in the contexts in Act V, Scene v with the analysis of Brutus's conspiracy. It is an unfortunate necessity, that surrounds the risk of failure, because it is considered an immoral act. All contexts are the appearance of the conspirators 'behaviour, not the essence of 'the common good to all' (V. v. 81). The truth of conspiracy appears only in the end to which it aims, but readers cannot be relied upon to understand this. The recommendation Brutus tenders 'Hide it in smiles and affability' (V. v. 82), appears more sorrowful than confident in his speech at the end. Although, the critics have seen Brutus is not a Machiavellian character because he insists to the very end by his own conscience that the assassination was not a crime, notwithstanding, they have given much critical effort to prove the contrast the play provides no evidence to doubt him in this judgment at least what is related within his own intentions are concerned for the main target toward Caesar. While Gloucester does not hold his ability to hide his own intentions but he also insists upon killing without conscience, which points out his manner is different from Brutus, for whom the act of killing must be responsible to a conscience which is considered a high court in the mind of the man and it will punish him as a part of psychology punishment that more than punished by the judgment of the court. However, Brutus does not understand the



Machiavellian point that circumstances too often reveal intention, that is clear when he says: "With this I depart, that as I slew my best lover for the good of Rome, I have the same dagger for myself, when it shall please my country to need my death." (II.ii.44-7). He seems incapable, for the best goals of preserving a distance between himself and the event, for killing Caesar simply and depart before the judgment of the people against them.

1.2. Conclusion:

Among the vast number of negative phenomena in society, crime appears at first sight to be one of the most widespread phenomena of Global concern. Shakespeare's plays give witness to his profound knowledge of human nature through the psychological inner. This knowledge is a product of his unique thoughts through the theme of criminal conspiracy and punishment throughout Shakespeare's drama. Thus, this study has attempted to address the phenomenon of criminal conspiracy and punishment in *Julius Caesar* (1599), and how they have committed a crime of conspiracy on the one hand and to punish the criminal and the administration of justice lies at the heart of this tragedy on the other hand. Although a tragic hero is always a nobleman who enjoys some status and prosperity in society, he has some moral weaknesses or imbalance that leads to his downfall throughout external circumstances and fate. The play focused on the role of the evil agents work on the hero. The evil forces cause the hero to make the wrong choices and innocent people always pay the price. In summing up, Shakespeare wants to teach his spectators and to advise them to be far from the effect of emotion because it, if not guided by reason, may lead to many complications that can easily be arranged by reason and conscience which can be governing the behaviour of the man. As a result, Shakespeare has succeeded in the depiction of punishment by conscience instead of the law and conspiracy against Caesar throughout the events, the alternate wresting and surrender of initiative, and above all of the responsiveness of the audiences to the influence of a supreme virtue in which the voice of good conscience prevail.



References:

- Al-khazaali, M. Hasan.(2017). 'The Human Frailty in William Shakespeare's *King Lear*'. *Int. J. of Adv. Res.* 5 (7). 108-111. <www.journalijar.com>. (Retrieved on 20 April, 2021)
- Charney, Maurice. (1961). *Shakespeare's Roman Plays: The Function of Imagery in the Drama*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Coward, Barry, and Julian, Swann. (2017). *Conspiracies and Conspiracy Theory in Early Modern Europe: from the Waldensians to the French revolution*. Routledge.
- Dove, J. R., and P. Gamble. (1979). "Lovers in Peace-Brutus and Cassius: Re-examination", *English Studies*, Vol. 60, No. 5.
- Griffin, Miriam., ed. (2009.) *A Companion to Julius Caesar*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hawkins, Harriett. (1972). *The likeness of Truth in Elizabethan and Restoration Drama*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press., p.148.
- Zghair, M. H. (2019). Reconsidering the Themes of "Law" and "Conscience" in the Select Plays of William Shakespeare: A Critical Study. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Acharya Nagarjuna University, India.
- Iyengar, K.R. Srinivasa. (1984). *Shakespeare: His World and His Art*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited, pp: 172-173.
- Kennedy, H. L., ed. (1981). *The Alexander Shakespeare*. London: Collins Publishers.
- Kernberg, Otto F., and Eve Caligor. (2005). "A psychoanalytic theory of personality disorders." *Major theories of personality disorder 2*: 114-156.
- Lyman, Michael. D. (2014). *Drugs in Society: Causes, Concepts and Control*. Anderson.
- O'Dair, Sharon.(1993). "Social Role and the Making of Identity in *Julius Caesar*", *Studies in English Literature*, Vol.33, Issue 2, Spring.
- Paolucci, Anne. (1960). 'The Tragic Hero in Julius Caesar.' *Shakespeare Quarterly* 11.3: 329-333.
- Roe, J. (2010). "Julius Caesar: Conscience and Conspiracy." In *William Shakespeare's Julius Caesar. Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations*. (pp. 67–115). Essay, Bloom's Literary Criticism.
- Ribner, Irving. (1957). "Political Issues in *Julius Caesar*". *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 56.1: 10-22.



- Schoenfeld, C. G. (1965). "The Superego's Influence on the Law", 14 DePaul L. Rev.299Availableat:<<http://via.library.depaul.edu/lawreview/vol14/iss2/3>>. (Retrieved on 31 May, 2021)
- Shakespeare, William. (2009). *Julius Caesar*. Dover Publications.
- .*Julius Caesar*. (1992). Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine (ed), New York: Washington Square. The most subsequent textual quotations of this play are taken for reference. Further references to this edition will appear parenthetically in the text.
- .*The Works of William Shakespeare: Coriolanus. Julius Cesar. Antony and Cleopatra. Cymbeline*. (2006).Vol. 8. New York.
- Vickers, Brian. (1985). *Towards Greek Tragedy*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Whitaker, Virgil, K. (1965). *The Mirror up to Nature: the Technique of Shakespeare's Tragedies*. Huntington Library.,p149.