KARADENIZ TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ * SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI DOKTORA PROGRAMI

POWER STRUGGLE IN SHAKESPEARE'S ROMAN TRAGEDIES: *CORIOLANUS,*
ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA* AND *JULIUS CAESAR

DOKTORA TEZİ

Fehmi TURGUT

ŞUBAT- 2015

TRABZON

KARADENIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY * THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

POWER STRUGGLE IN SHAKESPEARE'S ROMAN TRAGEDIES: *CORIOLANUS, ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA* AND *JULIUS CAESAR*

PhD DISSERTATION

Fehmi TURGUT

Thesis Advisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Zeki ÇIRAKLI

FEBRUARY- 2015

TRABZON

ONAY

Fehmi TURGUT tarafından hazırlanan "Power Struggle in Shakespeare's Roman Tragedies: *Coriolanus, Antony and Cleopatra* and *Julius Caesar"* adlı bu çalışma 06.02.2015 tarihin de yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda oybirliği ile başarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı dalında **doktora tezi** olarak Kabul edilmiştir.

Yrd.Doç. Dr. Mustafa Zeki ÇIRAKLI (Danışman-Başkan)

Prof. Dr. Mehmet TAKKAÇ (Üye)

Doç.Prof. Dr. Mustafa Naci KAYAOĞLU (Üye)

Doç.Prof. Dr. Ferit KILIÇKAYA (Üye)

Yrd.Doç. Dr. Serkan ERTİN (Üye)

Yukarıdaki imzaların, adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduklarını onaylarım.

Prof.Dr. Ahmet ULUSOY
Enstitü Müdürü

BİLDİRİM

Tez içindeki bütün bilgilerin etik davranış ve akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde edilerek sunulduğunu, ayrıca tez yazım kurallarına uygun olarak hazırlanan bu çalışmada orijinal olmayan her türlü kaynağa eksiksiz atıf yapıldığını, aksinin ortaya çıkması durumunda her tür yasal sonucu kabul ettiğimi beyan ediyorum.

Fehmi TURGUT
…/…/2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

CHAPTER TWO

ABSTRACT

This dissertation aims to study power struggle in Shakespeare's Roman tragedies *Coriolanus*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Julius Caesar.* The study employs a method of critical discourse analysis and borrows its terminology from the science of politics and sociology using the theories of New Historicism, Cultural Materialism and Orientalism in a way that it compares the fictional world of Shakespeare to the actual political arena of the contemporary world. These points of comparison and basis for analogy can provide the contemporary addressee with invaluable insights into the nature of political structure and universal/untimely power relations. The study therefore argues that power struggle in Shakespeare's Roman tragedies can be analyzed in terms of some political concepts. First, in *Coriolanus*, stern, conservative and humiliating discourse of the ruling class towards people and discourse showing social resistance against the Roman political and economic system foreground a social demand for "economic egalitarianism" that is believed to bring about political freedom with itself and to undermine "authoritarianism and elitism". Accordingly, the study associates Caius Martius' noncompliant and unconventional military discourse while transforming his military success into political with "militarism and military tutelage". Secondly, in *Antony and Cleopatra*, the study uses the concept of "orientalism" to analyze how the very discourse itself can have an influence upon the political relations and uncovers the Roman oriental discourse against the East, which is associated with "latent orientalism", "manifest orientalism" and "self and the other". Thirdly, in *Julius Caesar*, the study exploits the terms "agitation propaganda", "perception management", and "deep state operation" to analyze the conspiracies and allegations that lead to the assassination of a would-be dictator.

Key Words: Shakespeare, *Coriolanus*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Julius Caesar*, power struggle, discourse, politics

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı Shakespeare'in *Coriolanus, Julius Ceasar* ve *Antony ve Cleopatra* adlı Roma tragedyalarındaki güç mücadelesini incelemektir. Çalışma eleştirel söylem analizi yöntemini kullanmakta ve terminolojisini, Shakespeare'in bu oyunlarda yarattığı kurgusal dünyalarla yaşadığımız dünya arasında bir karşılaştırma yapacak şekilde Yeni Tarihselcilik ve Kültürel Materyalizm ve Oryantalizm teorilerini kullanarak siyaset ve sosyoloji biliminden almaktadır. Ortaya çıkan karşılaştırmalar ve benzerlikler, günümüz okuyucusuna politik konuların doğası ve evrensel güç ilişkileri hakkında önemli bakış açıları sağlayacaktır. Bu tez Shakespeare'in Roma Tragedyalarındaki güç mücadelesinin bazı politik kavramlar üzerinden incelenebileceğini ortaya koymaktadır. İlk olarak *Coriolanus* oyununda; yönetilen sınıfın, Roma ekonomik düzenine karşı toplumsal başkaldırısını 'egaliteryanizm', yönetici sınıfın, yönetilen sınıfa karşı katı, sert, tutucu, aşağılayıcı ve indirgemeci söylemini "yetkecilik ve seçkincilik", kendi askeri başarısını politik başarıya dönüştürürken Caius Martius'un uzlaşmaz ve sivil otoriteye boyun eğmeyen, askeri yetkeyi ve gücü kutsallaştıran tutum ve davranışlarını "militarizm ve askeri vesayet" kavramlarıyla ilişkilendirmektedir. İkinci olarak bu çalışma, *Antony ve Cleopatra* oyununda "Oryantalizm" ve "ben/biz ve öteki" kavramlarını, "gizli oryantalizm" ve "açık oryantalizm" kavramlarıyla ilişkilendirerek batı kültürünün doğu kültürüne bakış açısını incelemek için kullanmaktadır. Son olarak, bu çalışma, *Julius Caesar* oyununda; baş kahramanın diktatör olacağı algısı ve korkusu yaratılarak suikaste uğraması ile sonuçlanan süreci "ajitasyon propaganda", "algı yönetimi" ve "derin devlet operasyonu" kavramlarıyla analiz etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Shakespeare, *Coriolanus*, *Antony ve Cleopatra*, *JuliusCaesar*, güç mücadelesi, söylem, politika

INTRODUCTION

Can Shakespeare's political plays or Roman tragedies help us understand the contemporary political agenda and provide us with models to analyze political contexts in a consistent way? Or else, can we read Shakespeare's plays allegorically so that we can make up an analogy between the power relations in the contemporary world and the power struggle represented on the Shakespearean stage? Upon the consideration of these questions, this dissertation aims to study political discourse within the context of power struggle in Shakespeare's Roman tragedies *Coriolanus*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Julius Caesar*. To this end, first, this study reads *Coriolanus* in terms of egalitarian idea, elitism in direct relationship with authoritarianism, militarism and military tutelage. Second, it elaborates on *Antony and Cleopatra* with a focus on orientalism. Third, it analyses *Julius Caesar* in terms of agitation propaganda, perception management, and deep state operation. The premise of this study dwells on a curious theory that Shakespeare creates concepts of politics in the worlds he builds on the stage, synthesizing the past and the present in the future. This theory helps describe the way the worlds and societies created in these plays are governed, the way people of these worlds believe, the way they perceive themselves and others, and the way the rulers and the ruled deal with political issues. Therefore, this study suggests that Shakespeare, through a language of his own, deals with some political relationships, actions and situations that can be defined by relatively new and modern concepts.

Though the theory that drama creates concepts of politics and order on the stage is old, the application of this theory to Shakespearean texts is relatively a contemporary phenomenon. It would not be incorrect to claim that almost all concepts of politics and ideology possibly to be created out of Shakespeare's plays were unfamiliar to Shakespeare himself and his contemporaries, for the creation of these concepts is relatively new. Thus, this study tries to analyze and explain relatively old issues with relatively new terms and concepts. Whether Shakespeare was interested in politics, whether his plays reveal political meanings, and reflect political atmosphere of their time have always been a focus of

discussion. For some, Shakespeare was not a participant in the political issues and actions of his time. However, according to Allan Bloom (1964), he very successfully established political settings almost in all of his plays with characters who exercise capacities that can only be exercised in a political and social environment. One reason why "Shakespeare did not achieve a reputation as a deep thinker until the nineteenth century" (Cox, 2002: 107) was that only after the nineteenth century were modern social and political science and philosophy able to devise suitable terms and approaches to apply Shakespearean texts to scientific, philosophical and political analyses. Thus, it is historically true that Shakespeare's *Coriolanus, Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra* did not mean very much in terms of ideology and politics to the audience of the era in which they were written. However, with the introduction of New Historicism and Cultural Materialism into literary criticism, and with the use of Discourse Analysis in dramatic texts, which makes it possible to analyze language linked to social, ideological and political practices and language as a product of a system of thought, it has become clear to the critical minds that the plays hide political, ideological and sociological codes not only of their time but also of the modern times in the relationships between their characters, in their themes and subjects, and in their interests in, and concerns of the world affairs. It is for this reason that those who study Shakespeare's plays employ many more modern political, sociological, ideological, and even psychological terms and concepts in their analyses. All this led to the fact that, to understand both the ancient, and thus the modern world and life, the twentieth century literary criticism saw an immense upsurge in the interest in the olden texts, which brought an avant-gardist perspective to literary criticism since it motivated historians and critics of political thought, and also sociologists, to turn their faces to old great works of drama. With this critical perspective, art and life were no longer understood as detached from one another, and this avant-gardist approach put much emphasis in various ways on inserting art into life and society. This relationship between art and life made literature-drama in the context of this study- something much more than merely fine writing. The argument goes that literary people, just by tracing various genealogies and adapting clusters of historical and societal memories assume political, ideological and sociological positions. Shakespeare is no exception. After Greek plays, which are claimed to constitute the basis and theoretical background of Shakespearean dramatic perspective, Shakespeare's plays became the first source before modern times that provided researchers of politics and sociology with some valuable data about the ancestor founders of the

modern world. This focus of interest in Shakespearean texts led to the publishing of hundreds of thousands of books and papers. It also created an area of specialty and expertise in literary studies. Therefore, with these books and papers, it is not surprising that Shakespeare's plays provide more clues about the past, present and future, more information and knowledge about the science of politics, which has its roots deep in the history and which means they have a political nature. Murley and Sean (2006: 268) explain this political nature in Shakespeare's plays as follows:

> Political science is becoming ever more reliant on abstract statistical model and almost divorced from human judgment, hope, and idealism. William Shakespeare offers the political scientists an antidote to this methodological alienation, this self-imposed exile from the political concerns of citizens and politicians. Shakespeare… presents his characters as rulers, citizens, and statesman of the most famous regimes, governed by their respective law and shaped by their respective political and social institutions. The actions, deliberations, mistakes, and successes of his characters reveal the limitations and strengths of the regime, whether they be Athens, Rome, and England.

In *Coriolanus, Antony and Cleopatra* and *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare depicts Rome not only as London of his time or any other city or country but as a symbol of a microcosm as well. In this microcosm, from international relations to domestic and individual relations, from love and hate to hypocrisy and loyalty, all human actions are made apparent by Shakespeare. Shakespeare lets his characters play a political balance game in which every player must take his steps very carefully. The plays are a good example of what happens to in country whose leaders are trapped into a political conflict and a state of confusion where the game of politics is not played with the rules of politics. Unscrupulous power competitions, low-quality political criticism, envy of one another's power and authority, political manipulations and polarizations, egotism, false alliances, power-hunger, conspiracies and plots, all appear in any society very much similar to how Shakespeare depicts them in the three plays. Moreover, what makes the plays timeless and universal is the fragile dynamics and nature of politics. In *Julius Caesar*, what Cassius says to Brutus as to the assassination of Julius Caesar, either as a sign of guilt or of the need for washing the blood in their hands, hearts and minds, best summarizes this fragile and dynamic nature of politics: "How many ages hence/Shall this our lofty scene be acted over/In states unborn and accents yet unknown" (3.1.112-114), which is a prophecy that makes the play timeless and universal for the history of politics, which is full of such assassinations. In *Coriolanus*, Shakespeare creates universal and timeless characters and arguments: universal and timeless in that almost all countries have had their Caius Martiuses sometime in their

histories. Mussolini of Italy, Hitler of Germany, Augusto Pinochet of Chile, Oliver Cromwell of England, Franco of Spain, Kim Jong-un of North Korea, Lenin and Stalin of the former Soviet Union, all of whom have lots of traits in common with Caius Martius in terms of their relationships with their countries and citizens, are some examples. Just given the world we live in, which is full of social, political and economic unrest, a world over which wars have never ceased to flap their bloody wings, Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* resonates as contemporary as any play just written nowadays. Considering the time Shakespeare wrote the play, King James, with the conflicts between him and the parliament, is considered to be the Caius Martius of England: it was also a conflict between the patricians of England and its plebeians. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, Shakespeare creates another timeless and universal character: Cleopatra, a symbol of orientalism, a stereotype of oriental woman in the eyes of western man, an endless source of fascination, a lusty, intelligent and beautiful woman who may appear in most contemporary political and romantic dramas. *Antony and Cleopatra* is also universal and timeless because Shakespeare emphasizes the ever-lasting oppositions between love and politics, romance and reason, responsibility and pleasure, passion and emotion, which are very well-known to contemporary ears and eyes.

To the questions and suspicions whether Shakespeare was a political writer, the presence of kings, queens, soldiers, politicians, and rulers, all of whom, due to their responsibilities, dreams, desires and delusions, shortly human nature, play some very crucial political roles in any normal society, can be of some explanatory value. Shakespeare, both in his history plays and in his Roman tragedies, incessantly and very successfully, examines the boundaries between various classes in the society, the characteristics of political leadership, and the anatomy of politics, sociology and ideology as a discipline. According to Richard Eyre and Nicholas Wright (2000), the very existence of these plays in the Shakespeare canon reveals that politics fascinates Shakespeare very much. They put it that Shakespeare depicts a world of secular power with an enthusiastic curiosity, with a very highly developed sense of the workings of bureaucratic body of the governments and power struggles to rule these governments. Similarly, Allan Bloom (1964) considers Shakespeare as a political dramatists and claims that modern society and modern researchers need to recognize his ideas and beliefs in order to find both sources of and solutions to moral, social and political problems of the contemporary world. Though it

is possible to claim that Shakespeare is one of the rare literary people whose life experience, and social, political, economic and ideological standards of whose era constitute only a minority of those in their works, in other words, though Shakespeare should not and cannot be read fully autobiographically since his life and his time cannot provide us with the necessary information and data to understand his works, one cannot claim that Shakespeare can, and should, completely be isolated from England, Europe and European or Western thinking, culture, politics and ideology, and thus those of the world.

With a very long tradition of performances that aroused a deep sense of interest in the audience addressing issues of past and current events in micro and macro environments, thus encouraging public, political, social, ideological and economic consciousness and social transformation, the complexity and critical characteristics of political systems have long been a focus of interest in theatre. By its very nature, politics has dramatic attributes, which leads to the idea that politics is drama. Considering conspiracy theories, economic and sex scandals, jealousy, cynicism, secret alliances, groundless accusations, culture and class conflicts, corruption and wars, which are major sources of the dramatic conflicts, there is a strong association and similarity between politics and drama. The conventions in drama, the characters the scenes, the audience as public participation, the fixed forms on which it sets itself, all help understand the world (Williams, 1983). Given the idea that anything which comes up with a demand for changes in the way society is ruled is political, with its societal nature, with its demands for change, drama is the most political of all forms of art. Three qualities of drama, which make it different from other branches of art, make drama a social activity-a topic for social studies as well. One is the way it is performed: from the author to the director, to the actors and other staff, it is a group activity that requires some very strong cooperation during the process of performance. Second, it speaks directly to an audience. Third, drama questions human relationships within a given society. These social characteristics make drama a 'declaration': it is a social and political declaration, which aims to understand society, organize and reorganize it, transform and develop it. It reads off the society, the cultural codes that shape that society. In this respect, Shakespeare's plays reflect and respond to the aspects of the culture that creates them. This culture in *Coriolanus* is first economic, and then political in that it creates an atmosphere in which class and social divisions resources of problem. To put it in other words, Shakespeare depicts in the play a struggle between

the plebeians, who represent lower class or working class, and the patricians, who represent the upper class, or capitalism. It is also "a struggle between democracy, oligarchy and capitalism" (Murray, 1972: 253).

Shakespeare's Roman tragedies, with reference to the way they are engaged with politics, can be classified as what Jones (1922: 662) calls 'parallel plays'. He relates the term with satire in that "parallel plays cast ridicule upon a party or fraction by a display of the folly of their views in the action of the play." Jones sees *Coriolanus* as a parallel play which satirizes popular government, though there is nothing ridiculous in the play, which means drama also creates symbolic and "typical characters" (Jones, 1922: 662). From this perspective, drama has anthropological significance as well. Anthropologists deal with the concept of order and politics as symbols and devices that members of a society use in understanding their roles and places within that society (Roberts, 1979).In *Coriolanus*, *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, Shakespeare creates symbols of anthropological significance and value in terms of their roles and places in their micro and macro worlds. Caius Martius and Mark Antony are symbols of military power. In a world where international relations, economic issues and domestic policies are highly under the domination of military affairs, Martius and Antony are irreplaceable. This is why Octavius Caesar tries very hard to reconcile with Antony, why Caius Martius stands on his arrogant, elitist, and hard-line style while he is in a political campaign. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, Antony, as a powerful military figure, is a guarantee for the rise of Rome. In *Coriolanus*, Caius Martius symbolizes the safety of the status quo through militarism, military tutelage, and military oligarchy. Menenius, with his contempt for the plebeians, with his dependence on military power for the protection of the existing capitalist and oligarchic system, symbolizes civic oligarchy and capitalism. The plebeians, with their insistence on the implementation of the constitutional rights and roles, with their demands from the rulers, with their roles in the existing economic system, symbolize the working class, the units of participant democracy and equal citizenship.

Politics is defined as power by Weber (2004). He draws a strong relationship between leadership of a state or a society and politics. Since this leadership entails power to control and rule the state or the community, he equates politics with power. The problem is how this power is exercised in the hands of people who play their roles in the political

arena. Based upon Weber's understanding of the relationship between power and politics, Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*, *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, in which Shakespeare creates settings where power plays a crucial role and the way it is exercised creates political discussions, and where the most important problem is who will have it to rule, lead to a myriad of political and philosophical conflicts. In *Coriolanus*, the curtains open and close with a power struggle between Menenius, Caius Martius and the plebeians. This power struggle, from the beginning up until the end of the play, tells those who read and view the play through political lenses a lot about the boundaries within which the parties, namely Coriolanus as the symbol of military power, Menenius as the symbol of state authority or official ideology and the plebeians as the symbol of civic power, perform their roles. In *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare creates a political suspense thriller. The play is completely political in that it depicts "the death of the republic and the rise of the imperial Rome" (Hadfield, 2005: 167). In *Antony and Cleopatra*, Shakespeare takes his audience to a much wider political arena, ranging from Rome, the south-eastern edge of European culture and civilization, to Egypt, the heart of the-then-main center of the eastern political culture and civilization. Since the play has different geographies as its setting, it would be true to say that it draws a panorama of international politics. It includes love as a secondary theme; however, this is not a normal love. The play leads the critics to discussions as to whether love is in the service of politics or politics is in the service of love. The love affair between Antony and Cleopatra creates a great political, military and ideological tension both in the eastern and the western worlds (Preston, 2009).On the surface, the play appears to tell the ambitious love story between Antony and Cleopatra, a love which is corruptive when seen through western lenses since it takes Antony away from his real duties and responsibilities. The play actually becomes another political suspense thriller between Antony and Octavius Caesar, a bloody struggle for the domination of Rome over the rest of the world. Shakespeare blends in the play political struggle with emotional struggle. When Antony marries Caesar's sister Octavia, it becomes the point where emotional struggle is melted in political struggle, for this marriage is possible only for political considerations, notably in order to remind Antony of his real responsibilities and to empower the relationships between Caesar and Antony.

In politics, the concept of order is also regarded as an issue of structure and organization in various societal classes as well (Fukiyama, 2011). Almost all branches in

social studies, which help one another survive, deal with the concept of politics in some way or another. It is clear that literature, in which not only branches of social studies but also science and technology are the subjects, is no exception in terms of its relationship with the concept of politics. It has its own 'order theory' and 'order thesis'. A literary work may seem to depict at first glance a very chaotic environment, which is due to its tendency to violate the existing literary conventions and social, moral, political and ideological norms. However, as time passes, it makes its inner logic clear to its audience through critical lenses, which makes it open-ended, or open to infinity (Holland, 1992). It embraces man's complexity and unpredictability, and out of this complexity and unpredictability, it creates possibilities and opportunities to understand human experience. Literature naturally has characteristics of being political, social, scientific, and philosophical, for the first politicians, sociologists, and philosophers were literary people. This order thesis finds its origin in Plato and Aristotle. Plato argues against private property, which he considers as the source of corruption claiming that this will prevent them from devoting themselves to public duty and state affairs (Plato, 1993). However, according to Aristotle, when rule in a city state is based on the slave-master relationship, it is against the sine qua non of democracy, namely the ideal rule in a city-state which is based on the relationship among those who are free and equal, which means an ancient formulation participatory democracy(Aristotle, 1998). In *Coriolanus*, Shakespeare depicts a conflict between the Platonic view of order, one which Caius Martius and Menenius favor with reference to the plebeians' claims of rights on the national welfare, and Aristotelian order, one which is based on partnership, freedom and equality.

For economists, politics refers to the law of distribution of money, resources and goods (Hayek, 1948). Friedman (1962: 8) mentions the dual role that economics plays in a society as follows: "freedom in economic arrangements is itself a component of freedom broadly understood, so economic freedom is an end in itself. In the second place, economic freedom is also an indispensable means toward the achievement of political freedom." This is what the plebeians try to do in the play *Coriolanus*: to gain their political freedom through economic freedom. They very well know that without economic freedom, their political freedom is in danger. Shakespeare also opens the curtains in *Coriolanus* into a world where economics is one of the main issues and one of the main sources of problem

between Caius Martius and the Plebeians: this problem is the allocation and distribution of economic goods, namely wheat.

Dollimore (1994: 8) presents two ways as regards to the effectiveness of the theatre in a given society: "its capacity to instruct the populace to keep them obedient" and "its power to demystify the authority and even to subvert it." Either explicitly or implicitly, both ways have the potential to create polemical and political ends and discussions- polemical because they will have their counter-arguments and ideas in that society, and political because they demand some changes and transformations in the society. The relationship between literature and politics has created very heated discussions among literary circles. The language dominating and shaping the nature of these discussions have shown differences throughout history, but literature has never ceased, though in an indirect way, to inform, educate, and to influence man concerning his most important issues and problems. While doing this, it sets and employs political and ideological concepts as its means. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield (1985: 210) define these as "beliefs, practices, and institutions which work to legitimate the social order." Dollimore (1994: 9) also argues that ideology is composed of "the very terms in which we perceive the world." Such a perception can be shaped in the notions of the state, of power, of the exercise of power, of justice, of equality, and of freedom. Such notions, as Williams (1992: 127) puts it, can easily be detected in characters actions and dialogues: "Shakespeare's ideological stances can be seen in the words characters speak and actions they perform, or ideological stances of critics can be supported by the words and actions of Shakespeare's characters..." Hence, this study attempts to uncover Shakespeare's characters' political stances and what Dollimore and Sinfield (1985: 210) call as their 'beliefs, practices, and institutions' which they establish to legitimate their power or the social order in which they exercise power.

CHAPTER ONE

1. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

> A linguist deaf to the poetic function of language and a literary scholar indifferent to linguistic problems and unconversant with linguistic methods, are equally flagrant anachronisms.
>
> Roman Jacobson (1960: 377)

Shakespeare portrays in his plays worlds of paradoxes. The paradoxical nature of his dramatic worlds makes him no different from other poets in that he does not offer direct solutions to our problems and answers to our questions, especially if it is politics. The reason for this is that in politics the world is a place "where men play their public parts as soldiers, officers of state, justices and tradesmen, and the multiplying people swarm in the market-place or yawn in congregations" (Knights, 1965: 59), all of which are subject to interpretation while being decoded and examined in terms of the language they use not only in the real world but also in the one created in a literary work. Shakespeare's plays do not reveal meanings but produce meanings based upon their readings of Roman and English politics, and also the contemporary politics, for their characters use language and words as tools for communication, which make them participated in the act of building up the worlds in the plays, which requires both formal and contextual interpretation. This kind of interpretation requires the use of Critical Discourse Analysis, which primarily considers the social context the text is born into and the context the text is interpreted. Despite the common belief in academic circles that they are distinctive from one another, if there is only one thing that brings linguistics and literary studies together in a crossroad, it is Critical Discourse Analysis, which has emerged from the studies of critical linguistics (Wodak, 2006). Critical Discourse Analysis is therefore "both a theory and method" says Rogers (2011: 2) and adds:

> Researchers who are interested in the relationship between language and society use CDA to help them describe, interpret, and explain such relationships. CDA is different from other

discourse analysis methods because it includes not only a description and interpretation of discourse in context, but also offers an explanation of why and how discourses work (2).

Rogers also claims that the term Critical Discourse and the study of power relations can be associated with one another. Similarly, Fairclough (1989: 43) sees some very strong relationships between language and power.

I focus upon two major aspects of the power/language relationship, power in discourse, and power behind discourse... The section on power in discourse is concerned with discourse as a place where relations of power are actually exercised and enacted; I discuss power in 'face to face 'spoken discourse, power in, 'cross-cultural' discourse where participants belong to different ethnic groupings, and the 'hidden power' of the discourse of the mass media. The section on power behind discourse shifts the focus to how orders of discourse, as dimensions of the social orders of social institutions or societies, are themselves shaped and constituted by relations of power.

Thus, this dissertation aims to study power struggle in Shakespeare's Roman tragedies using critical discourse analysis, as already suggested, and borrows its terminology from the theories of politics and sociology such as New Historicism, Cultural Materialism and Orientalism. The study compares the fictional world of Shakespeare to the actual political arena of the contemporary world, that is to say, it refers to a readerly context in the interpretative act of the critical stance. The points of comparison and basis for analogy in the present study provide the contemporary reader with insights into the nature of political structure and universal/untimely power relations implied and represented in Shakespeare's fictional/dramatic world(s). The study argues that power struggle in Shakespeare's Roman tragedies can be analyzed in terms of some political concepts. First, in *Coriolanus*, intimidating discourse of the ruling class is analyzed in terms of "economic egalitarianism," "authoritarianism and elitism," and "militarism and military tutelage." Secondly, in *Antony and Cleopatra*, the study lays emphasis on "orientalism" as having a remarkable influence on perspective revealed through various discourses. Thirdly, in *Julius Caesar*, the study deals with discourse according to "agitation propaganda," "perception management," and "deep state operation" that lies behind the power relations escalating the struggle to undermine the existing order.

Political and social implications of Shakespeare's plays analyzed in this dissertation are primarily concerned with the political discourse representing the socio-political patterns in society, which the micro and macro-worlds Shakespeare builds up in these

plays reveal. In a relatively narrower context, by investigating, explaining and interpreting this discursive praxis adopted by the various Shakespearean characters, this study dwells on some political, sociological, economic and ideological concepts with reference to some open, hidden, concealed, embedded, instilled, implanted, inscribed or imbued messages between the lines of the language used in these plays. These direct and indirect messages accompany through the course of action in the plays by Shakespeare and are particularly indicative in Roman tragedies. This study maintains the fact that, in these political pieces, discourse elements and rhetorical suggestions wrought in discourse are of significance. The study also devotes considerable space for perception, how the characters perceive themselves and conceive of the others in the societal and political quarters and how this is represented and revealed in their discourse. To this end, the study carries out a sort of reading which can be termed as an act of slow reading with a critical eye on the discourse of the Roman plays. The analysis is not characterized as quantitative; rather, the slow reading adopted in this dissertation is mainly based upon the critical readings-critical discourse analysis- of the representative passages that provide its audience with deliberate word choices, selection of rhetorical patterns, administrative skills on the determination of certain perceptions and manipulating distortions of certain expressions. All these are subject to the critical readings in this dissertation which to decode, deconstruct and unveil ostensibly vague, discursively ambivalent, expressively direct or indirect codes, suggestions and implications of the political discourse. Considering these relationships, this study aims to interpret how Shakespeare creates his characters, the conflicts and the tensions, and even the resolutions based on power relations in *Coriolanus*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Julius Caesar*. In *Coriolanus*, it is between the plebeians and the patricians, in *Antony and Cleopatra*, it is between the Rome and Egypt, between Mark Antony, Octavius Caesar and Lepidus, in *Julius Caesar*, it is between the Popupares and the Optimates. The power relations in these plays mainly exhibit their characteristics in words- namely the language- used by their characters. The language the characters use in the plays reveals their attitudes towards each other, and what this study intends to do is to conceptualize these attitudes. Hence, the plays are viewed as "parts of the whole process of social interaction" (Fairclough, 1993: 24). Furthermore, Fairclough explains the role of Critical Discourse Analysis in exploration and interpretation of the whole process of social interaction as "a factor that secures the power and hegemony" claiming that discourse analysis explores:

> …the relationships of causality and determination between ... discursive practice, events and text, and ... wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power (135).

Fairclough (1989: 26) also refers to three levels of discourse: "description, interpretation and explanation." This study focuses on two of them: interpretation and explanation which are "concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context–with the social determination of the processes of production and interpretation, and their social effects" (26). The text in Fairclouhg's words refers to the plays which this dissertation studies, what Fairclough means by discursive practice is the words Shakespeare makes his characters utter to influence, shape and then lead to the interpretation of the events in the plays, social and cultural structures are the social and cultural spheres the Plebeians and the Patricians come from in the play *Coriolanus,* understanding of state and ruling of *Julius Caesar*, the Rome, the east as viewed from the Rome, Egypt, Cleopatra and Mark Antony in the play *Antony and Cleopatra*. According to Jorgensen and Phillips (2002: 6), "representations of worlds are partly linguistic-discursive." They claim that meanings have some historical and cultural characteristics, and social-interaction plays a very crucial role in the creation of knowledge**,** which is why cultural, political and social studies take Critical Discourse Analysis as one of their most important constituent part. Whether it takes the literary work-the play, the novel, the poem or the short story- as a complete and finished work from a structuralist perspective or as merely a text from a post-structuralist perspective, unfinished and incomplete yet, which is always in a state of continuity in terms of meaning and interpretation, Critical Discourse Analysis uses Barthesian idea that "it is language which speaks and performs in the text" (Moreno, 2014: 74).

The arguments developed in the three plays under analysis in this study have a political nature in that they are "fundamentally about making choices about how to act in response to circumstances and goals, ... about choosing policies, and such choices and actions which follow from them are based upon practical arguments" (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012: 1). This political nature is also influenced by the use of such concepts and terms as power, hegemony, conflict, domination control and struggle (Fairclough, 1995 and 1989; Giddens, 1985 and 2001; van Dijk, 2008). Fairclough (1989) clarifies the ultimate goal of political discourse as one that is employed for specific social purposes.

Within the context of this study the term 'social' tends to be a comprehensive one in which economics, politics, militarism are included. Howarth and Stavrakakis (2000: 1) call it "new discursivity", which they believe will fill in a huge gap in the study of discourse analysis since traditional discourse analysis has neglected to deal with:

> Examination of populist and nationalist ideologies; the discourses of new social movements; the political construction of social identities; the forms of hegemonic struggle; different logics of collective action; the formulation and implementation of public policy; and the making and unmaking of political institutions; not to mention the traditional topics of political science, such as voting behavior and political decision-making(2).

The footsteps of strategies Shakespeare's characters use in the three plays to create their social identities, the forms of hegemonic struggle and the voting process and Caius Martius and the plebeians' attitudes in this process in *Coriolanu*s, collective action in *Julius Caesar* to delegitimize Caesar, formulation and implementation of Roman state policy in *Antony and Cleopatra* to orientalize and discredit Antony are the focus of interest of political discourse analysis in this study.

Labov (2001) refers to two stylistic modes of political discourse: casual and careful. In *Julius Caesar*, beginning with Flavius saying "Hence! home, you idle creatures get you home" (1-1-1) and ending with Octavius saying "So call the field to rest; and let's away,/ To part the glories of this happy day" (5.5.80-81), and in Antony and Cleopatra beginning with Philo saying " Nay, but this dotage of our general's/ O'erflows the measure ..." (1.1.1-2) and ending with Octavius Caesar saying "And then to Rome. Come, Dolabella, see/High order in this great solemnity"(5.2.368-369), all characters use what Labov calls careful political discourse. In Coriolanus, the opening speeches of the plebeians can be considered as casual discourse at first. However, what begins as casual later transforms into a very careful political discourse and Shakespeare gives a very careful public voice, class conscience, political awareness, social and political identity to the plebeians. This study seeks to uncover in the three plays what Chilton and Schaffner (2002: 5) describe as "politics -struggle for power, the struggle between those who seek to assert and maintain their power and those who seek to resist it", If politics is, as defined by Chilton and Schaffner," cooperation, the practices and institutions a society has for resolving clashes of interest over money, power, liberty and the like" (5), and if we develop and use "a variety of techniques to get our won way: persuasion, rational argument, irrational strategies,

threats, entreaties, bribes, manipulation" (5), which require some certain "kinds of linguistic action-that is, discourse" (5), Critical Discourse Analysis is considered to be the best method to use in the study.

This study also takes on one of its point of departure what Cultural Materialism and New Historicism bring to literary criticism as theory and methodology: placing primary emphasis on historical and socio-political context. There is a common belief among Shakespeare scholars that the turning point in Shakespeare criticism in the twentieth century is 1985 when J. Dollimore and A. Sinfield published their seminal book *'Political Shakespeare'*. Before 1985, much of Shakespeare studies dwelled on his dramatic style and artistry as a genius of universal scale who knitted universal issues typical of man with great aplomb and with great dramatic talent in his plays. Paul Brown, Leonard Tennenhouse, Graham Holderness, Stephen Greenblatt, Kathleen McLuskie, Morgot Heinemann were the contributors with their essays in *Political Shakespeare* to this new trend of Shakespearean criticism: one in which they tried to explain the political present with reference to Shakespeare's plays written in a faraway past (Dollimore and Sinfield, 1994). The book borrowed the term Cultural Materialism from its recent use by Raymond Williams. Williams (1983) established and developed his approach named Cultural Materialism in *Culture and Society*, in which, in the ideological atmosphere of the cold war era, he emphasized the continuity between culture and society in a retrospective manner; and the *Long Revolution*, in which he deals with institutions and discourses by exploring ways of understanding the meaning, the nature, the production and continuity of culture and individual interrelationships within the society, which will also be the main focus of the present study. Also in his *'Drama in Performance'*, Williams (1954: 116) surveyed the relationship between staging practices and social developments. He summarizes this as follows:

> Many writers no longer conceive their themes in a naturalist way. The emphasis has changed, in the mind, from the presentation of apparent behavior to a very different process: the process of attempting to discover a pattern, a structure of feeling, which is adequate to communicate, not merely the acknowledged and apparent, but the whole and unified life of man. One can see, in certain contemporary novels, and in certain plays, that the theme is obviously of this kind.

What Williams emphasizes as 'contemporary issues as performance analysis and the meaning of drama' seems to be in line with the fact that drama presents a socio-political totality and dramatist portrays this totality on the stage (Higgins, 1999). While presenting this social totality, the dramatist creates social and political norms, principles, rules and concepts on the stage that govern a society. Shakespeare can be considered the first to change the emphasis that Williams mentioned: more political, more social, and more (multi)cultural, and more ideological societies he created in his works. Raising objections to Tillyard's idea of cosmic order (1954), Dollimore and Sinfield (1994) develop a new perspective in Shakespeare criticism, ably combining Cultural Materialism with its American counterpart New Historicism. For them, the world Shakespeare creates in his play is political. The combination of Cultural Materialism and New Historicism create an environment in which the critic interprets a literary text with a focus on contemporary political agenda. Cultural materialists are more interested in how a literary work can be applied to the world where and to the time when it is read than how it might have been understood and interpreted by its audience at the time. Hence, cultural materialism develops a way, both as a theory and method, to reassess political and ideological and social issues (Sinfield, 2006) by focusing on political, ideological and social systems referring to political practices and structures, which makes it closer to the field of politics. This sort of reading, Sinfield writes, is "strenuous reading" (198), one which places the literary text on a sphere in the political and ideological continuum. Thus, it tries to uncover ideological, political, societal and economic terms and concepts analyzing the discourse that hides such terms and concepts in a literary work. The relationship between New Historicism and Cultural Materialism, Parvini (2012) argues, is that both try to explain political issues in a literary work and then fix a position accordingly. This study, through political and sociological lenses, tries to set this position in Shakespeare's *Coriolanus, Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra* through a deep reflection and analysis of political, sociological and ideological issues. It does so because *Coriolanus*, according to Hazlitt (1817: 88), is a play in which Shakespeare is made himself very much involved in state affairs and politics. He argues that 'the play is a store-house of political commonplaces' and writes as follows:

> The arguments for and against aristocracy or democracy, on the privileges of the few and the claims the many, on liberty and slavery, power and the abuse of it, peace and war, are here very ably handled, with the spirit of a poet and the acuteness of a philosopher.

It does so because, in *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare cannot have missed the role and function of history as a guide to teach politics and sociology, which was a movement fueled by the Renaissance ideology. Shakespeare is believed to have written the *Tragedy of Julius Caesar* in 1599. *Of the English Republic*, by Sir Thomas Smith, a political and legal figure of his time and also a member of Parliament, was published in 1583. In the treatise, Smith, with reference to Rome, discusses political issues and political institutions in England (Dewar, 1964).This study also bases itself implicitly on a theory and assumption of its own that Shakespeare might have been strongly influenced by Sir Thomas Smith, claiming that he depicts the political atmosphere in England with reference to classical Rome. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, the study refers to an insidious, and a deadly game of power, and it argues that power in the play acts as a strong source of political force. Therefore, the analysis of Shakespeare's plays require some general references to and discussions of the political, ideological and social structure of not only his era but also later eras. As a matter of fact, England provided Shakespeare with the necessary material to use in his plays. Shakespeare's England, with a feudal society, ruled by feudal aristocracy and feudal state organization, was a country where a great majority of people were exploited. Naturally, feudal bourgeois minority, with economic, political and societal power in their hands which was disproportionate to their number, created social, political and economic crises. The era also witnessed the blossoming of the first seeds of nationalism and patriotism as a result of the defeat of the Spanish Armada, victory over internal disputes, and the first and the most efficient centralized government until then established by Elizabeth I. But still, the era in which Shakespeare wrote can be described as one of conflict, hardship and oppression. It was inevitable that His plays would be influenced by this chaotic political atmosphere. This study also aimed to uncover sources, signs, discussions, objections, and reflections of such characteristics of the era in Shakespeare's *Coriolanus, Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra.*

Though there are some differences between these two approaches such as that Cultural Materialists attack the dominant ideologies and their institutions, while the New Historicists focus on the dominance itself, and that New Historicists put the concept and acts of power in the center of literary criticism, while Cultural Materialists the production of cultural change (Milner, 1993; Knowles, 2004; Colebrook, 1997; Hopkins, 2005), "the two approaches remain closely aligned" (Makaryk, 1993: 24).With Cultural Materialism

and New Historicism, "... all criticism is political, and the critic, obliged to acknowledge the biases and thwarts of any reading, is free to use that reading in the service of contemporary political agenda", writes Allman (1999: 9), which is what the present study is also set to do: it will read Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*, *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra* in the service of contemporary political agendas. New Historicism, first coined by Stephen Greenblatt (1987) as a theory applicable to literary criticism, which he calls Poetics of Culture, establishes theoretical and interpretive practices with a focus on the idea that social and political relations, shortly power relations, provide the ideal context for both literary and non-literary texts. He argues that based upon a relationship between themselves and the socio-cultural context in which they are written and read, texts do not only reveal the societal forces that represent and constitute a society within a historical context but also shed light on the socio-political, cultural and economic processes by creating an economic metaphor that explains how they contribute to the distribution of socio-political energy. According to New Historicists, the material conditions of a culture hide in itself the way the members of that culture express themselves (Barry, 2002).They approach a text with an eye for how it reveals the economic, political and social realities because they believe the text produces ideological, political and sociological concepts. Researchers point to two major changes New Historicism has undergone: the first occurred in the United States when literary critics started to use it as the dominant discourse in their studies of the English Renaissance. Those who studied feminism, Marxism, and other political and social discourses created the second change. With reference to these two changes, Carolyn Porter (1990: 256) argues that new historicism, cultural criticism and formalist practices constitute "a common ground" in literary studies which is called "discourse" or "the social text." Thus, according to New Historicists, there is a mutual interactive relation between history, culture and literature: it is that literature is made within a social and cultural context, history and culture can be made within a literary work (Gallagher and Greenblatt 2000; Pieters 2001; Barry 2002). This relationship can be formulated as follows: literature that makes culture and history, culture and history that make literature. Hence, literary interpretation gains a political and cultural perspective that gives way to the establishment of strong bonds between the literary texts and the political and cultural environments in which they are created and read. This also leads to the idea that though all criticism is a product of its own era, it is open to a contemporary understanding of history and literature, which equips literary texts with timeless social,

political, historical and ideological nature (Eagleton, 1996). Montrose (1992: 395), one of the leading minds of New Historicism, explains this nature as follows:

> The emergent social-political-historical orientation in literary studies is characterized by an anti-reflectionist perspective on cultural work, by a shift in emphasis from the aesthetic analysis of verbal artifacts to the ideological analysis of discursive practices, and by an understanding of meaning as situationally and provisionally constructed.

Montrose (1996: 33), in *The Purpose of Playing* comes up with discussions of the tensions among theatre, city, and state, and the (un)reliability of attempting to use theatre as a political tool, and reveals unknown cultural complexities that not only shaped the drama but also were shaped by drama with a focus on Shakespeare's comedies and tragedies:

> Shakespeare generates dramatic action by combining conflicts grounded in such fundamental cultural categories as ethnicity, lineage, generation, gender, political function and social rank. Interpersonal conflicts- and also intrapersonal ones- give human and dramatic embodiment to ideological contradictions.

Within the context of theory and methodology, introducing a comprehensive social and historical approach to literature, and focusing on the relationships between literature and history, politics and ideology, Jerome J. McGann (1988: 63) seems to have paved the way to Montrose's assertions:

> … the governing context of all literary investigations must ultimately be an historical one. Literature is a human product, a humane art. It cannot be carried on (created), understood (studied), or appreciated (experienced) outside of its definitive human context. The general science governing that human context is socio-historical.

It is also this relationship that this study intends to base its theoretical and methodological ground on. In this socio-historical context are also included socio-cultural, socio-economic, socio-political and ideological contexts. The plays this study analyzes present vivid scenes of such contexts.

As in any theory of literary criticism, new historicism and cultural materialism have their own pitfalls as well. One is argued by Maguire (2004: 4): by analyzing Shakespeare's works work within these contexts, new historicism and cultural materialism "have brought with them not only new discoveries but also new dangers: their specialist vocabularies

have made Shakespeare criticism less accessible to the ordinary reader." With new critical theories, as in the case of Cultural Materialism and New Historicism, all political and ideological movements find or (re)invent something in Shakespearean texts to suit their needs and positions. This is why in contemporary critical literature there are many Shakespeares: "Shakespeare the royalist, Shakespeare the republican, Shakespeare the capitalist, the libertarian ... the sentimentalist, the champion of women's rights, ... Marxist Shakespeare, classist Shakespeare, aesthetic and pathetic, Ricardian, Stoppardian" (Bloomfield, 2012: para. 4). Also this study has its own vocabulary , which those who keep themselves detached from politics, sociology, ideology and economics will experience some difficulty in understanding. Additionally, some other critics come up with the idea that what new historicism does within a literary text may not be visible to the naked eyes since it "resisted systematization" (Gallaher and Greenblatt, 2000: 1). Gallaher and Greenblatt argue that ..". new historicism is not a coherent, close-knit school in which one might be enrolled or from which one might be expelled (19)", which might be a point of negative criticism probably to be directed to any study, and thus to the present one, which uses both cultural materialism and new historicism, on the ground that these theories are not visible within the text, and not very well systematized.

Foucault's emphasis on power and on discourse provides another point of departure for this study. Foucault (1984) argues that power relationships can be seen in any sphere of any given society and they extend to cultural, political and economic aspects of that society, and that power relations do exist between individuals or groups, and these relations influence the end-products of their actions, which makes them complex and distinctive. Complex power relations set the worlds, the societies, the states, the systems, and the nature of the politics in the plays *Coriolanus*, *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*. From a Foucauldian perspective, in terms of their capability of action and choice, Shakespeare's *Coriolanu*s, *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra* are full of power relations that influence almost all characters taking part in the plays dramatically. Foucault argues that power relations, as actions with specific structures influence the actions in which free members of a society. To put it other words, Foucault (1984)claims that power relations cannot exist unless both parties are capable of action**.** In *Coriolanus*, Caius Martius is capable of action, as a commander and military leader, and he rejects the authority and power to act given to the plebeians by the Roman constitution, which creates

the tension in the play, turning it into a political power struggle. The Plebeians, though very limited, are also capable of action since they have the right to vote for or against Caius Martius' consulship, or else they try to extend their capacity to take action both in economic and political quarters.

In any society, potentiality of dramatic approach to relationships among various spheres, to cultural and political relationships as a whole that constitute the makeup and transformation of that society cannot be denied. This is why drama has witnessed some brutal pressure and censorship especially in conservative and closed societies. The society in which Shakespeare was born, grew up, formed his dramatic, political and artistic identity, and wrote his plays was no exception. Shakespeare, through his innovative use of history and historical figures in his plays as source material, provides illuminating and foreshadowing insights and projections into the political and cultural characteristics of England. Asquith (2005) alleges that, in a time of censorship and propaganda during which people, whether they be of lower or higher classes, were banned from the subjects of religion and politics, during which people were trapped between being the subjects of the God or of the King, namely the monarch, during which an unprecedented authoritarianism flapped its wings over England, the one similar to what she witnessed in the former Soviet Union, during which England was no different from what call now 'a militarist or police state', Shakespeare, the greatest genius of all times, can't have remained indifferent. She argued that Shakespeare, through a hidden language that was specific to himself only and keeping a delicate balance, with his sophisticated artistic quality and talent , allowed his readers to have some insights into the political, social and ideological order of his time. A similar theory comes from Pierce (1971: 3): "If a man stands at the center of drama in Shakespeare's plays, it is public man, man as a ruler, courtier, warrior, or a citizen", he says and continues: "Implicit in the events and explicit in the speeches of the characters are some of the timeless issues of public life. "Caius Martius in the play *Coriolanus* stands in the center of the play as a military figure as commander, and a political figure as a candidate for the senate. The plebeians and their representatives in the senate also stand at the very center of the play as political figures. Menenius is another political figure. Their actions and speeches reveal political stances they hold in the play. All characters in *Julius Caesar* are the players of a political power game. While Caesar tries to extent and exercise his power through populist tactics, Brutus, Cassius, Cinna and other senators, as the

oligarchs and elites of the Rome, try to oppose Caesar, which implies balancing Caesar's power. The crisis in *Antony and Cleopatra* is created by political discussions as to the establishment of a powerful Roman Empire. Hence, this study attempts to uncover the political, ideological and sociological sides of this public life referring to contemporary terminologies named and used by political critics, sociologists and philosophers many years after Shakespeare.

The most ancient and the most grounded theory on which the study sets itself is that of Aristotle. Over two millennia ago, Aristotle believed that, by seeing plays on the stage, people would experience emotional relief from negative feelings such as pity, fear, and anger (Sachs, 2006).This emotional cleansing was believed to be beneficial to both the individual and society, which gave drama a social role. Sometimes it became a means of both individual and group revolt against the authority deriving its origin from the Greek drama, at times it became a means of propaganda as in the Medieval age and, as in the Eighteenth-century utilitarianism, it appeared as a social movement. Thus, drama has become not merely a literary and artistic phenomenon but a social and political one as well. The study also deals with Shakespeare's use of drama to create political, social and ideological awareness among people. The theory in this study goes that Shakespeare, by taking up politically, sociologically and ideologically sensitive issues, almost all of which were a taboo before, during and a couple of centuries after his time, and by presenting them on the stage in an unprecedented realistic manner, tried to make changes and transformations not only the English society of his time but also of later eras.

Another theoretical insight into the dramatic text is that the traits and characteristics of the dramatist, and the characters he creates on the stage, can both influence and be influenced by social and political events and relationships (Bowie, 1993). It is this inter-relationship between drama, society and politics that makes it possible to gather information, insights, ideas and theories out of the text about the era in which it is created and into which it is carried. This is in line with what is mentioned before in this study as to the anthropological significance of dramatic texts. It is also possible to come up with arguments on the future political and social concepts, trends and movements based upon the dramatic text. When taken from this perspective, drama has a role to socialize and politicize events, ideas and concepts. The way it does this is sometimes through idealizing

and sometimes criticizing them. In either case, drama gives the opportunity to conduct sociological and political observations and evaluations. Like any other event which is planned, organized and happens in a social environment, and whose consequences may create some sociological and political considerations and discussions, drama is also a social event, since it aims at a social group, and since it is written and performed in a social environment. With such characteristics, drama influences the society, helping the transformation of society, inspiring leaders, proposing alternative solutions to social and political problems, and also creating alternative social, political and economic models. This is related to drama's characteristic of becoming or creating a model world and order. Thus, "drama in a variety of forms and contexts, can make, and indeed has made, positive political and social interventions in a range of developing cultures across the world"(Boon and Plastow, 2004: 1). This is a laudable but strange and old conviction shared by a dearth of dramatists including classical and modern ones: "by writing plays and putting them on stage, playwrights could create a change in the way society is structured" (Patterson, 2003: 1), which is one of a myriad of various characteristics that distinguish drama from other forms of art: notably, drama is more social and more political. According to Patterson, even in itself, this characteristic of drama may vary:

> In terms of content, some plays are clearly more determinedly political than others, but it should be equally clear that it is impossible to parade characters interacting socially in front of a public assembled to witness these relationships without there being some political content. Thus even the silliest farce or most innocuous musical will reflect some ideology, usually that of the Establishment. In this sense, all theatre is indeed political (3).

If a theory, movement or idea is political, it demands change in the matters it deals with. This means drama concerning itself with social relationships involving authority and power and with the act of governing plays a political role in the lives of peoples and nations. As an end product of this focus of concern, drama reveals social or socio-political messages or declarations. One of these declarations is about political order. Either explicitly or implicitly, political drama creates concepts of order, either criticizing or idealizing the existing political values and principles. This characteristic of drama is not new. Playwrights with their dramatic texts and actors on the stage, with their performances passing through the filters of directors urge us to perceive and conceive that they are "someone other than themselves, the desire to represent the words, vocal inflections, posture and gestures, first, of someone known to us, and later, of some imagined or

imaginary figure" (Storey and Arlene, 2005: 62). It is clear that in ancient times, poets and philosophers used dramatization as a form of writing or behavior . But as an art-form, it certainly has its beginning at Athens in the sixth century with the establishment by the tyrants of a new festival in honor of Dionysos (Storey and Allan, 2005). The context in which drama was created made it a political means, for it was first 'polis', the way it was governed, the roles its citizens were supposed to play, and the relationship between the polis and its constituents. Thus, Storey and Arlene (2005: 68-69) fix the relationship between drama and politics as follows:

> To many modern critics, the political content of tragedy is equally evident. In both its themes and its language, tragedy can be seen to be an extension of the political debates carried on in the law courts, assemblies, and councils of contemporary Athens, where its citizens were continually redefining themselves and their city through the enactment of new laws or the introduction of new policies that altered to a greater or lesser degree the social institutions that we identified as the subject of debate in drama. Like comedy, tragedy takes the institutions of the city as its point of reference, but these are embedded in a framework of myth, in stories peopled with the great names of tradition, Agamemnon, Odysseus, Oedipus, Theseus, and the like. On the surface, then, it is more difficult for tragedy to be as blatantly topical as comedy, but this does not prevent it from addressing questions of political importance for the polis.

Thus, this relationship is highly based upon the way drama questions "the polis", or in today's terms "the society", which leads to the occurrence of several questions to our minds: Does drama contribute to the formation of classes in a society? Does it help people define themselves in terms of identity and nationality? Does it derive people's attentions and interest towards political, social and governmental issues? Participation of people in dramatic activities serves two political and social purposes in a society: the first one is that drama, as in the polis in ancient Greek, creates a sense of attachment in people to the society in which they were born. Second, drama designs an atmosphere in which people in a society view themselves as members of that society. From this perspective, Shakespeare's plays can be said to have displayed a perfect relationship between man and society, to have transformed their audience into political and ideological beings and to have helped them build their ideal social orders. Perhaps this is why Euben (1986: 2) writes that "Greek tragedy shaped classical political theory, and it also shaped the tradition of political theory as a whole." In a sense, drama plays a role to make alterations in the flow of history, and hasten social and political changes throughout history. Based on all the related theories and methods already mentioned, the underlying theory behind this study is that, changing Shakespeare's famous quote "All the world is a stage" (As You Like It,

2.7.139)into 'All the stage is a world', drama is the exact representation of life and the world we live in. It also implies some future projections, the unseen of the present, and the hidden and the buried facts of the past and the probable, the possible or the ideal of the future, creating political, ideological and sociological concepts, ideas and images. Great plays make us live in a thousand worlds, each of which is a part of ours, whose rules, principles, codes, values were not determined at the time. Thus, they provide us with the opportunity to explore the way in which the world is viewed and experienced by members of a social group in a particular society in the olden days. It is a very effective way of understanding a culture of a particular time, or of a particular class, or social or ethnic group, which lets us understand how diverse times, cultures and classes are different, and how they are alike, which means "Without this understanding of the range of human experience in its continuities and possibilities, we live in a claustrophobic world in which we cannot make meaningful discriminations" (Lye,2002: para.5).Placing all these roles played by drama as a literary and artistic form, and its ideology and world-view theses in the center, this study suggests that Shakespeare, through power struggles he made his characters involved in, much more meticulously, effectively, vividly and influentially than any other playwrights, seeded some political, sociological and ideological concepts between the lines of his plays, some of which were unnamed in his time, but later have become major issues in political sciences.

Reading Shakespeare also requires a thorough study of the relationships between drama and order before Shakespeare: the heritage Shakespeare received. In terms of dramatic conventions, critics see no similarity between Greek plays and Shakespeare's plays, claiming that Greek plays were dedicated to dramatic unity, but Shakespeare's plays to dramatic variety (Chapman, 1915). However, in terms of theme and subject, and the way Greek plays dealt with social and political issues, Shakespeare's plays seem to be the continuation of a theatrical tradition. Greek poets came up with arguments in their works both for and against the view of some forms of state or concepts of state and order, thus creating a social and political variety. After many centuries, Shakespeare did the same in most of his plays. Nevertheless, critical commentaries linking Shakespearean plays with Greek plays are varied. Some sent references to very important commonalities between Greek plays and Shakespeare's plays. Claiming that Greek tragedies were not taught in grammar schools, some argued that Shakespeare had very limited use of Greek tragedies

and antiquity in their plays. However, the plays attributed to Shakespeare's authorship are too complex and varied in terms of their language, dramatic conventions, characterizations, references to mythology and thematic issues for a brain educated in a grammar school. In *Shakespeare and the Classics*, Thomson (1956: 27) argues that Shakespeare's plays are full of references to Greek plays:

> Shakespeare works in the Greek way upon the knowledge of his audience in order to produce the effect of tragic irony. . .The boastful language of Caesar is very like those hubristic utterances which proceed from great persons in Greek tragedy on the verge of their downfall (27).

Since history of drama has seen a long and deep rooted tradition of dramatic writings and stage performances dealing with social, political and ideological issues, analysis of plays written in any period would give a great deal of information to sociologists and social anthropologists in that these plays use a similar way to that used by sociologists and social anthropologists. Making an addition to this, the study tries to analyze three of Shakespeare's plays through the lenses of a political scientist. If we take drama as an important historical source for the era, the society, the country and the political and economic systems in which it is produced, then it has a lot to tell us more than it says to its audience at the time. In *Coriolanus, Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, what Shakespeare tells us between the lines are all political inclinations, ideas, and opinions. Even if he was more a playwright than a political theorist, the themes of his plays cannot be isolated from political theories. If done so, it would be the same as one would try to consider G. Bernard Shaw, Caryl Churchill, Sarah Kane, Harold Pinter, Berthold Brecht, Arthur Miller and many others and their plays and their political ideas in isolation.

Each play creates a model world either in the text or on the stage, either implicitly or explicitly. When they do this, they also shed light on social events and realities, political and ideological issues, either completely or partly. This makes drama a social declaration in that it focuses on man, his relationships with others, society, order and other social and governmental institutions. But, is all theatre political? It all depends on the play itself: on the characters, the theme, the dialogues, the setting, and the subject. All theatre, either implicitly or explicitly, creates certain social, economic, ideological or political contexts. The theatre is political as long as it is concerned with the state, the system and the order.

The three Shakespeare plays this study analyses are political plays, for they are concerned with the state affairs, for they are concerned with the system, with the order, and with the way the society they create in the text and on the stage is ruled. The plays are also political, for they are concerned with social relationships, for they are concerned with exercise of power by authorities. There is also ideology in the plays, for they are concerned with "the history of social formations, and thus of the modes of production combined in social formations, and of the class struggles which develop in them" (Althuser, 1977: 99). The plays are also political, for they are concerned with "the insolence of power and the plea of necessity" (Hazlitt, 1817: 189). With reference to Aristotelian idea that every drama or tragedy requires a beginning, a middle, and an end, with antecedent following precedent, one can say that the world, as a structured sphere, is organized based on Aristotle's dramatic dimensions. The implied plays portray a picture of the world and attempt to say something about that world. **"**One definition of politics is that it is the conduct, concern for, and administration of public affairs. Obviously, concern for public affairs means concern for humanity and the world, which requires a recognition of humanity's self-awareness in the world" says Vaclav Havel, the late Czech leader (Havel, 2012, February 1: para.2). In *Coriolanus,* Shakespeare is concerned with public affairs, administration of public affairs, with humanity and the world, with humanity's self-awareness in the world he creates in the play. Similarly, though there are a myriad of controversial definitions, ideology means beliefs and ideas about the order of society and how this order can and should be achieved (Adorno et al., 1950; Eagleton, 1991; Erikson and Tedin, 2003). This simplistic definition highlights the role of social groups and their inter-relationships. In *Coriolanus*, *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, Shakespeare seeds between the lines beliefs and ideas about the order of the society he creates in the plays, and the ways of achieving the order. This study sets to explain these beliefs, ideas and relationships by defining them with contemporary terminology.

1.1. Operational Definitions

The readings in this study are centered around the pivotal term "power struggle." After outlining the references to the central term of power struggle and providing relevant literature to the term, this section will present the operational definitions of the terminologies employed in the study. These technical vocabulary can be listed as follows:

economic egalitarianism (1.1.1.), authoritarian Elitism (1.1.2.), Militarism and Military Tutelage (1.1.3.), Latent and Manifest Orientalism (1.1.4.), Self and the Other (1.1.5.), Agitation Propaganda (1.1.6.), Perception Management (1.1.7.) and Deep State Operation (1.1.8.).

According to Weber (1958), power as a concept refers to the control mechanisms and deterministic patterns and political instruments pertaining to the ruling parties. This implies a strong embodiment of power through politics. Weber also draws a strong association between power and politics by claiming that the latter is to strive for power, which requires struggle and conflict. He argues that struggle coexists with power since it represents a relationship that is political and ideological by its very nature. It may be coercive as well when it intends to impose one's will over others, which naturally results in resistance. This resistance brings about what Weber calls as political conflict which he sees as a perspective that requires a social and political action. Arendt (1969) comes up with a definition of power struggle broader than Weber's. She sees no distinction among power, strength, force, authority and violence. She also claims that power can gain its legitimacy through authority. Lack of authority, Arendt claims, makes power vulnerable to violence. Thus, power struggle in politics can transform itself into direct, explicit or implicit political violence which this dissertation discusses in the implied plays.

Power, whether it be abstract or concrete, is a means through which man creates meanings by which he experiences and understands the world. Though no comprehensive and interpretation-free definition has yet been created, one thing is apparent that it is a relation between man and man (Dahl,1957). Thomas Hobbes defines power as a man's "present means to obtain some future apparent good" (Martinich and Battiste, 2011: 96) and divides it into two: "original and instrumental" (96). In instrumental power, the power brings more power. In *Coriolanus*, Caius Martius uses his military power as an instrument to gain political power. Alvin Toffler (1991) does not come up with a specific definition of power whereas he recognizes three main forms of power, all of which are a focus of interest in this study: violence, wealth and mind, which require close human relationships. The close relationship defined as power struggle exists between what Dillon calls as "conflict groups" (Dillon, 2014: 218). In *Coriolanus* conflict groups are the plebeians and the patricians, in *Julius Caesar*, the Populares and Optimates, in *Antony and Cleopatra*, the

East and the West. Foucault's definition of power seems to be a little reductionist and simplistic: "a relation between forces" (Delueze, 1999: 59). However, what makes Faucouldian perspective of power relations more enigmatic is that he is more interested in the way power is exercised than is defined. Foucault is "engaged in a highly sophisticated analysis of power which ... focused not on the subjects of power but ... the relations of force that separate within social practices and social systems" (Schrift, 1994). According to Foucault, power struggle is "anti-authority struggle", and it is "transversal" which means "not limited to any country ... not confined to a particular political and economic form of government" (Rabinow, 2000: 330-331). In *Coriolanus*, *Julius Caesar*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*, power struggle performed by power groups to whom Shakespeare gives social and political identity is anti-authority in that they resist one another's authority. Power struggle in these plays are transversal in that they show no characteristic variation from one play to another. However, power struggle in these plays can be analyzed with reference to various concepts.

Foucault (1982) uses "immediate struggles" (780) instead of power struggle since he associates it with unpredictable spontaneity. He stresses "instances of power" in society and draws attention to the fact that people do not search for their "chief enemy but for the immediate enemy" though it would not bring about peace and harmony. No solution to problems are offered by the vain attempts of the craving groups displaying signs of immediacy in their struggles that, as the name suggests, immediately turn into "anarchistic struggles" (780). Foucault maintains that there is a burning question to which those involved in power struggles seek to find a response: " Who are we?" (781). Actually, in the three plays under consideration, this is the question the characters ask themselves both explicitly and implicitly. Foucault recognizes three forms of power struggles, which he calls "social struggles" (781): (1) economic; (2) religious, ethnic or social; and (3) political. In the first group, he claims that the struggle is "against forms of exploitation which separate individuals from what they produce" (781), which is what this study analyzes in *Coriolanus.* In the second group, it is "against forms of domination" (781), which reveals itself in *Antony and Cleopatra* as ethnic and cultural domination. In the last one, it is against "subjection and submission" (781), which can be seen in *Julius Caesar* since Shakespeare's conspirators reject subjection and submission to Julius Caesar's ruling. Furthermore, it is seen that in the three plays by Shakespeare power struggle manifests

itself in two ideological forms. One is what Althusser (1984) calls as institutional power struggle in which citizens in a country or society are oppressed by the institutions and organizations. The study reveals that in Shakespeare's Roman plays oppression comes from the Roman capital city, and its senate. Suffering from institutionalized oppression by the armed forces and the senate, for instance, signposts "the relations of production and of a class domination which the development and specific forms of the forces of production have rendered possible" (1980: 88). Foucault argues that such a structure is subject to Marxist analysis (88). Secondly, power relations have an individualistic nature, which Foucault and Althusser understand or receive differently. Foucault (1980) analyzes power struggle at individual level claiming that it reveals itself "in the form of a chain" (98). Power struggle also may have a Foucauldian nature in that first it starts at individual level with the characters and later it turns into what Foucault defines as "a netlike organization" (98). Foucault (1979), in one of his earlier studies, also distinguishes between sovereign power and disciplinary power. In the former one, the power is exercised by the well-known institutions or individuals. In the latter one, the power is invisible, pervasive and diffuse. In one of the plays, the exerted power is presented as sovereign power while the one exercised by the conspirators as the disciplinary power since it aims to curb established authority.

All in all, in the Roman plays by Shakespeare, power struggle manifests itself in different ideological discourses. Weber considers power as a concept that refers to the control mechanisms and deterministic patterns and political instruments. This idea suggests a strong embodiment of power through politics. Weber also highlights striving for power and associates it with struggle and conflict. Struggle is said to coexist with power and manifests itself in discourse. Arendt's definition of power struggle is more sophisticated than that of Weber. He outlines power struggle as having close ties with strength, force, authority, lack of authority and violence. All that are emphasized by Arendt shed light on the social relationships between Shakespeare's political worlds. In the same vein, Foucault foregrounds "immediate struggles" that he associates with unpredictable spontaneity and culminating anarchy. Althusser, furthermore, refers to its institutional characteristics as well as individual, and the Roman plays by Shakespeare reveals it through the recurrent motif of oppression.

1.1.1. Economic Egalitarianism

The term egalitarianism is a multifaceted one: it has its moral, political, democratic, gender and legal forms. The study dwells on economic egalitarianism. Economic egalitarianism is one without which the others become inefficient and meaningless. Arneson (2009) refers to economic egalitarianism as a situation in which members of a society enjoy a reasonable degree of equality of income and wealth. Though the study borrows the term from Arneson, it also exploits Milton Friedman's perspective of egalitarianism. Friedman (1962), with a focus on the ethics of distribution and the instrumental role of distribution according to product, with which this study deals in the play *Coriolanus,* argues that economic arrangements play a crucial role in the promotion of political freedom in a society. He also sees a strong correspondence between economic freedom and concentration and distribution of power in a society, which is also one of the main source of conflict in *Coriolanus.* Economic egalitarianism sometimes manifests itself in the form of distribution of basic goods, as is suggested and implied in the play *Coriolanus* in terms of the distribution of grain, sometimes in the form of rising the living standards.

1.1.2. Authoritarian Elitism

Linz (1964) defines an authoritarian system as one in which there is only one primary governing elite, which draws a co-existence with elitism. He also argues that there might be other groups "not created by nor dependent on the state which influences the political process" (42), which means there is a very limited pluralism. In *Coriolanus*, Shakespeare creates such a system in which the study argues the plebeians can be considered what Linz refers to as "other groups." While they are created by the system, this creation has its negative connotations in terms of economic and political freedom and rights. The negative connotation in the play *Coriolanus* is that the worsening economic conditions of the plebeians in the city of Rome is the result of widening class inequalities. The plebeians dependence on the system is also subject to harsh criticism since the Roman political system in the play imposes exclusion from the governing body on them. As for elitism, one who should deal with this concept had better make a start with Plato, the godfather of elitism. The elitist Roman society in the play Coriolanus resembles very much

the one Plato has sympathy with: a small number of nobles, backed up by constitutional, economic, and military shields and a large number of underprivileged and poor citizens. This Platonic elitism argues that people do not have the required virtue backed up by knowledge and ability to participate in the democratic system, which is the main reason for why, as is that case in Coriolanus, lay people and their votes are undervalued and despised. The study mainly focuses on the concept of elitism developed by Walker (1966), Mills (1956) and Young (1994), which will be mentioned in the upcoming chapters.

1.1.3. Militarism and Military Tutelage

The study borrows the term " militarism" from Karl Liebknecht. Liebknecht (1918) defines militarism as the extension of military discipline and military ideology to all spheres and all aspects of a society. He argues that, with the help and support of other semi or non-militaristic institutions, it dominates the whole society. In *Coriolanus*, the Roman society Shakespeare creates on the stage is controlled by military discipline and ideology with the help of the nobles and the members of the senate. Gerardo Munck (1998: 42)refers to a strong relationship between authoritarianism and militarism arguing that authoritarianism is "based on the functional convergence of the interests of the military ... elites", which the study takes on as military tutelage. In *Coriolanus*, Shakespeare depicts a society saturated by military discipline, military ideology and the convergence between civic elites and military elites. To the question as to "Why Moderates would tolerate military autonomy ...that restricts the possible range of democratic outcomes, at times humiliates civilian politicians, and introduces a source of instability in the democratic system", Adam Przeworski (2003: 82) comes up with an answer that is valid for all countries across the world: that "Moderates fear that any attempt to impose civilian control will immediately provoke exactly what it is intended to eliminate: military intervention." Though the Patricians in the play *Coriolanus* cannot be considered as Moderates, though they do not fear any military intervention, they do so because they believe Caius Martius' military power, authority and elitism will support their civic elitism. This once more refers to the convergence between civic elitism and military elitism, an anti-democratic cooperation and interdependence between the two, which can be defined as military tutelage.

1.1.4. Latent and Manifest Orientalism

The study borrows the term from Edward Said (1978), who defines Orientalism as "a way of coming to terms with the Orient that is based on the Orient's special place in European Western experience" (1). He also argues that "Orientalism is a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction between the Orient and (most of the time) the Occident" (2). Thus, orientalism turns out to be "a sense of confrontation felt by Westerners dealing with the East ... the varying degrees of projected inferiority ... the kinds of characteristic features ascribed to the Orient" (201), which represents a constructed and fabricated image of the other and the alien. Based upon Said's idea of orientalism, the present dissertation foregrounds two types of orientalist outlook: latent orientalism and manifest orientalism.

Latent orientalism refers to the western mindset or the collective unconscious and can be conjectured as what the westerners keep in their minds as unconscious perceptions of the East (Said 1978). According to Said, these notions include exoticism, femininity, separateness, eccentricity, backwardness, sensuality, which are secretly and subjectively considered to be parts of the eastern culture. With such a classification, Said reshapes and reformulates the very nature of the concept of Orientalist discourse in that latent orientalism reveals what is hidden in the unconscious sphere of the Western mind a dreams, images, fantasies and fears leading to the production of systematic knowledge about the Orient (Yeğenoğlu, 1998). In a sense, Latent Orientalism constitutes Orientalism's "doctrinal and doxological character, its everydayness and naturalness, its taken-for-granted authority" (Yeğenoğlu: 23).

As regards "manifest orientalism", it is when the unconscious images of the latent orientalism are, as the name suggests, manifested (Said, 1978). Said argues that each era brings its own perspective of manifest orientalism, which means manifest orientalism may change from time to time and from person to person. The study will show how biased and prejudiced images of the orient are expressed or represented in Antony and Cleopatra, which epitomizes how the words and actions can influence the discourse about the imagined Orient.

1.1.5. Self and the Other

By the term 'the self and the other', the study understands an act of positioning individuals according to their political and cultural values (Harre and Van Langenhove, 1999). It does so because "core of act of positioning relies on discursive practices" through which social realities are revealed (Tirado and Galvez, 2007: para.20). In the way it is employed in the study, the term refers to a malignant, problematic, prejudged and unjust positioning. This negative positioning is very often employed in *Antony and Cleopatra*, even Antony, though he belongs to the West, is positioned in the east in terms of his love affair with Cleopatra. Given political discourse produced in the play, both Cleopatra and Antony are subject to unfavorable contrasting with the Occidental Self. Relating the concepts of 'the Self and Other' to positioning theory, Harre and Moghaddam (2003: 6) argue that "in each social milieu there is a kind of Platonic realm of positions, realized in current practices, which people can adopt, strive to locate themselves in, be pushed into, be displaced from or be refused access, recess themselves from and so on, in a highly mobile and dynamics way." In Antony and Cleopatra, this mobile and dynamic way reveals itself in Mark Antony and Cleopatra's ambivalent and contradictory attitudes towards one another. In the play, Shakespeare depicts what Harre and Moghaddam call as indirect positioning just implying that Cleopatra and her attendants are immoral and unreliable. Though "western representations and theories of non-western peoples and cultures with reference to European expansion and colonialism" (Pandian and Parman, 2004: 3) began in the fifteenth century, what Shakespeare does in the play by dating this phenomenon back to the Roman times should not be seen as anachronic since that era was also one of the Roman expansion and colonial move towards the East. This colonial move, naturally with racial, cultural, geographical and moral contacts of the west and the east, led to the exploration of "the relativistic diversity of many cultures" (Pandian and Parman: 4) and to the creation of two terms: "colonizing West (the self or 'Us') for whom the non-west functioned as 'the Other' in an epistemic framework" (Pandian and Parman: 4). The study also reads the play Antony and Cleopatra to uncover how the non-west, notably Cleopatra and her attendants function in the play through the lenses of the colonizing west and how Mark Antony is made non-west since he submits himself to the love of Cleopatra and eastern lifestyle.

1.1.6. Agitation Propaganda

Cunningham (2002: 66) defines agitation propaganda as"a type of propaganda that is designed and orchestrated to arouse the public, to generate turmoil, to incite fear and discontent." Cunningham argues that agitation propaganda uses such means as posters, speeches and graphic displays. In *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare uses speeches made by Flavius, Marullus, Cassius and Cinna and letters delivered secretly to Brutus and other senators to arouse interest in the perceived fear that Caesar would become a tyrant. The term and the strategy is a common one, it has its roots in the Marxist theory with the definition of Georgy Plekhanov: "propaganda as the promulgation of a number of ideas to an individual or small group and agitation as the promulgation of a single idea to a large mass of people" (as cited in Encyclopedia Britannica Online, 20.12.2013). The term was developed into a theatrical style in order to create some sort of political and ideological awareness or create perceptions and representations among masses. Long before this, Shakespeare, some of whose plays were the agitprops of his time, used it as theatrical style within his own theatrical style: he integrated agitation and propaganda in theatre. The way he uses propaganda in Julius Caesar complies with what Marlin (2002) refers to as "political propaganda" and "social propaganda" (36). It is political because it "is carried out by a definite body- for example, a government, a political part, an administration, a pressure group-for definite goals" (Marlin: 36). The senators as the Optimates of the Roman republic in the play can be considered as a political part, an administrative and pressure group. The definite goal is to delegitimize and discredit Caesar. It is social because "it is diffuse, based on general climate of opinion operating imperceptibly without appearance of propaganda" (Marlin: 36), which reveals itself in the relationship between the Tribunes, the representatives of the plebeians in the senate, and the plebeians themselves.

1.1.7. Perception Management

The term was first coined by US Department of Defense to refer to influence the emotions, motives of their enemies and to lead them to objective reasoning in line with their own objectives. The underlying theory behind perception management is that among the many realities man faces in his vicinity he tends to select only a small number with

respect to their influence (Agarwal, 2009). Thus, perception management is a process that leads to the understanding of a selected message in a form that intends to change the target population's point of view in a way closer to the originator's one, which makes it different from propaganda (Garfield, 2002). With Leigh Armistead's words (2007: 1), it is "information warfare" which Shakespeare uses not "to separate hype from reality" but to mix them in Julius Caesar. Goldman (2004) draws a strong association between perception management and psychological operations in that both aim at a certain audience in order to affect their beliefs and attitudes in a given issue, and claims that it differs from public diplomacy in that perception management includes "falsehood and deception" as its "important ingredients" and that "the purpose is to get the other side to believe what one wishes it to believe, whatever the truth might be" (149). The truth, that is, whether Julius Caesar really wishes to be a tyrant or not, whether he really holds some tyrannical tendencies which will kill the democratic and republican spirit of Rome, is not known from the play. What Casca, Cassius, Cinna and others, with Brutus's cooperation, do in the play is an operation that creates a false sense of reality.

1.1.8. Deep State Operation

Eric Wilson (2012: 3), using "dual state" and "parapolitics" as its synonyms, defines deep state as "the bifurcation of the ostensibly monolistic liberal state into a parallel phenomenon of public/judicial/rational and private/extra-judicial/irrational, the myriad relationships between the two sets governed by a strictly binary operational logic" (3). Deep state, according to Wilson, organizes itself from top to down, not a public or bottom-up state it is. Between these two sets, Scott (2014) recognizes a difference based upon Hannah Arendt's theory of persuasion through argument and Huntington's coercion by force. In Julius Caesar, an inner conflict is solved through Huntington's method, namely using coercive power and violence. Arendt's is the Greek way of solving domestic problems. In Julius Caesar, the representatives of the Roman deep state employ Huntington's coercive power method to solve a domestic problem, which the Greeks use to deal with foreign problems.

In conclusion, the plays which the study analyzes are about a struggle among their characters, none of whom has a minor role, all of whom strive for some sort of domination

in the socio-political and economic quarters and all of whose relations with one another are full of emulation. This power struggle creates a concept of Rome that is difficult to define without any reference to the above contemporary terms. Thus, what Shakespeare achieves in the plays is to transform this Rome from an ancient microcosmic society into a macrocosmic one which is easily adaptable to the contemporary world with richer political, economic and ideological identities.

CHAPTER TWO

2. POWER STRUGGLE AS IMPLIED AND REPRESENTED IN *CORIOLANUS*, *ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA* AND *JULIUS CAESAR*

2.1. Power Struggle for Economic Egalitarianism in *Coriolanus*

Kastan (1999: 149), in *Shakespeare After Theory*, raises a question: "Is the language of class relations applied to the social formation of early modern England an anachronism? "As an answer to this question, he asserts that, though the term class is a nineteenth century analytic category and was unavailable to the people of Tudor and Stuart England, social vocabularies like estate and degree and all other items listed in the Great Chain of Being, as a sign of social differentiation on the basis of status but not income and occupation, show that the concept of class existed in early modern England, for social organization permitted an unequal distribution of property and power. Shakespeare opens the play *Coriolanus* with a seemingly new but actually a deep-rooted conflict between the plebeians and the state, or the ruling class, just because of this unequal distribution of property, privilege and power. On the surface, this conflict seems to be a food riot, which reflects the era's social and economic history. It was a time of rapid change in the social scale: a time when ordinary people, especially those from the middle class were rising into prominence, a time of social, economic and historical awakening. Shakespeare depicts this awakening as follows:

First Citizen:

> We are accounted poor citizens, the
> patricians good. What authority surfeits on would
> relieve us: if they would yield us but the super-
> fluity, while it were wholesome, we might guess
> they relieved us humanely; but they think we
> are too dear: the leanness that afflicts us, the
> object of our misery, is as an inventory to parti-
> cularise their abundance; our sufferance is a gain
> to them Let us revenge this with our pikes, ere

we become rakes: for the gods know I speak this
in hunger for bread, not in thirst for revenge(1.1. 15-25).

This main speech by a plebian notes that they demand a share in the surplus production of the grain. They say they are kept poor in wealth by the patricians. This speech is also a manifestation of citizenship in Rome which is characterized by inequality, ignorance and economic oppression which is characterized by "leanness, misery, sufferance, hunger for bread." This discourse also proves the sign of patricians' richness and abundance in Shakespeare's representation of poverty. He portrays the patrician as "fat, overflowing, surfeited, and indifferent to the plebeians' poverty" (Carroll, 1996: 176). Through a discourse of discontent and revolt, the plebeians claim that the patricians' actions and attitudes are harmful and destructive as a whole for the well-being of the society:

First Citizen:

Care for us! True, indeed! They ne'er cared for us
yet: suffer us to famish, and their store-houses
crammed with grain; make edicts for usury, to
support usurers; repeal daily any wholesome act
established against the rich, and provide more
piercing statutes daily, to chain up and restrain
the poor. If the wars eat us not up, they will; and
there's all the love they bear us (1.1.81-88).

The opening scene of the play is a criticism of a capitalist, a sweating system, one of monopolistic exploitation. Here, the bitter reality of capitalism comes to the front: in Rome, as in any capitalist economic system, gain or property is privatized and loss is socialized, penetrating all spheres of the society. It was feudalism in Rome, and with an updated version, still it is feudalism in our contemporary world. In the Roman social structure, high above the plebeians were seated the elite oligarchs, namely patricians, nobles and senators, few in number but controlling and exploiting much of the national income and welfare. This inequality, as in many countries in today's world, led to the emergence of two distinct Romes. It is evident that too much inequality in the Roman society resulted in unbearable pressure on "the isonomic social structure" and "mutual social contact"(Arendt, 1990: 170), leading to instability and revolt. Shakespeare's England was no different from Coriolanus' Rome. "So distribution should undo excess/And each man have enough.", says Shakespeare in King Lear (4. 1. 2325-2326). Although Elizabeth I enacted two British Poor Laws, one in

1598 and the other in 1601, in order to provide a system of social security and a relief in the existing economic system, they failed to prevent the Midlands foot riots in 1607. Considering that Shakespeare wrote *Coriolanus* sometime between 1607 and 1608, though historians are not certain of each of these dates, he probably relates this social unrest in the play to that of England in 1607 (Gurr, 1975). After a few years of famine due to bad harvests, the English people living in the Midlands faced a real poverty. This led to a deep frustration among the poor and the needy, and thus, they were attracted into acts of violence. Both riots are the result of the plebeians' desperate poverty. They targeted the wealthy landlords. In the play *Coriolanus,* the plebeians target Cassius Martius as the representative and the protector of a society based on military tutelage and war-economics. This study takes this class awakening, a very much explosive social and economic antagonism and discontent, as a sign of plebeians demand for "economic egalitarianism" (Roemer, 1996). Roemer explains economic egalitarianism as economic affairs or opportunities that provide all the participants of a society with a satisfactory welfare to enjoy and exercise their individual power as citizens. Here, the argument rests on the distribution of resources or goods, and in *Coriolanus,* the resource or the good which is subject to distribution is wheat. Wheat is an economic good, but in the play it becomes what Rawls (1971: v) defines as "primary social good": distributable good. Thus, Shakespeare achieves to transform an economic conflict into a social and political one. In a sense, the play implies an economic war with the effect it creates in the first scene. And surprisingly enough, Shakespeare suddenly makes Coriolanus the scapegoat of all this conflict, making it a power struggle between the military, the nobles and the plebeians. Citizens declare Coriolanus as the enemy of people when Shakespeare probes deep into the hearts and minds of the citizens and makes him a symbol:

Second Citizen:

Would you proceed especially against
Caius Martius?

All:

Against him first: he's a very dog to the
commonalty (1.1. 26-29).

This economic conflict created at the very beginning of the play reveals a rough idea of Roman citizen-body: one that is left outside in the sharing of welfare and other economic affairs including ways and means of consumption, fixing the prices of goods, a blindness or indifference of the Roman aristocrats and bureaucrats to the starving masses in the street (de Light, 2012). Shakespeare's rebellious civil discourse can be taken as a voice coming from the plebeians against the social, cultural and economic dominance of the upper class rulers:

First Citizen:

Our business is not unknown to the
senate; they have had inkling this fortnight what
we intend to do, which now we'll show 'em in
deeds. They say poor suitors have strong breaths:
they shall know we have strong arms too (1.1.59-63).

By saying "our business is not known to the senate", citizens derive the audience's attention to the indifference of the ruling class to the sufferings of the lower classes in Rome. Shakespeare puts in the play a public voice which represents the progressive political perspective not only of his time but also modern times. The egalitarian idea in the play rejects the quest for monopolizing the sources of distribution and consumption. On the surface, this seems to be a Marxist theory of class divisions as the most important source of social conflict. However, Weber's analysis of class is more suitable to the play since it deals with the concept of class in the context of social stratification from a more general perspective. He analyzes social classes with reference to the possession of material resources, accumulated by advantage in the marketplace, resulting in distinctive qualities in terms of the standard of living (Weber, 1978).In political theory, egalitarian claim is that there is huge economic gap among the members of a given society, and this is unjust (Cohen, 1989). Supporters of egalitarian ideologies favor equal distribution. The plebeians in *Coriolanus* cry for equal distribution of wheat. As to this inequality, Ronald Dworkin (1981) argues that equality can be defined as an envy-free distribution of resources. This means that the motive behind egalitarian policies is mere envy (Anderson, 1999). In the first scene of the play, Shakespeare portrays a political environment which is full of envy and very hostile to equality, to the rights of the public and their participation in the existing democratic system. This seems to be a clash between the plebeians, notably egalitarians,

who favor equality and those patricians who appear to be non-egalitarian. Arneson (2009: 1) explains how Caius Martius and Menenius perceive their statue and that of the plebeians and how the plebeians perceive the statue of the ruling class:

> An egalitarian might rather be one who maintains that people ought to be treated as equals-- as possessing equal fundamental worth and dignity and as equally morally considerable. In this sense, a sample non-egalitarian would be one who believes that people born into a higher social caste, or a favored race or ethnicity, or with an above-average stock of traits deemed desirable, ought somehow to count for more than others in calculations that determine what morally ought to be done.

It is observed that the commoners are depicted as masses who are weak in terms of character and personality, without will-power and unable to make correct choices simply because they lack economic power and freedom, and thus cannot exercise sanctions on the existing rulers and system. Caius Martius' military power is considered to be a means of enforcement. Menenius considers himself, the nobles, and Cassius Martius, because of his military achievements, as "born into a higher social caste, or a favored race or ethnicity, or with an above-average stock of traits deemed desirable, ought somehow to count for more than others in calculations that determine what morally ought to be done" (Arneson, 2009: 1). He likens Rome to a human body in which he considers himself, the senators and military figures as the store-house, the highest rank:

Menenius:

> The senators of Rome are this good belly,
> And you the mutinous members; for examine
> Their counsels and their cares, digest things rightly
> Touching the weal o' the common, you shall find
> No public benefit which you receive
> But it proceeds or comes from them to you
> And no way from yourselves. What do you think,
> You, the great toe of this assembly?(1.1.51-58)

Here, Menenius, as the representative and the official voice of the Roman state order, shows that they take the plebeians' claims for economic equality as a disturbing force. What the plebeians demand for is an economic and thus political and social compromise. Some hidden economic imperatives are at work in *Coriolanus*, as Gabriel Egan puts it for *The Merchant of Venice* when he discusses the relationship between Shakespeare and Marxism (Egan, 2004). Shakespeare creates a tension in *Coriolanus* between different

classes in terms of distribution of food, and consumption models and, with Egan's words, as "pre-capitalist and capitalist notions of the correct uses" of the sources (Egan, 2004: 3). And these economic imperatives help us pave a way in *Coriolanus* from egalitarianism to Marxism. With "What's their seeking?" (1.1.192), Caius Martius does not hesitate his anti-egalitarian stance:

Martius:

What's their seeking?

Menenius:

For corn at their own rates; whereof, they say,
The city is well stored.

Martius:

Hang 'em! They say!
They'll sit by the fire, and presume to know
What's done i' the Capitol; who's like to rise,
Who thrives and who declines; side action sandgive out
Conjectural marriages; making parties strong
And feebling such as stand not in their liking
Below their cobbled shoes.
They say here's grain enough!
Would the nobility lay aside their ruth,
And let me use my sword,
I'll make a quarry
With thousands of these quarter'd slaves, as high
As I could pick my lance (1.1.192-204).

The stances Caius Martius and Menenius hold can be explained by the concept of political economy since they claim that the plebeians are unaware of what is happening in the Capitol and how the Roman economic system is made work. According to Eatwell, Milgate and Newman (1987: 907), "Political economy is the science of wealth and deals with efforts made by man to supply wants and satisfy desires. "However, successful implementation of political economy may negatively be influenced by such factors as ineffective legal regulations, favoritism, corruption, biases, inconsistencies in the implementation and military overspending that weaken the economic budget allocated, and

does not always bring about the desired economic equality and welfare in a given society. Here in the play, it is inequality of distribution of the social and economic good, notably wheat, that leads to the fall of the social structure of the city of Rome. Common people have some different expectations from the rulers and the government. Thompson (1993: 260) calls these expectations as "moral economy: the political culture, the expectations, traditions, and indeed, superstitions of the working population most frequently involved in actions in the market. "In *Coriolanus*, Shakespeare refers to the lack of moral economic principles in the Roman society, which can be taken as an economic and social critique, a warning to the rulers of his own country: ignoring the public problems and public voice leads to a collective power, whether organized or disorganized, that threats the viability of the governmental system and the well-being of the county. In Act IV, Scene VI, Shakespeare gives a portrait of what happens when moral economic principles and economic egalitarianism are secured in a society:

Sicinius:

We hear not of him, neither need we fear him;
His remedies are tame i' the present peace
And quietness of the people, which before
Were in wild hurry. Here do we make his friends
Blush that the world goes well, who rather had,
Though they themselves did suffer by't, behold
Dissentious numbers pestering streets than see
Our tradesmen within their shops and going
About their functions friendly. (4.6.1-9)

Though Shakespeare scholars see two of Shakespeare's plays, *Timon of Athens* and *The Merchant of Venice* as mostly economically oriented plays (Kamps, 1995), *Coriolanus* is no different from these plays in terms of the economic mind Shakespeare instilled in it. With this economic mind, Shakespeare attributes to his characters, beside many others like psychological, gender, cultural, religious, political, ideological, an economic identity with an individualistic and societal perspective that finds its place in the larger economic spheres.

In sum, in *Coriolanus*, through the words uttered by both Caius Martius and Menenius, through their negative attitudes towards the place and the role of the plebeians in the establishment and the constitution, which leads to the crisis, and the social

disturbance he depicts in the play, one may think that Shakespeare might have sympathized the idea of egalitarianism keeping tough but a delicate relationship and balance between the rulers and the ruled. It depends on where one stands when s/he analyses the cause-effect relationships that create the conflict in the play and lead to the abuse of power which brings Rome to the edges of a civil violence. Is it that people, namely the plebeians in the play, enjoy too much power, such that forces Coriolanus to self-exile leaving all his military victories, and political gains behind, enough to declare his own country and his own people as his enemy? Or is it that Coriolanus is an anti-egalitarian, a compulsive conservative who strongly rejects the rights that the Roman constitution has given to the plebeians? Both perspectives may find some very sound grounds in the play to defend themselves. And both may refer to the observation made by Lord Acton: "All power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely" (Keating, 1988: 224). This study takes the power and authority and the rights given to the commons by the constitution as a means of 'checks and balances', and concludes that it is not too much power exercised by the commons but it is Caius Martius, Menenius and other patricians' non-egalitarian, conservative attitudes that lead to the tragic end in the play. They do not like it that they have to share their rights and authority with the commons, that the Rome is about to transform from an oligarchy to an egalitarian society, that the newly given political rights of the commons also give them some economic rights in terms of the questioning the economic decisions made in the senate, the allocation and distribution of economic goods, and thus that of national welfare. The patricians are about to lose what Lord Acton called 'their absolute power'. This is an unwelcome innovation for Coriolanus. Taken as a play about a man with great martial valor, the mere existence of this man poses threats to the political system. The first sign of this threat is that the plebeians of Rome think Caius Martius will be an insurmountable barrier with his newly gained political status for quenching their hunger for food, political power and honor of citizenship.

Menenius likens the State to a body made up of head as the leader, of heart as the senate, of the stomach or the store house and the shop as senators and oligarchs, and of arms and legs as the military. Even its various civic functions are performed by these parties. There is no room for the plebeians in the body. Claiming that Shakespeare embeds in his plays his political wisdom that makes his plays timeless and that this timelessness contributes a lot to our understanding of the chaotic and pressing political issues both of

the past and the present, Dobski and Girsh (2013: 1) explain this metaphor as "Body Politic", which, they say, "recalls the brutal authoritarian regimes".

2.2. Power Struggle for Authoritarian Elitism in *Coriolanus*

With a small scale research on the history of nations and societies, one can easily see how they have changed and evolved in time. However, fundamental conflicts and problems have defied these changes and evolution. Among these are the concepts of power and authority that have always been a focal point of interest in terms of the way they are exercised, abused and in terms of the effect they have on masses. Almost in any of Shakespeare's Roman tragedies, there is an 'immensely ambitious man who feels compelled to do things that he knows are politically and morally disastrous' (Greenblatt, 2007: 1). The immense ambition in these characters has its roots in their immoral, illegal, noncompliant, and violent search for power and authority. Caius Martius is one of these men, Greenblatt says. Allan Bloom (2000: 59) describes Julius Caesar as "a man becoming a god and Richard II as a god becoming a man." Based upon Bloom's words, this study comes up with another description of its own: Shakespeare's Caius Martius is a soldier not becoming a real politician, and a would-be- politician becoming too much a soldier. Caius Martius considers himself to be divine, furnished with the capacity to be elected as a consul without getting the votes of the plebeians, for he is a commander. Despite all his modesty in words when he hears of the praises and adulations from the senators and nobles, he thinks that he must be a politician without putting off his uniforms and authoritarian personality. Martius is not alone on the stage with an authoritarian personality. Menenius, though he is a civic figure of the political system, holds an authoritarian personality as well. They try hard to keep the plebeians under control by claiming that they are weak and cannot understand what is really happening:

Menenius:

Nay, these are almost thoroughly persuaded;
For though abundantly they lack discretion,
Yet are they passing cowardly. But, I beseech you,
What says the other troop?

Martius:

> They are dissolved: hang 'em!
> They said they were an-hungry; sigh'd forth proverbs,
> That hunger broke stone walls, that dogs must eat,
> That meat was made for mouths, that the gods sent not
> Corn for the rich men only: with these shreds
> They vented their complainings; which being answer'd,
> And a petition granted them, a strange one—
> To break the heart of generosity,
> And make bold power look pale--they threw their caps
> As they would hang them on the horns o' the moon,
> Shouting their emulation (1.1.206-220).

Here, Martius thinks that the plebeians cannot be ruled properly. By despising Roman citizens, Martius also despises all lower class people across the world. His hostility to the plebeian class represents the common hostility to the working class and lower classes in wild capitalist systems. Thus, Caius Martius helps the marginalization of lower class people, and this marginalization leads to loss of their belief in the common interest of their country, which might be the reason why they are unwilling to fight against the enemy in the battlefield and why they do not want to vote for Martius in his campaign for the consulship: "You have been a scourge for her enemies/ You have been a rod to her friends;/You have not indeed loved the common people" (2.3.97-99). Caius Martius does not want to compromise with the citizens, though at times he seems to, because the courageous, powerful beast in him, destructive forces inside prevent him from doing so, which means that a different version of "power struggle" is at work here, potentially despotic, destructive and authoritarian.

In terms of sources of power, Plato recognizes two main ones: corrupt and non-corrupt. He argues that if a power source is motivated by self-interests, it does not aim toward the common advantage of the society. According to Platonic view of source of power, this study argues that both Martius and Menenius' sources of power can be considered corrupt though they take their power from different sources. Menenius takes his power from his civic and political status, which was granted to him by his nobility and wealth and Coriolanus from his military status, both of which Plato argues are corrupt sources. Menenius loses the sight of the common interest of the people, thus holds the idea of an authoritarian state order, unquestionable of its affairs. He portrays a model of state order which organizes itself regardless of demands from its subjects and other participants

parties -in the play they are plebeians. The plebeians, according to Meneius, have to behave in the way the rulers order them to. What is expected from them is absolute obedience:

Menenius:

I tell you, friends, most charitable care
Have the patricians of you. For your wants,
Your suffering in this dearth, you may as well
Strike at the heaven with your staves as lift them
Against the Roman state, whose course will on
The way it takes, cracking ten thousand curbs
Of more strong link asunder than can ever
Appear in your impediment. For the dearth,
The gods, not the patricians, make it, and
Your knees to them, not arms, must help. Alack,
You are transported by calamity
Thither where more attends you, and you slander
The helms o' the state, who care for you like fathers,
When you curse them as enemies (1.1.67-80).

By saying that '...the Roman state whose course will/ on the way it takes, cracking ten thousand curbs' (1.1.71-72), Menenius portrays an authoritarian state order which overlaps with Althuser's words: "The state is a machine of repression, which enables the ruling classes to ensure their domination over the working class, thus enabling the former to subjects the latter to the process of surplus-value extortion" (Althuser, 1977: 137).The gender of the state in Menenius' mind is masculine: "The helms o' the state, who care for you like fathers" (1.1.79). In *The Prince,* Machiavelli (1985) refers to the gender role of the state. He determines some qualities that a prince should have to be successful in state affairs. These qualities include effeminate and weak versus fierce and bold, generosity versus greed; cruelty versus mercy; and lasciviousness versus chastity. For Machiavelli, success comes through the qualities attributed to men: fierce, bold, greed, cruelty, lasciviousness. Caius Martius and Menenius are the two representatives of these masculine qualities and their ideal state order is one which organizes itself based upon these qualities.

Menenius likens the state to a body and to the organs of the body. He takes not the brain, which symbolizes knowledge, virtue, reason, memory, intelligence, control, government, and management, not arms or legs which symbolize work and labor, but stomach, which symbolizes consumption or exploitation. Stomach also reveals a

connotative meaning in terms of economics. Menenius' understanding of order is etatist. State controls all public and economic and governmental areas. According to Menenius, it is not the nation as a whole or people with their various class differences but the state itself which is the basic element of human existence . In the liberal political ideology, classes in a society are determined based on individual rights. This is called social stratification, putting people into institutionalized categories as groups, classes, or casts, which implies inequality between persons(Flanagan, 1989).

As soon as he appears on the stage, Martius reveals his anti-republican, hierarchical and authoritarian idea of order:

Martius:

He that will give good words to thee will flatter
Beneath abhorring. What would you have, you curs,
That like nor peace nor war? the one affrights you,
The other makes you proud. He that trusts to you,
Where he should find you lions, finds you hares;
Where foxes, geese: you are no surer, no,
Than is the coal of fire upon the ice,
Or hailstone in the sun. Your virtue is
To make him worthy whose offence subdues him
And curse that justice did it.
Who deserves greatness
Deserves your hate; and your affections are
A sick man's appetite, who desires most that
Which would increase his evil. He that depends
Upon your favours swims with fins of lead
And hews down oaks with rushes. Hang ye! Trust Ye?
With every minute you do change a mind,
And call him noble that was now your hate,
Him vile that was your garland. What's the matter,
That in these several places of the city
You cry against the noble senate, who,
Under the gods, keep you in awe, which else
Would feed on one another? What's their seeking?(1.1.171-192).

Martius cannot put up with the plebeians since he thinks they are fickle, dishonest, and cowardly, which is anti-populist and pro-authoritarian rhetoric. According to Cahn (2001: 273), "Shakespeare must have been fascinated by politics" and this happened through authority that took place within governmental institutions, and "the world of his plays is hardly democratic, but the strategies his characters employ to gain advantage over their opponents resonate with remarkable accuracy in all societies, even our own as much as any

other." He also refers to power as "one of the strongest motivations" in Shakespeare's plays (285). In *Coriolanus*, this strong motivation is Caius Martius' strong authoritative desire to dominate and rule over the plebeians. Martius becomes so consumed by the lust for power that, in Cahn's terms, he loses whatever ethical center he might have had and undergoes changes in personality and values. This is what makes *Coriolanus* a political tragedy, for what Cahn refers to are his tragic flaws.

Antony Giddens (1985: 9) claims that all political and social systems are power systems and power is distributed by institutions in these systems, which he calls "the institutional mediation of power." Political thinkers see a significant distinction between power and authority. Parsons (1963: 232) defines power as follows:

> ... having to do with the capacity of persons or collectivities "to get things done" effectively, in particular when their goals are obstructed by some kind of human resistance or opposition. The problem of coping with resistance then leads into the question of the role of coercive measures, including the use of physical force, and the relation of coercion to the voluntary and consensual aspects of power systems.

Parsons refers to the coercive nature of power which Caius Martius does not hesitate to use when he is confronted with some kind of resistance and opposition from the plebeians while he is walking on the way to the senate. Machiavelli defines this resistance as insuppressible, arguing that this tendency ultimately keeps the common people away from coercive power's range of action (del Lucchese, 2009). This irrepressible and insuppressible nature of resistance can be seen in *Coriolanus*. As for authority, from a Weberian perspective, it is what legitimizes the use of power. What is fundamental in democracies is the civil authority. In democracies, domestic and international affairs and policies are determined and performed by those who have submitted themselves to the power of civil authority, namely those who have been elected by the civilians as their representatives. The elected, notably politicians, exercise the power given to them in the name of civilians. As for the soldiers, their role in a democratic system is only related to the defensive of the nation, nothing more than this. One of the conflicts between Caius Martius and the men of the people in *Coriolanus*, though it may seem individual on the surface, is this power-authority relationship. Caius Martius, though he is a very successful soldier, wants to play in the political and civil arena with his military identity and military qualities. From the beginning up until the end, Shakespeare portrays a power and authority

game in the play. The Plebeians want to have a share of authority in the system. Actually, they have just received this share. They favor controllable authority. *Coriolanus*, representing the uncontrollable authority, on the other hand, harshly criticizes the idea that the men of people can control his authority:

Coriolanus:

... Seal what I end withal! This double worship,
Where one part does disdain with cause, the other
Insult without all reason, where gentry, title, wisdom,
Cannot conclude but by the yea and no
Of general ignorance,--it must omit
Real necessities, and give way the while
To unstable slightness: purpose so barr'd, it follows(3.1.142-148).

He thinks he has good reasons to disdain the plebeians while the plebeians insultations are groundless. By 'double worship', Martius refers to the plebeians civil authority they have newly gained by the constitution, which he hates and rejects. This anti-pluralistic rigid stance makes him uncontrollable in the eyes of the plebeians:

Sicinius:

You are at point to lose your liberties:
Martius would have all from you; Martius,
Whom late you have named for consul. (3.1.194-196)

Caius Martius, who already holds military power, upon being elected as consul, will be given political power as well, in which the Plebeians see a threat to their liberty. In the play, Shakespeare forces the audience, and thus the plebeians, to make a choice between safety and liberty. Safety is the very nature of all states and governments, and to secure the desired safety, they pass laws, and develop and implement policies. However, as they make society safer they, slowly undermine civil rights, liberties, and their citizens' personal freedoms, which is what happens in *Coriolanus*, for Caius Martius and Menenius and other patricians see the plebeians as mindless government slaves.

Power and authority, though they may seem similar in meaning and are used interchangeably, are not the same in practice. Power is the ability those who have it use to make choices or influence political, economic or military outcomes while authority means the legitimacy, justification and right to use that power. From this perspective, what the Third Citizen says when they are discussing whether they will vote for or against Caius Martius' consulship is significant.

Third Citizen:

We have power in ourselves to do
it, but it is a power that we have no power to do;
for if he show us his wounds and tell us his deeds,
we are to put our tongues into those wounds and
speak for them; so, if he tell us his noble deeds,
we must also tell him our noble acceptance of
them. Ingratitude is monstrous, and for the
multitude to be in grateful, were to make a monster
of the multitude: of the which we being
members, should bring ourselves to be monstrous members. (2.3.4-13)

They think they have power, but their power does not yet yield authoritative characteristic. This means they influence others, but they cannot get things done through others or they cannot influence decisions or they are not in a position to make decisions. When Caius Martius insists on his irreconcilable stance against the plebeians disdaining their roles and positions during his election campaign and their constitutional statue, they dare to use their authority:

Sicinius:

... in whose name myself
Attach thee as a traitorous innovator,
A foe to the public weal: obey, I charge thee,
And follow to thine answer. (3.1. 174-177)

Sicinius, as a man of law, gives the message and Brutus receives it:

Brutus:

> Or let us stand to our authority,
> Or let us lose it. We do here pronounce,
> Upon the part o' the people, in whose power
> We were elected theirs, Martius is worthy
> Of present death.(3.1.207-211)

Here, they use their authority by making a decision to declare Caius Martius a traitor and force him to self-exile because of his virulent opposition to power-sharing. Power-sharing is something related to diplomacy in political relationships. Sometimes ignorance of others' power and authority may pose a fatal mistake as in *Coriolanus*. His abrasive, undiplomatic behaviors and attitudes make it difficult for him to play the game of politics according to its rules, which puts the plebeians in an advantaged position because of the effectiveness of their discretion.

According to Weber(1978), power is the ability of an individual or a group to realize their will in a social action, even against the will of others and relates to the ability to command resources in a particular domain. Power as a phenomenon can show itself in various forms. Economic power, then, is the ability to control material resources: to direct production, to monopolize accumulation, to dictate consumption. In the play, the nobles, the senators and the patricians hold this economic power. The uprising at the very beginning of the play, though in this study it has been attributed to some other reasons, is a sign of public protest against the abuse of this economic power. Equipped with political power, add to this his military power, Caius Martius' power tends to be, the plebeians fear, a coercive one:

Brutus:

> Could you not have told him
> As you were lesson'd, when he had no power,
> But was a petty servant to the state,
> He was your enemy, ever spake against
> Your liberties and the charters that you bear
> I' the body of the weal; and now, arriving
> A place of potency and sway o' the state,
> If he should still malignantly remain
> Fast foe to the plebeii, your voices might
> Be curses to yourselves? You should have said

That as his worthy deeds did claim no less
Than what he stood for, so his gracious nature
Would think upon you for your voices and
Translate his malice towards you into love,
Standing your friendly lord (2.3.185-199).

Shakespeare makes no mention of slaves in the play though there were slaves in republican Rome. Caius Martius see the plebeians as "slaves" of Rome through a language of tyranny, which results in a deep fear among the plebeians that Caius Martius' political success would enslave them.

Weber (1947: 215) also refers to three kinds of authority: "domination by : rational authority, traditional authority, and charismatic authority." He defines rational authority as "resting on a belief in the legality of enacted rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands" (215). He uses another term for it: "legal authority" (215). When Sicinius says to Caius Martius, "We charge you, that you have contrived to take/From Rome all season'd office and to wind/ Yourself into a power tyrannical"(3.3.61-63), he refers to legal power and legal authority. To a certain extent, though weak in practice, they hold what Weber calls as 'legal or rational authority' according to the Roman constitution. The stage of *Coriolanus* turns out to be a battle field where authorities clash with authorities: Caius Martius' tyrannical authority versus plebeians' weak, rudimentary but legal authority, which Caius Martius always rejects. This is not a simple rejection, one which is based on contempt, hatred and class distinction. Second type of domination or authority Weber refers to is traditional authority. This type of authority works when subordinate individuals or lower class people or those who are politically, economically and culturally poor accept the traditional rights of a powerful and dominant individual or group either willingly or unwillingly (Weber, 1947). Those who hold this type of authority enjoy either religious or spiritual power, one which comes from well-established sets of culture or familial, tribal structures (Weber, 1947). The noble people in the play *Coriolanus* have this type of traditional authority. When Menenius says "... our renowned Rome, whose gratitude/ Towards her deserved children is enroll'd,/ In Jove's own book, like an unnatural dam/ Should now eat up her own!" (3.1.291-294), 'deserved children' are those who hold what Weber calls traditional authority. In the eyes of the nobles and senators, namely all patricians, since he is the only military man on whose talents the Rome's defensive against the Volcsicans depends, Caius Martius seems to be a

god-like figure, which makes him also a man with traditional authority, a man into whom a god crept:

Brutus:

All tongues speak of him, and the bleared sights
Are spectacled to see him: your prattling nurse
Into a rapture lets her baby cry
While she chats him: the kitchen malkin pins
Her richest lockram 'bout her reechy neck,
Clambering the walls to eye him: stalls, bulks, windows,
Are smother'd up, leads fill'd, and ridges horsed
With variable complexions, all agreeing
In earnestness to see him: seld-shown flamens
Do press among the popular throngs and puff
To win a vulgar station: or veil'd dames
Commit the war of white and damask in
Their nicely-gawded cheeks to the wanton spoil
Of Phoebus' burning kisses: such a pother
As if that whatsoever god who leads him
Were slily crept into his human powers
And gave him graceful posture(2.1.201-217).

Charismatic authority is much more apparent in the play than any other type of authority. Weber (1947: 358-59) defines charismatic authority as follows:

> The term "charisma" will be applied to a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader. It is recognition on the part of those subject to authority which is decisive for the validity of charisma. This is freely given and guaranteed by what is held to be a "sign" or proof, originally always a miracle, and consists in devotion to the corresponding revelation, hero worship, or absolute trust in the leader. But where charisma is genuine, it is not this which is the basis of the claim to legitimacy. This basis lies rather in the conception that it is the duty of those who have been called to a charismatic mission to recognize its quality and to act accordingly. Psychologically this "recognition" is a matter of complete personal devotion to the possessor of the quality, arising out of enthusiasm, or of despair and hope.

Caius Martius is well known by everybody in the play as a powerful military figure or leader. As Weber puts it, he is treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. Caius Martius' charismatic authority comes from his military qualities. Even the common people of Rome, who see Caius Martius as their enemies, are aware of his charismatic authority or domination. This charismatic authority is widely accepted among the patricians and senators and nobles in

Rome. As a matter of fact, Rome wants to make use of Caius Martius' charismatic and military authority to keep herself safe against the Volcsicans military campaigns, which is why they want to nominate him as a consul. Leaders who have charismatic authority also have qualities and visions by which other people are inspired and attracted. When compared to one another, charismatic power or authority seems to be much more favorable since it is individualistic. Nevertheless, the problem arises when Caius Martius gives the impression that he is not satisfied with his charismatic authority and asks for more or wants it all. However, never in the play does Caius Martius himself ask the plebeians or senators for something. It is senators and those who take part in the governmental bodies want to attach Coriolanus to the Senate and thus to the Roman governmental body, which is why all these qualities of authority Caius Martius holds create a negative atmosphere, one of fear and despair, among the plebeians. They fear because they think when Caius Martius backs his qualities of authority, which, unless combined or coordinated with political power, would be weak and ineffective in a republican system where there is, though defective, some sort of balance of powers, they will lose their own political rights:

Sicinius:

On the sudden,
I warrant him consul.

Brutus:

Then our office may,
During his power, go sleep. (3.1.238-241)

Much of the conflict between the plebeians and the patricians of the Rome derives from the patricians' belief in an aristocratic elite theory, one which sees endless personal resources, power, intelligence, skills and deeds that nourish a vested, natural and divine interest in the government. The others, ordinary people, the plebeians of the Rome in the plays, are incompetent, without any capabilities of even governing themselves:

Martius:

What's the matter,
That in these several places of the city
You cry against the noble senate, who,
Under the gods, keep you in awe, which else
Would feed on one another?
What's their seeking? (1.1.188-193).

Originally, elite theory or elitism as an ideological and sociological concept emerged as a reaction to the idea that an egalitarian society or a classless society, as Marx puts it, could be possible. Whether it be social or ideological, elitism defines the rulers according to their "dominant and superior personal qualities in the way they exercise their power" (Walker, 1966: 286). Thus, according to Walker, "at the heart of the elitist theory is a clear presumption of the average citizens' inadequacies" (286). When Martius says "You cry against the noble senate, who,/Under the gods, keep you in awe, which else/Would feed on one another?", he refers to the average citizens' inadequacies. In this sense, the term refers to the superiority, excellence and adequacy of some particular groups in a given country. All these qualities can show themselves in political, economic, scientific, military, and intellectual spheres. Therefore, contrary to common belief, the term elite or elitism cannot be limited only to political arena. In his analysis of American society in the 1950's, Mills (1956) referred to three major institutions (or power blocs) within the State which he thought were of primary importance in terms of the potential for wielding power in society: major corporations, the military, and federal government. In the Rome of Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*, it is possible to replace the block of major corporations with nobles and patricians, who inherit their social and economic status from birth or from their ancestors and wealth. In the case of England, the term patrician can be referred to those families who ruled Shakespeare's England up until the late nineteenth century: Plantagenet's, Lancastrians, Yorkists, and Tudors, and other royal families, who, based on economic and political activities, ruled England over many generations. Mills' military block can be replaced by Caius Martius himself alone. With pride and arrogance, with strong and superior personal and military qualities, with a strong desire to achieve glory, fame and position, Caius Martius represents the military elite. As for the bloc of the federal government, Rome's senators would be an ideal resemblance, for they directed the magistrates, and for it also had an enormous degree of power over the civil government in

Rome in terms of the management of state finances, and the dispersal of public fund from the treasury. Thus, Shakespeare creates a tension between these three blocks of elite and common people, notably between the ruling classes and those who are ruled. At the beginning of the play, when Menenius says to common citizens, who are angry with the patricians, Caius Martius and the senators for economic problems they suffer from, "Thou rascal, that art worst in blood to run, /Lead'st first to win some vantage./But make you ready your stiff bats and clubs: / Rome and her rats are at the point of battle; / The one side must have bale" (1.1.161-165), he shows his face of governmental and corporational elitism. Just after Menenius utters these words, Caius Martius enters with a face and mind full of contempt for the commons revealing the class distinction on the basis of elitism in Rome:

Martius:

What's the matter, you dissentious rogues,
That, rubbing the poor itch of your opinion,
Make yourselves scabs? (1.1. 167-169).

As a military commander, he gets his courage to utter such words from his military power and the elite bloc which the system provides for him. Caius Martius strongly disagrees with the plebeians' participation in the ruling activities in Rome. According to him, Rome should be ruled by the patricians, the senators and naturally by military figures whose heroism gives life to Rome:

Martius:

And a petition granted them, a strange one—
To break the heart of generosity,
And make bold power look pale--they threw their caps
As they would hang them on the horns o' the moon,
Shouting their emulation (1.1.213-217).

He is so proud of his military deeds, and so satisfied with the rights which the status quo gives to him that he cannot bear it even when the plebeians speak for their problems and demand from the government. For him, the plebeians wisdoms are vulgar and they have no

right to get organized with under a constitutional body to voice their sufferings, to defend themselves against their opponents:

Martius:

Five tribunes to defend their vulgar wisdoms,
Of their own choice: one's Junius Brutus,
Sicinius Velutus, and I know not--'Sdeath!
The rabble should have first unroof'd the city,
Ere so prevail'd with me: it will in time
Win upon power and throw forth greater themes
For insurrection's arguing(1.1. 119-125).

He exhibits his elitist attitudes, behaviors, ideas and feelings even in the battlefield. Although the plebeians serve in the Roman army, sacrificing their lives for the well-being, safety and victory of Rome, he has a never-ending elitist hatred towards them. He rates his own soldiers with those in the rival army:

Martius:

See here these movers that do prize their hours
At a crack'd drachm! Cushions, leaden spoons,
Irons of a doit, doublets that hangmen would
Bury with those that wore them, these base slaves,
Ere yet the fight be done, pack up: down with them!
And hark, what noise the general makes! To him!
There is the man of my soul's hate, Aufidius,
Piercing our Romans: then, valiant Titus, take
Convenient numbers to make good the city;
Whilst I, with those that have the spirit, will haste(1.5. 5-14).

While Shakespeare creates an elitist political, social, economic and military atmosphere through the lenses and minds of the patricians, senators and Caius Martius himself, he also implies a pluralistic governmental system through the lenses of the plebeians. He places elitism and pluralism on the opposite edges of the political spectrum. Today's political spectrum is made up of radicals, liberals, moderate, conservatives and reactionaries (Hoffman and Graham, 2006). In the play, the plebeians represent the radicals, who strongly desire social, economic and political changes in the existing system. In contemporary political terminology, they constitute the left wing of the political spectrum. The Patricians stand on the right wing:

59

Menenius:

This is strange now: do you two know how you are
censured here in the city, I mean of us o' the
right-hand file? Do you? (2.1.24-26)

As for Caius Martius, he is conservative and reactionist, trying to restore the order as it was in the past, which is against Rome's newly established constitutional premature pluralism. In a sense, for Shakespeare, elitism can be balanced only by pluralism. Pluralism holds the idea that there is not a dominant class or a set of institutionally based privileged power groups that control all the power and the ruling in a country (Domhoff, 2005). When power and wealth generated in a given country are disbursed in social, economic, ethnic, cultural, and political groups, inevitably it will provide unity within that society (Johnson, 2005). From this perspective, there is a strong association between pluralism and free-market economy (Marangos, 2013). Politicians in pluralistic systems follow a similar path while moving to their offices to that followed by the buyers in the market: they are engaged in political propaganda to compete to get support from voters in the electoral arena. Shakespeare creates a political environment of this kind where Caius Martius should play according to the rules of free-market economy: he has to ask for the plebeians votes, and if they are persuaded, the plebeians will vote for them. It is a game of exchange. Caius Martius breaks the rules of this game with his elitist stance. His elitist stance is more like "a pro-monarchic one" (Bell, 1992: 9). He sees his elevation to the position of consulship as a right to be granted to him due to his military achievements and services:

Coriolanus:

Most sweet voices!
Better it is to die, better to starve,
Than crave the hire which first we do deserve.
Why in this woolvishtoge should I stand here,
To beg of Hob and Dick, that do appear,
Their needless vouches? Custom calls me to't:
What custom wills, in all things should we do't,
The dust on antique time would lie unswept,
And mountainous error be too highly heapt
For truth to o'er-peer. Rather than fool it so,
Let the high office and the honour go
To one that would do thus. I am half through;
The one part suffer'd, the other will I do. (2.3.119-131)

He strongly opposes the act of electing or the electoral system. According to Bell (1992), in a world of equality, no one has political mastery over any one else by right. For Shakespeare, Caius Martius has to get what Bell calls as political mastery through election by getting the plebeians consent in the way politicians do in parliamentary democratic system. "Such a mastery", Bell (1992: 58) writes, "must be won by persuasion and justified on the name of equality elsewhere", which is a breaking point in *Coriolanus*. Nominating Caius Martius as a candidate for consulship is considered to be a normal process in the- then -Rome. Another normalcy is that this process has to be followed by an electoral process- that is, Caius Martius has to persuade the common citizens for his consulship. Nevertheless, Caius Martius cannot bear this idea, and plebeians are well aware of this:

Fourth Citizen:

You have been a scourge to her enemies, you have
been a rod to her friends; you
have not indeed loved the common people (2.3. 97-99).

In terms of the relationships between the men of the people and the nobles or those who are privileged, Caius Martius is the most problematic and complex character whom Shakespeare ever created. Out of this problematic and complex identity comes no hesitation to look down upon the plebeians. Another sign of military elitism is that soldiers very often blame civilians for lack of discipline. In normal democratic and liberal societies, the difference or gap between military and civil worlds or values is not a problem as long as the military sets itself apart from the political and civil affairs. However, such a military response as Caius Martius gives is always problematic:

Coriolanus:

You common cry of curs! whose breath I hate
As reek o' the rotten fens, whose loves I prize
As the dead carcasses of unburied men
That do corrupt my air, I banish you;
And here remain with your uncertainty!
Let every feeble rumour shake your hearts!
Your enemies, with nodding of their plumes,
Fan you into despair! Have the power still

To banish your defenders; till at length
Your ignorance, which finds not till it feels,
Making not reservation of yourselves,
Still your own foes, deliver you as most
Abated captives to some nation
That won you without blows! Despising,
For you, the city, thus I turn my back:
There is a world elsewhere (3.3.120-135).

Very often, perhaps to put much emphasis on his military qualities and to imply a class or socio-political distinction between himself and the plebeians, he blames them for being coward. According to him, they are the "mutable, rank-scented many" (3.1.66). While Menenius is trying to persuade him to stay in front of the plebeians to ask for their votes that will carry him to the consulship, for a moment he seems to be persuaded, yet he can't help showing his elitist manner:

Coriolanus:

What must I say?'
I Pray, sir'--Plague upon't! I cannot bring
My tongue to such a pace: --'Look, sir, my wounds!
I got them in my country's service, when
Some certain of your brethren roar'd and ran
From the noise of our own drums.' (2.3.55-60)

Menenius tries to play the role of a mediator in what is called a normal democratic system. He behaves so since he thinks the Rome needs Caius Martius' military power.

Menenius:

O me, the gods!
You must not speak of that: you must desire them
To think upon you.

Coriolanus:

Think upon me! hang'em!
I would they would forget me, like the virtues
Which our divines lose by 'em.

Menenius:

You'll mar all:
I'll leave you: pray you, speak to 'em,
I pray you, In wholesome manner (2.3.60-69).

Oftentimes, when some people think that they are superior to others, that they have done much more for their countries than others, and that they mean much more for their country than others, this can lead to untold tragedies. Such a rhetoric naturally creates huge gaps between the classes and groups playing their own roles in the establishment. Normally, in a democratic or republican establishment, these groups find themselves in a struggle to manage the system, to make sure that their own interests are not threatened. However, Shakespeare creates an environment in which none of the parties in the establishment of the Roman Republic feel secure for their rights and interests. This is what makes *Coriolanus* a political tragedy, a military tragedy, a social tragedy, and an elitist tragedy. When the plebeians withdrew their votes for Caius Martius, his crow-and-eagle metaphor was the highest point of his elitist stance, which is another breaking point of the relationships between Caius Martius, the plebeians and the senators:

Coriolanus:

The nature of our seats and make the rabble
Call our cares fears; which will in time
Break ope the locks o' the senate and bring in
The crows to peck the eagles (3.1.135-138).

In elitist theory, power is enjoyed by a small number of people, and the way to democracy goes through oligarchy. The oligarchs take their power from ability, character capacity, experience and wealth, or positions given to them by the state; they are not the elected but the appointed. In this respect, Caius Martius is also a military oligarch. His elitism reaches its highest point when the Plebeians reject his consulship. His destructive elitist attitude can best be explained by Archer's words:

He insists that the common people are barbarians, alien in the extreme and implicitly enemies for the killing. Even if born in the Capitol itself, they are not Romans because they are not Patricians and are not fighters. ... The plebeians at any rate are only littered or

calved in the city of Rome. They have no claim to citizenship for being born there than animals do" (2005: 157).

It is these intentions that make him almost an egomaniac, which is in line with a superiority complex and narcissistic personality disorder. He very well matches Jeremy Holmes' definition of narcissistic personality:

> Sufficient unto himself, he becomes more and more self-absorbed- either hyper-vulnerable to every slight, or brutally bullying his way to the 'top' whose twin peaks are his own self-aggrandizement and the denigration of others" (Holmes, 2001: 57).

Both his hyper-vulnerability and brutal bullying are apparent in the play. When he says"I banish you" (3.3.123), and then while leaving the city of Rome, "There is a world elsewhere" (3.3.135), he gives up and gives in, which reveals his vulnerability.

He becomes a respected and beloved (by his friends, not by the common people) general after his triumph in the city of Corioles against the Volcsicans. This triumph is to make his way to the senate. He is vulnerable, as Holmes puts it, because when the voters-namely the plebeians, turn on him and banish him from the city, he turns his sword to his own country, giving up everything he has gathered in Rome. The elitist solidarity in the play ought not to escape the careful eyes. This solidarity reveals itself at the very beginning of the play with Menenius trying to get involved in a PR work for the election of Caius Martius as a consul. For some, the role that Menenius plays can be taken as that played by a mediator in normal political or social conflicts. However, Menenius is hardly able to hide his true ideas and intentions for the battle between Caius Martius and the plebeians. He is on the side of Caius Martius. However, the real Menennius Aggrippa in the Roman history was a man of great and respected wisdom and character, with which he was easily able to control the masses when they tended to be insurgent, and who was known as the friend and the father of the plebeians. Though the play is named after its main character, a biographical play, Menenius holds a very central role to the events that take place, one which controls or influences almost every happening in some way or another. In a sense, Shakespeare reinvents Menenius based upon his relationship with the plebeians. When the tension between Caius Martius and the Plebeians reaches its highest point, posing a threat to the Roman governmental system, he tries hard to take the situation under control by his attempts to curb Caius Martius' irreconcilable attitudes towards the plebeians. However, if

he had assumed his paternalistic and mediative attitudes at the beginning of the play, he would have saved Rome from an internal conflict, and the end would have been different. What causes this catastrophic end is Menenius' elitist and irreconcilable aristocratic attitudes at the beginning of the play, combined with those of Caius Martius. His elitist attitudes reveal itself not only in his words for the plebeians but also in those he utters for Sicinius and Brutus, the two Tribunes of the People. Sicinius and Brutus are two judges. When Manenius says "I cannot call you Lycurguses" (2.1.60), he also despises their understanding of law. Lycurgus is known to be the Spartan law giver who evolved the institution of senate, or Council of Elders, and blended it with the government of the kings. In Plutarch's *Lives*, he is credited to have paved the way towards democracy by making the power of the senate a sort of balance to the tyranny of the kings. In a sense, Lycurgus can be considered a lawmaker who advocated the supremacy or superiority of law. Meneius is for the law of the superiors or the privileged:

Menenius:

You know neither me, yourselves, nor
anything. You are ambitious for poor knaves'
caps and legs: you wear out a good wholesome
forenoon in hearing a cause between an orange
wife and a fosset-seller; and then rejourn the
controversy of three pence to a second day of
audience. When you are hearing a matter between
party and party, if you chance to be pinched
with the colic, you make faces like mummers;
set up the bloody flag against all patience; and,
in roaring for a chamber-pot, dismiss the controversy
bleeding the more entangled by your
hearing: all the peace you make in their cause
is, calling both the parties knaves. You are
a pair of strange ones(2.1.75-89).

Menenius' attitude can also be explained by the term 'meritocracy' as well, which is a different version of elitism. The modern formula of meritocracy is IQ+Effort is Merit (Young, 1994). In the play, the ancient or Shakespearean formula is Power (Military and Political) + Effort (especially in the battle field and political and economic arena) is Merit, which is a kind of elitism. Menenius is the representative of the political power and thus that of economic power, for the economy is under the monopoly of the state, Caius Martius is that of the military one. Both argue that Rome should be governed by those who comply

with the above equitation. On the side of the Roman nobles, the play creates an Aristotelian conception of meritocracy, one which is based upon aristocratic or oligarchic structures (Everson, 1988).In a sense, Menenius can also be considered to be the representative of Etatism, for he and other Patricians advocate the individual's subordination to the state without any condition.

2.3. Power Struggle for Militarism in *Coriolanus*

Karl Liebknecht (1918) defines the military spirit, also he calls it patriotic spirit and spirit of loyalty to the King, as a readiness against domestic and foreign threats. Sometimes, he asserts, there is no need for a reasonable or existing threat**.** Fear can also be an instrumental motivation for the generation of what Liebknecht calls patriotic spirit or military spirit. Eckstein (2006: 133) refers to the term "great fear" as not true but an indication of the psychological situation**.** In *Coriolanus*, Shakespeare describes, among the glorious cries of the Roman politicians and commanders, the mood of fear hanging over the city of Rome. The reason was that Rome did not feel secure all across the Euro-Asian geography. Thus, the first step Rome took towards an Empire state was, and had to be, a militaristic one in nature. Eckstein (2006: 164) says that "Roman aristocratic culture was intensely war-like." This militarist culture dominated all spheres in the state organization, though seemingly Roman Empire set itself on republican traditions. Shakespeare portrays this militaristic atmosphere very carefully, ably and very brilliantly in the play *Coriolanus*. Caius Martius, whom will be named as Coriolanus after his victory over the city of Cariole, has the mind-set of a man of the military ideology that made Rome an empire. Although he dislikes it when Menenius and others talk about his qualities as a soldier and a patriot, somewhere in his alter ego, he is poisoned and paralyzed by his superior resolution, boldness, daring and extraordinary deeds when he is asked to play in the political arena, where things are different from the battle field. Being a soldier and a commander, Caius Martius claims that some political and governmental rights must be given to him without the consent of the people even if it is required of in a republican system:

Coriolanus:

You know the cause, sir, of my standing here.

Third Citizen:

We do, sir; tell us what hath
brought you to 't.

Coriolanus:

Mine own desert.

Second Citizen:

Your own desert!

Coriolanus:

Ay, but not mine own desire.

Third Citizen:

How not your own desire?

Coriolanus:

No, sir, 't was never my desire yet to
trouble the poor with begging.

Third Ctizen:

You must think, if we give you
anything, we hope to gain by you(2.3.68-78).

By saying, "my own desert", Caius Martius thinks that he deserves that political post as a senator just because of his military achievements. By saying "..but not my own desire", he means he does not approve the act of asking the plebeians for vote. He is harshly critical of republican order, which forces him to obey the rules of civilian political system, and also

of any right given to the plebeians concerning the distribution of power in a republican political system:

Menenius:

What is granted them?

Martius:

Five tribunes to defend their vulgar wisdoms,
Of their own choice: one's Junius Brutus,
SiciniusVelutus, and I know not--'Sdeath!
The rabble should have first unroof'd the city,
Ere so prevail'd with me: it will in time
Win upon power and throw forth greater themes
For insurrection's arguing(1.1.118-225).

As a matter of fact, the play is full of conflicts and clashes between the representatives of various political, social and ideological movements. One is the clash between militarism, democracy and republicanism. The concepts mentioned above are some of the sub-topics of the political debate in the play. In a power-play between civilians, soldiers, jurisdiction and senators, who make the constitutional body, especially in countries which rely on warfare in terms of their geopolitical and economic conditions, soldiers tend to be more advantageous than the other parties. In the play, Romans from upper classes who exercise a major influence on the government and on the determination of policies make large profits out of warfare. The concept of profit does not necessarily refer to an economic one. In most cases, it is political, social and constitutional. Sometimes politicians tend to reinforce their roles in the governmental body through militarism, which is why they are willing to share the governmental authority with soldiers:

Menenius:

Having determined of the Volsces and
To send for Titus Lartius, it remains,
As the main point of this our after-meeting,
To gratify his noble service that
Hath thus stood for his country: therefore, please you,
Most reverend and grave elders, to desire
The present consul, and last general

In our well-found successes, to report
A little of that worthy work perform'd
By Caius Martius Coriolanus, whom
We met here both to thank and to remember
With honours like himself. (2.2.41-52)

It has always become a problem for civilians to deal with how to keep armies under their control. This problem arises from the fear that the imbalanced and uncontrolled power of the army in wartime can be turned to them in peace time. The same fear rages in the hearts and minds of the plebeians and their representatives. Brutus feels this very deep in his heart:

Brutus:

Could you not have told him
As you were lesson'd, when he had no power,
But was a petty servant to the state,
He was your enemy, ever spake against
Your liberties and the charters that you bear
I' the body of the weal; and now, arriving
A place of potency and sway o' the state,
If he should still malignantly remain
Fast foe to the plebeii, your voices might
Be curses to yourselves? You should have said
That as his worthy deeds did claim no less
Than what he stood for, so his gracious nature
Would think upon you for your voices and
Translate his malice towards you into love,
Standing your friendly lord (2.3.185-199).

Menenius tries to achieve this balance by appointing Caius Martius as a candidate for consulship, which means that he wants to guarantee the political domination under the military power which Caius Martius holds. However, Caius Martius believes in absolute militarism, and this belief prevents him from playing the game of politics in Rome as is required. After he has received the consent of the plebeians, he has to attend a meeting in the Senate. Now, he is about to become consul, but still he considers himself a soldier, a commander, and a military personality:

Coriolanus:

May I change these garments?

Sicinius:

You may, sir.

Coriolanus:

That I'll straight do; and, knowing myself again,
Repair to the senate-house. (2.3.155-158)

The garments are those civilian people wear as a sign of modesty which exists nowhere in Coriolanus' militaristic world. In the play, the nobles, the senators and Caius Martius favor state and military authority. To put it other words, the so-called republican system in Shakespeare's Rome is dependent upon Caius Martius' military power. Cominius' speech in front of the senators act as a PR work for Coriolanus, as Menenius does in most parts of the play, and thus for the legitimacy of Rome's dependence on his military power:

Cominius:

I shall lack voice: the deeds of Coriolanus
Should not be utter'd feebly. It is held
That valour is the chiefest virtue, and
Most dignifies the haver: if it be,
The man I speak of cannot in the world
Be singly counterpoised. At sixteen years,
When Tarquin made a head for Rome, he fought
Beyond the mark of others: our then dictator,
Whom with all praise I point at, saw him fight,
When with his Amazonian chin he drove
The bristled lips before him: be bestrid
An o'er-press'd Roman and i' the consul's view
Slew three opposers: Tarquin's self he met,
And struck him on his knee: in that day's feats,
When he might act the woman in the scene,
He proved best man i' the field, and for his meed
Was brow-bound with the oak. His pupil age
Man-enter'd thus, he waxed like a sea,
And in the brunt of seventeen battles since
He lurch'd all swords of the garland. For this last,
Before and in Corioli, let me say,
I cannot speak him home: he stopp'd the fliers;
And by his rare example made the coward
Turn terror into sport: as weeds before
A vessel under sail, so men obey'd
And fell below his stem: his sword, death's stamp,
Where it did mark, it took; from face to foot
He was a thing of blood, whose every motion
Was timed with dying cries: alone he enter'd

The mortal gate of the city, which he painted
With shunless destiny; aidless came off,
And with a sudden reinforcement struck
Corioli like a planet: now all's his:
When, by and by, the din of war gan pierce
His ready sense; then straight his doubled spirit
Re-quicken'd what in flesh was fatigate,
And to the battle came he; where he did
Run reeking o'er the lives of men, as if
'Twere a perpetual spoil: and till we call'd
Both field and city ours, he never stood
To ease his breast with panting(2.3. 86-126).

For Cominius, and naturally for all other patricians, true deed lies in one's military power. Caius Martius deserves any appreciation and admiration, for his military heroism defies all criticisms of his paternalistic, prideful and imperious attitudes. In the play, the Tribunes and the Senators also exhibit such attitudes. Even Volumnia, Coriolanus' mother, though she is a civic figure, plays a crucial role in structuring civil-military relations:

Volumnia:

You are too absolute;
Though therein you can never be too noble,
But when extremities speak.
I have heard you say,
Honour and policy, like unsever'd friends,
I' the war do grow together: grant that, and tell me,
In peace what each of them by the other lose,
That they combine not there. (3.2.39-46)

On the one hand Volumnia seems to support Coriolanus' super-aggressive and egomaniac attitudes, on the other hand, she tries to teach how to behave pragmatically: obeying the rules of the politics in peace time if he wants to make his way to the senate:

Coriolanus:

Tush, tush!

Menenius:

A good demand.

71

Volumnia:

If it be honour in your wars to seem
The same you are not, which, for your best ends,
You adopt your policy, how is it less or worse,
That it shall hold companionship in peace
With honour, as in war, since that to both
It stands in like request?

Coriolanus:

Why force you this?

Volumnia:

Because that now it lies you on to speak
To the people; not by your own instruction,
Nor by the matter which your heart prompts you,
But with such words that are but rooted in
Your tongue, though but bastards and syllables
Of no allowance to your bosom's truth.
Now, this no more dishonours you at all
Than to take in a town with gentle words,
Which else would put you to your fortune and
The hazard of much blood.
I would dissemble with my nature where
My fortunes and my friends at stake required
I should do so in honour: I am in this,
Your wife, your son, these senators, the nobles;
And you will rather show our general louts
How you can frown than spend a fawn upon 'em,
For the inheritance of their loves and safeguard
Of what that want might ruin(3.2.39-65).

Though Shakespeare does not give us direct information about the role of Volumnia as a mother in how Caius Martius has become a political, militarist and elitist beast, the role Volumnia plays here is a more modest and political one. When Volumnia urges him to retract his defiance of the people and thus regain their votes for consulship, he rejects this and breaks the delicate balance between the military and the civil politics. In fact, what the plebeians demand from Coriolanus is his loyalty and submission to the system and its institutions. Actually, the armed forces might be, especially in totalitarian societies and in countries with special conditions due to the surrounding geo-political atmosphere like Rome in the play, powerful social and political organizations that play some vital roles in

the political arena. And, in such countries, the military is considered to be a would-be-democratic institution. Shakespeare seeks ways of transforming military power into political and social organization in the character of Caius Martius. However, he also determines the principles: Martius should play the game of politics by civilian principles. According to Liebknecht (1918), military is a national institution whose duties and responsibilities, in the first place, are to cope with external aggression or for protection against an external danger. Caius Martius best symbolizes this type of militarism in the play while fighting to protect Rome against Volcsicans and his great rival Aufidius. In the campaign that follows, the Volcsicans are defeated, and the Rome takes the Italian city of Corioles, thanks to the heroism of Martius. In recognition of his great deeds, he is granted the name Coriolanus. Upon his return to Rome, Coriolanus is given a hero's greeting, and the Senate offers to make him consul. In order to gain this office, however, he must go out and plead for the votes of the plebeians, a task that he undertakes reluctantly. And this is where Liebknecht's (1918) second phase of militarism comes to the front: it is no longer a means of defense and a weapon against the external enemy; now it has its second task in the play: "the task of protecting the prevailing social order, of supporting capitalism and all reaction against the struggle of the working class for freedom." This is why all the nobles and patricians in the play are on the side of Caius Martius. They see him as the guard of their social, political, and economic status. Here, militarism becomes a tool in the hands of the ruling classes, designed to hinder the development of class-consciousness by its alliance with power (Liebknecht, 1918). Why do Senators and nobles want to appoint Caius Martius as a Consul? Would it be because they want to hold Coriolanus and his military power as a tool in their hands against the conscious will of the majority of the people, its dominant position in the state and its freedom to exploit? The answer this study comes up with to such a question is 'Yes', considering Rome's geopolitical location and real politics of the era. What Coriolanus does is to seek to pave his way to the status, which is the only way in a militarist system. Such an attitude from military circles in a country leads to a de facto system in which all issues and affairs and patterns, from structural to economic ones, are determined and shaped by military values, ideology and institutions. Militarism, therefore, could not exist in any country without collaboration and acquiescence from the political circles. Rome's maintenance of militarism is due to the high degree of economic dependency on military expenditures across Europe and Asia. This interdependency has led to a voluntary military tutelage in the Roman republic.

Deeply entrenched in Rome's patricians psyche, militarist culture in the play *Coriolanus* contributes to the formation of a mood in which even politicians promote military solutions to political and diplomatic problems. This is the militarization of politics and diplomatics. From the perspective of the science of politics, the problem between the plebeians and Caius Martius is of diplomatic nature and could easily be solved through diplomatic negotiations. Caius Martius and patricians' militarist culture makes a simple conflict one that leads to a destructive earthquake in the establishment of the Rome. Cominius' following words will make it easy to understand how deeply Roman political culture is dominated by militarist culture in the play:

Cominius:

If I should tell thee o'er this thy day's work,
Thou'ldst not believe thy deeds: but I'll report it
Where senators shall mingle tears with smiles,
Where great patricians shall attend and shrug,
I' the end admire, where ladies shall be frighted,
And, gladly quaked, hear more; where the dull tribunes,
That, with the fusty plebeians, hate thine honours,
Shall say against their hearts 'We thank the gods
Our Rome hath such a soldier.
Yet camest thou to a morsel of this feast,
Having fully dined before (1.9.1-11).

With Coriolanus, Shakespeare creates a discussion platform where he provides literary and political critics with the opportunity to question militarism and militarist culture. Focusing on certain realities, logical connections between historical events both in his History and Roman plays, organizing ideas, terms and concepts in the form of a system, Shakespeare's plays mark the development of a new era, one which creates a new European self-identification that values civilian power or culture over military power and culture, one which relies on political and economic means of influence, if not at the international level, at the domestic one.

Patricians aim to hold the Plebeians in tutelage, which transforms power and authority into coercion: "The state is essentially an apparatus of compulsion and coercion. The characteristic feature of its activities is to compel people through the application or the threat of force to behave otherwise than they would like to behave" (von Mises, 1944: 46). What von Mises (104) calls "total war, or war of aggression" can easily be seen in Caius

Martius' militarism, which helps the Patricians to keep the plebeians under control, thus creating what is called the Military Tutelage. He resizes "every opportunity to wage war and to conquer" (von Mises, 1944: 104). His election as a consul is an opportunity for him to demilitarize his existence, a move from a military identity to a political identity. However, "his passionate addiction to combat to bloody face-painting and scarred limbs" (Barish, 1991: 18) starts a new war within the city of Rome. "Shakespeare sets up a contrast ... between war and peace" says Barish and adds: "In each case ... the hero, who has served with success and brilliance in battle, proves inadequate to the more complex demands of peace. War has the advantage of mobilizing aggressions and providing an outlet of them" (18). It is this inadequacy that creates one of his tragic flaws, inadequacy of keeping a delicate balance between militarism in war time and civic politics in peace time. To the historic battle between aristocracy and democracy, Coriolanus adds another dimension: military or militarism in the form of foreign war and domestic conflicts. What the play reveals in terms of militarism may depend on one's critical perspective: either from a conservative perspective or from a liberal one. When viewed from a conservative perspective, the play seems to have very few democratic tendencies, for it idealizes Coriolanus in his military efforts to defend Rome against foreign attacks. But, from a liberal perspective, in peace time, Coriolanus also tries hard to create his own domestic enemies to sustain his militaristic influence over the political system of Rome. The fact that his attitude is approved by the Patricians creates an ideal atmosphere for military tutelage. They think their economic, social and political presence relay heavily on Caius Martius' military power. This is not acceptable in democratic thinking. From this perspective, the play *Coriolanus* seems to be critical of militarism. This is why, in Nazi Germany, they adapted a different version of the play and used it as a means of propaganda by idealizing Caius Martius as a character who very well fit the members of Hitler's ideal society. Also, the militarism and military tutelage can be associated with today's American militarism:

> The world is a dangerous place. There are war-making aggressive, hostile forces in the world, countries which oppress their own people and threaten others, as well political movements that are prepared to use violence to get their way. We must oppose these threats to our national security. But we are not aggressors. We have a Department of Defense, not a Department of War. We use our military power to defend freedom, to defend democracy, to protect America, but not to dominate other countries and people. If sometimes serious problems arise from our use of military power, as in the Vietnam War or in the Iraq war, mostly these reflect bad judgment, poor information or inadequate understanding of the context rather than bad motives or malevolent goals. Even though we are not perfect, we

are a moral force in the world and use our military power for moral purposes (Wright, 2011: 2).

The study argues that the Rome is in danger. War-making aggressive, hostile forces which threaten others are Volsces. Caius Martius is a Neo-Conservative commander who never misses any chance of taking advantage of using military power against his enemy, Aufidius. All in all, *Coriolanus* is a distinctive play. It is distinctive in that Shakespeare creates heated discussions for and against democracy, republicanism, and aristocracy. It is also distinctive in that he creates arguments against elitism in the form of the privileges of a minority group over the claims of the majority, against militarism which brought the fall of the Roman Empire, started many wars all across the world claiming millions of lives. It is distinctive in that the play can be considered an ancient form of class awareness in the form of egalitarianism. He achieves all these with the spirit of a poet, playwright and an actor, and the acuteness of a philosopher and political thinker.

2.4. Power Struggle through Latent and Manifest Orientalism in *Antony and Cleopatra*

It is observed that, for a long period of time long before the west created what is called now Western Civilization or Western values, European literary people, who made undeniable contributions to what Harold Bloom calls *Western Canon*, were inspired by the rich sources in the works of the East. Nevertheless, this inspiration, which in its essence must have scientific, literary or philosophical characteristics, was dominated by the blindness of ideology. Literary, cultural, philosophical and scientific values were sacrificed to politics and ideology. Though this created a multicultural environment, much of this multiculturalism was shaped and interpreted from a highly ethnocentric and geocentric perspective. Orientalism is the concept used to define this perspective. Beneath this political and ideological distortion of values and realities lies hegemony, either cultural, or ideological, or political, or scientific, or militaristic. Edward Said (1978: 7) explains this hegemony as follows:

> It is hegemony, or rather the result of cultural hegemony at work, that gives Orientalism the durability and the strength I have been speaking about so far. Orientalism is never far from what Denys Hay has called the idea of Europe, a collective notion identifying "us" Europeans as against all "those" non-Europeans, and indeed it can be argued that the major

component in European culture is precisely what made that culture hegemonic both in and outside Europe: the idea of European identity as a superior one in comparison with all the non-European peoples and cultures. There is in addition the hegemony of European ideas about the Orient, themselves reiterating European superiority over Oriental backwardness.

Between 16.and 19. centuries, the reevaluation and criticism of the criticism of cultural values of Christian cultural values and Near East and Greko-Roman traditions led to the creation of a new civilization that redefined all these values in combination with information and knowledge emerged. Shakespeare was among those people who paved the way with their works towards a new world.

Though scholarly studies and researchers go as far back as to the 18[th]century to discuss the subject of orientalism, it is a well-known fact that numerous literary works written in Elizabethan and Jacobean periods, those by Marlowe, Webster, Ford, Dekker, Marston, Greene, and Kyd revealed a widespread interest in the east in England with the rise of economic relationships with the eastern countries. *Tamburlaine* and *The Jew of Malta* by Christopher Marlowe, *Soliman and Perseda* by Thomas Kyd, *Selimus* by Robert Greene are some examples. Thus, they, with a revived interest in the East and their depiction of the Oriental characters, led to a tradition in drama and literature, which is called 'Literary Orientalism', which stands for the embodiment, the representation and the description of the East in Western literary texts (Kidwai, 2009). In terms of moral portrait, the Orient was a place full of passionate people, and the fact that these plays were mainly revenge tragedies shaped the very nature of the literary orientalism: more than exoticism and fascination with the east, it was a matter of culture, religion and politics. Shakespeare seems to be interested in what was oriental in his time from a historical and cultural perspective in his *Antony and Cleopatra*. By making Cleopatra as one of its main figures and creating her counter-parts in the west, Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* can be read as a play creating stereotype figures associated with the Orient.

From a Cultural Materialistic and New Historicist perspective, it is possible to study Shakespeare's orientalism with more contemporary perspectives, terms and clichés. One of these perspectives would be one which was developed and used by Edward Said (1978). He mentioned two kinds of Orientalism: latent and manifest. Latent Orientalism, as the name suggests, reveals unconscious, constant and unanimous views about the Orient, representing the deep, underlying, Orient's eccentricity, 'its backwardness, its silent

indifference, its feminine penetrability, its supine malleability'(206) while Manifest Orientalism shows itself in views different in form or personal style. Though much of Said's criticism of orientalism is related to western scholars' views, and perceptions of Islam, Orientalism is deep-rooted and it dates back to pre-Islamic era for the term Orient was indiscriminately used for all of the Asian civilizations encountered by Europeans in their eastward imperial and colonial expansion. In *Romans and Aliens*, Baldson (1979) deals with how Romans regarded other peoples, focusing on the themes of Graco-Roman sociology; the Roman image in the eyes of others, dislike of Greek morals and Romans' attitudes towards peoples they called barbarians. The book reveals how western image is both implicitly and explicitly idealized over others and concerned with the concepts of top people and others in Roman era. Similarly, Paul A. Cartledge (1993) emphasizes how Greeks conceptualized themselves and their culture in opposition to others**.** His book implies parallelism between the Greek era and the modern one in that people who call themselves as the members of a superior culture see the world in mere black and white, and thus create the concepts of 'Us' and 'Them' or 'the Self' and 'the Other'. All these support the notion that Romans idealized their own self-perception in opposition to the others. The Others were Egyptians, Phoenicians, Ethiopians, Gauls, Turks and other foreigners. In this regard, Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra,* wherein the west and the east politically, culturally, emotionally and militaristically meet, is deeply grounded in what Said called 'orientalism'. The way he depicts the characters from the Orient, and the false assumptions he seeds in his plays about the Orient make this play a prelude to Western Orientalist discourse. "Shakespeare was a powerful tool of empire, with the doctrine of European cultural superiority… Universal Shakespeare was both a beacon of the greatness of European civilization and a gateway into that greatness" says O'Toole (2012).

It is apparent at the very beginning of *Antony and Cleopatra* how easily Shakespeare lends himself to manifest orientalist discourse:

Philo:

Nay, but this dot age of our general's
O'er flows the measure: those his goodly eyes,
That o'er the files and musters of the war

78

Have glow'd like plated Mars, now bend, now turn,
The office and devotion of their view
Upon a tawny front: his captain's heart,
Which in the scuffles of great fights hath burst
buckles on his breast, reneges all temper,
And is become the bellows and the fan
To cool a gipsy's lust (1.1. 1-10).

Since she represents the Orient, Philo thinks that Anthony's relationship with Cleopatra is corruptive, for it is a submissive one: "the Orient corrupts", which is the manifestation of latent orientalism. Here, "tawny front" refers to the dominant skin-color in the east, and "gipsy's lust" represents the eastern lifestyle. Philo also implies that Antony is controlled by his heart, meaning that he is the slave of his emotions and feelings, which keeps him away from his responsibilities as a commander and politician. This is also a revelation of western patriarchal society of Rome. Antony, contrary to western image of masculinity which is expected from him, adopts feminine qualities like passion, emotion and love, which undermines his western qualities. Here, the study takes on Foucauldian perspective which is based on the complicity of discourse that is a manifestation of power, superiority and hegemony, in which masculinity is seen as means of hegemonic power. This also represents criticism, depiction and understanding of the East through the dominating frameworks of the West. By creating the East as the "other", orientalist discourse also tries to define the west/occident.

To better view the portrait of Cleopatra in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* from an orientalist perspective, one must refer to Cleopatra as a historical figure and identify the differences. Although Cleopatra was a pharaoh of Ancient Egypt, equal to Octavius Caesar, the Roman Emperor of her time, in terms of political status, although she was a member of the Ptolemaic dynasty, a family of Greek origin that ruled Ptolemaic Egypt after the death Alexander the Great during the Hellenistic period (Burstein, 2004),Shakespeare allows his Roman characters to use the word "strumpet" for Cleopatra. Shakespeare uses the word several times in his other plays. One is in *King Henry VI*, Part I. He uses the word for Joan La Pucelle, aka Joan of Arc, his first villain, a national hero to the French, but less revered in England. She represents the Other for Shakespeare since England and France were rivals and for the English in 1590s,Francegeographically belonged to the Orient. Similarly, in *Titus Andronicus*, Shakespeare puts the word 'strumpet' in Titus' mouth to humiliate Tamora, the Queen of the Goths, mother of Chiron

and Demetrius. Tamora's barbarism, savagery, and lasciviousness are what make her the Other. Shakespeare portrays her as opposite in every respect to Lavinia, the archetypal victim and the daughter of Titus Andronicus. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, he does the same. He contrasts Octavia and Fulvia with Cleopatra. They are opposite in every aspect. Octavia is the archetypal Roman woman as wife of man: an archetype of beauty, wisdom, and modesty.

Maecenas:

> If beauty, wisdom, modesty, can settle
> The heart of Antony, Octavia is
> A blessed lottery to him (2.2.246-248).

Oriental woman lacks wisdom, and modesty, and thus beauty. These qualities are specific to the western woman. Shakespeare's Cleopatra can be associated with Gustave Flaubert's Kuchuk Hanem as a stereotype oriental woman. Gustave Flaubert mentioned Kuchuk Hanem in his accounts of travel to Egypt as a famed beauty and dancer. Kuchuk Hanem became a key figure and symbol in Flaubert`s Orientalist accounts of the East. Flaubert depicts Kuchuk Hanem as follows:

> Kuchuk Hanem and Bambeh begin to dance. Kuchuk's dance is brutal. She squeezes her bare breasts together with her jacket. She puts on her girdle fashioned from a brown shawl with gold stripes, with three tassels hanging on ribbons. She rises first on one foot, then on the other--marvelous movement, when one foot is on the ground, the other moves up and across in front of the shin bone. The whole thing done with a light bound. I have seen this dance on old Greek vases. Bambeh prefers a dance on a straight line; she moves with a lowering and raising of one hip only, a kind of limping of great character. Bambeh has henna on her hands. She seems to be a devoted servant to Kuchuk...All in all, their dancing, except Kuchuk's step mentioned above, is far less good than that of Hassan el-Belbeissi, the male dancer in Cairo. Joseph's opinion is that all beautiful women dance badly (Steegmuller,1979: 115-116).

As Flaubert did so many years after him, which proves oriental images and perceptions are deep rooted, "Shakespeare evidently saw Cleopatra as a gypsy, exerting a spell over her man by her contrariousness, her changing moods, her tempestuous temperament, her feminine cunning, and her passions" (Rowse, 1978: 467).Shakespeare is said to have got his story in *Antony and Cleopatra* from Plutarch's Lives (Mabillard, 2000). Though, Plutarch refers to Cleopatra's political intelligence, her western-rooted ambition, her ability to use language effectively and impressively, none of these qualities Shakespeare attributes

to his Cleopatra in the play. Plutarch also refers to Cleopatra's sexual qualities as a means that helps her hold political power. But, in the play *Antony and Cleopatra*, she is controlled by her sexual desires and she uses sex only to keep Antony under her control.

Said (1978: 296) is critical of the nineteenth-century writers' perceptions and ideas about the Orient claiming that:

> ... the differences in the ideas about the Orient can be characterized as exclusively manifest differences, differences in form and personal style, rarely in basic content. Everyone of them kept intact these parateness of the Orient, its eccentricity, its backwardness, its silent indifference, its feminine penetrability, it supine malleability.

In terms of feminine penetrability, the following lines are of great significance. Enobarbus talks about how Cleopatra and Egypt inspired and enthralled Antony referring to Cleopatra's femininity and lust:

Maecenas:

She's a most triumphant lady, if report be square to her.

Enobarbus:

When she first met Mark Antony, she pursed up
his heart, upon the river of Cydnus.

Agrippa:

There she appeared indeed, or my reporter devised well for her.

Enobarbus:

I will tell you.
The barge she sat in, like a burnished throne,
Burned on the water. The poop was beaten gold,
Purple the sails, and so perfumèd that
The winds were lovesick with them. The oars were silver,
Which to the tune of flutes kept stroke, and made
The water which they beat to follow faster,
As amorous of their strokes. For her own person,
It beggared all description: she did lie

In her pavilion—cloth-of-gold, of tissue—
O'er picturing that Venus where we see
The fancy outwork nature. On each side her
Stood pretty dimpled boys, like smiling Cupids,
With divers-colored fans, whose wind did seem
To glow the delicate cheeks which they did cool,
And what they undid did.(2.2.190-209)

This femininity and lust that Shakespeare attributes to Cleopatra is just opposite of what western eyes would like to see in a woman in Shakespeare's England: purity and obedience to patriarchal power and authority.

Orientalist discourse tries to find reasons or arguments to exclude people in the Orient from the universality of progress and civilization. Ignorance of duties and uninterrupted idyllic life are presented as the characteristics of the Orient (Said, 1978). Shakespeare refers to such extravagant, luxurious, indifferent and lustrous lifestyle. He very successfully blends orientalism with exoticism, associated with colonialism and imperialism, and pursues the discovery, perception and understanding of 'the self' with reference to extraordinary differences from 'the other':

Enobarbus:

Her gentlewomen, like the Nereides,
So many mermaids, tended her i' the eyes,
And made their bends adornings: at the helm
A seeming mermaid steers: the silken tackle
Swell with the touches of those flower-soft hands,
That yarely frame the office. From the barge
A strange invisible perfume hits the sense
Of the adjacent wharfs. The city cast
Her people out upon her; and Antony,
Enthroned i' the market-place, did sit alone,
Whistling to the air; which, but for vacancy,
Had gone to gaze on Cleopatra too,
And made a gap in nature (2.2.211-223).

Shakespeare is said to have borrowed these lines from Plutarch's Life of Antony. In his translation of Plutarch's Lives, Thomas North (1579) depicts an exotic atmosphere in which all Egyptians enjoy their time regardless of their duties and governmental affairs. Since Mark Antony imprisons himself into such an oriental and exotic lifestyle, he is considered to be ignorant of his duties and responsibilities as a triumvir. As for Cleopatra,

she is portrayed as a representative and a product of such a lustrous life style, nothing of her cultural or national values is mentioned in the play. Never in the play is Cleopatra seen talking about world or governmental affairs even though she is the queen of a country. On the contrary, she is far away from such serious and noble duties and responsibilities, which is why she is corruptive and poisonous:

Cleopatra:

Give me some music; music, moody food
Of us that trade in love.

Attendant:

The music, ho!

Cleopatra:

Let it alone; let's to billiards: come, Charmian.

Charmian:

My arm is sore; best play with Mardian.

Cleopatra:

As well a woman with an eunuch play'd
As with a woman. Come, you'll play with me, sir?

Mardian:

As well as I can, madam. (2.5.1-8)

"The Oriental male was considered in isolation from the total community in which he lived and which many Orientalists have viewed with something resembling contempt and fear", says Said (1978: 207) and adds that:

Orientalism itself, furthermore, was an exclusively male province; like so many professional guilds during the modern period, it viewed itself and its subject matter with sexist blinders. This is especially evident in the writing of travelers and novelists: women are usually the creatures of a male power- fantasy. They express unlimited sensuality, they are more or less stupid, and above all they are willing.

There is no significant oriental male figure in the play. Instead, at the very beginning of the play, Antony appears to be an orientalized-male figure:

Philo:

Look, where they come:
Take but good note, and you shall see in him.
The triple pillar of the world transform'd
Into a strumpet's fool: behold and see (1.1.11-14).

With reference to Northrop Frye's definition of fictional modes: " ... the hero is a leader. He has authority, passions, and powers of expression far greater than [other people], but what he does is subject both to social criticism and to the order of nature" (Frye, 1987: 34), this study argues that Antony's tragic flaw is his self-orientalization, which leads to his failure in making reconciliation between love and duty. The crystallization of orientalization in Antony Caesar is expressed as follows: " ... he fishes, drinks and wastes / The lamps of night in revel is not more manlike/ Than Cleopatra; nor the queen of Ptolemy/ More womanly than he; hardly gave audience, or / Vouchsafed to think he had partners. You shall find there / A man who is the abstract of all faults that all men follow" (1.4.4-9). Shakespeare makes Antony aware of this self-orientalization at the beginning of the play:

Mark Antony:

Forbear me.
There's a great spirit gone! Thus did I desire it:
What our contempt doth often hurl from us,
We wish it ours again; the present pleasure,
By revolution lowering, does become
The opposite of itself: she's good, being gone;
The hand could pluck her back that shoved her on.
I must from this enchanting queen break off:
Ten thousand harms, more than the ills I know,
My idleness doth hatch. How now! Enobarbus! (1.2.25-34)

He sees unlimited sensuality in Cleopatra, and marginalizes her: "She is cunning past man's thought" (1.2.49) . He thinks he does not belong to the East, and says "I must be gone" (1.2.40). However, he cannot keep himself away from his obsession with Cleopatra. His ambivalence, being trapped between the will of staying in Egypt and of escaping it, gives him a confusing, and perplexed identity, not a man of the real would but of an oriental one. Shakespeare portrays this world as a ceremonial one. Whenever and whatever he speaks, whatever he does and why, one cannot understand whether he tells the truth or not or whether he does the right thing or not for he is a deluded lover. As a deluded lover, Shakespeare makes him see the reality (Oates, 1964): "I am so lated in the world that I/ Have lost my way for ever" (3. 9. 3). He lost his way in the Orient.

For Pompey, Antony suffers from the corruptive venoms of the East. Guided by reason, honor and political and national responsibility, far away from such corruptive traits as passion and lust, Pompey wishes that Antony be destroyed and lose his identity in his relationship with Cleopatra in a strange, magical, to some extent, supernatural land-scape and oriental life style:

Pompey:

> But all the charms of love,
> Salt Cleopatra, soften thy waned lip!
> Let witchcraft join with beauty, lust with both!
> Tie up the libertine in a field of feasts,
> Keep his brain fuming; Epicurean cooks
> Sharpen with cloyless sauce his appetite;
> That sleep and feeding may prorogue his honour
> Even till a Lethe'ddulness! (2.1.20-27).

"Charms of love" are compared to "Salt", which is erosive and corruptive, it wanes one's lips, 'whitchcrafting' is a fatal sin, which is religiously, morally and socially corruptive. 'the charm of love', 'waned lips', 'whitchcrafting', 'lust', 'fuming', 'cloyless sauce', 'sleep and feed' are all examples of manifest orientalism. What Pompey says about the Orient and Cleopatra is not only his own perception of the Orient but an archetype of perception deep-rooted in western civilization, and it also may help create perceived realities in the minds of others, which is what Said called as latent orientalism. What Antony says to

Caesar after returning from Egypt can best represent what is called 'perceived reality' or 'latent orientalism' already constructed in Rome:

Mark Antony:

> I learn, you take things ill which are not so,
> Or being, concern you not.(2.2.28-29)

Antony is well aware of the fact that, through perceived reality constructed by Oriental discourse, he is detached from the political issues in Rome. Mark Antony and Cleopatra create a world in which they are accessible to one another through language (Wilders, 1977).

More than two thousand years have passed after her death, but Cleopatra still creates political, ideological and cultural debates over her ethnic origin and skin-colour. All these arguments are based on whether she was black or white. Such an approach inevitably takes these arguments to a Eurocentric or Afrocentric-Orientalist and Occidentalist space. Scholarly discussions reveal that Cleopatra had a mixed race: by her father, she had a Macedonian Greek origin, her father was a general in Alexandra the Great's army and also the founder of the Ptolemaic dynasty, but there was a problem: it was her mother, which is where her race has been put under discussion, and though there is no clear evidence for whether her mother had African, Greek or European origin, speculations hold that either her mother or her grandmother might have had African origin (Brome Weigall, 1914; Roller, 2010; Tyldesley, 2008; Ashton 2008;Bernal, 1987) refers to Cleopatra's Afro-Asiatic origin and calls her "Black Athena" . It is this African origin that at the very beginning of the play Philo refers to as "a tawny front" (1.1.6). Keith Rinehart (1972: 81) points to some (dis)similarities between Shakespeare's Cleopatra and Elizabeth I : "Elizabeth is the fair vestal throned by the West, Cleopatra is 'Egypt's widow' (1.5.25), Elizabeth was courageous, Cleopatra a coward." In the construction or invention of the Oriental Woman in literature as a fictional character, which later will create social norms and meanings with reference to what is oriental, one characteristic Shakespeare attributes to Cleopatra is her betrayal of Antony's trust. This is something which reveals itself in the prejudgments and false perceptions of Orientalism. The play draws, from the beginning up until the end, a twisting line between loyalty and betrayal. First Cleopatra tries to betray

Antony by sending a false death report. Why she tries this has always occupied the inquiring minds in literary circles. Is it that Antony, like any other honorable Roman commander, will kill himself? Or is it that she wants to finish with Antony and make a new start with Octavian? What we know from the play is that while Antony and Cleopatra are fighting against Octavian in order to control the East of the Roman Empire, their army has been defeated and their fleet has been destroyed just because Cleopatra, with her fleet and men, sailed away from the battle field leaving Antony all alone and weakened to the hands of Octavian:

Mark Antony:

All is lost;This foul Egyptian hath betrayed me:
My fleet hath yielded to the foe; and yonder
They cast their caps up and carouse together
Like friends long lost. Triple-turn'd whore!'tis thou
Hast sold me to this novice; and my heart
Makes only wars on thee. Bid them all fly;For when
I am revenged upon my charm,I have done all.
Bid them all fly; begone(4.12.12-21).

This betrayal is not rare with an oriental character, particularly a woman, in any other play or novel. "The charge of women's betrayal, of infidelity, has been represented as intrinsic to feminine nature" says Leslie Bow (2001: 1) and argues that

"Allegations of feminine perfidy thus offer ready instances for understanding both the homo-social nature of collective associations, including ethnic and national ties, and the role of women in securing and maintaining these associations. As symbolic boundary markers for ethnic and national affiliations, women embody ethnic authenticity, patriotism, and class solidarity--and their repudiation. For Asian American women, these symbolic boundary markers are especially fraught."

This is what exactly is done in Antony and Cleopatra: perfidy is specific to Cleopatra's ethnic and national ties. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, it is significant because "power" is at stake, which is shown as something not specific to the Eastern hands, something which is exercised or managed badly. Shakespeare does not make his Roman characters, Antony included, question or criticize why Cleopatra decides to withdraw from the battle field. The reason for this, the study claims, is that it is what is expected from her, which is another form of latent orientalism.

2.5. Power Struggle behind Agitation Propaganda, Perception Management and Deep State Operation in *Julius Caesar*

When *Julius Caesar* was first staged in1599, the stories Shakespeare told his audience were not unknown. People in Renaissance England knew a lot about the ancient Roman Republic, which was not remote and exotic to them since Julius Caesar invaded Britain in 54 BCE and the Roman Empire, which succeeded the republic, occupied Britain from 77 to 407 CE. Politically, English people identified themselves as citizens of the Roman Republic. Hence, this era served as an important political, historical and sociological source upon which Renaissance Europe built its civilization. Perhaps this is why Shakespeare tells his audience very little at the beginning of the play about the state order, namely power blocs in Rome. Surprisingly, Shakespeare tells very little about Julius Caesar through Caesar's own words, either. Given the appearances in the play, the dialogues and monologues Shakespeare uses to create his characters and given that Shakespeare creates his characters through their dialogues and monologues, one cannot help asking why the title of the play is *Julius Caesar*, but not the Tragedy of Brutus or something else. The reason for this is that Shakespeare creates the character Julius Caesar not on the stage as a physical entity and identity but fills in this identity with ideas and perceptions other characters hold about him. From this perspective, the play is a good example of what we call today as 'perception engineering' or 'perception management'.

Though being technically a republic before *Julius Caesar*, dictatorship was not something new to the Roman Empire. Lucius Cornelius Sulla, restoring the Senate as the main ruling body, with the weakening the role and the power of the Tribunes in the law making process, had already exhibited almost all the characteristics of a dictatorship before Caesar (Morey,1901). Of the political parties in Rome, namely the Optimates and the Popularis, Caesar sided the Popularis, which proves that he had different attitudes towards the Tribunes and the plebeians, which makes it hard to think that he held dictatorial tendencies like those having ruled the Rome before him. However, still it was natural to call the rulers of Rome as 'dictators'. The word in the Roman context had a fixed and limited meaning, unlike the modern one. In today's world, when one uses the word 'dictator', they mean absolute and enduring power without any control over it. Caesar was a legal official, and his responsibilities were fully dominated by the senate. The problem

was whether he held some imperial and dictatorial tendencies for enduring and uncontrolled power. Nowhere in the play we hear of Caesar mention any of these tendencies. At the very beginning of the play, Casca implies that Julius Caesar has a hidden agenda, which aims to create a perception in his target audience:

Casca:

> .. there was a crown offered him:
> And beeing offered him, he put it by with the back of his hand,
> thus; and then the people feel a shouting (1.2.40-42).

This perception is very well scratched and exploited by Cassius. What urges Cassius to do this, we learn more from history, but less from the play: that in order to widen support from the public, Caesar granted citizenships to those who were not native Roman, that he strengthened his ruling by gaining allegiances from proconsuls, that he built up a very strong network of spies, that he started a policy of land reform, which weakened the position of the wealthy, and that he reduced the power of the senate, just opposite of what Lucius Cornelius Sulla did. In *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*, Kott (1974) refers to Shakespeare's plays as sources of rich materials that provide information to understand the ideological conflicts of the modern world. The perception management Cassius and his friends exercised to pave the way to Caesar's assassination, the agitation propaganda plotted to take Brutus their side, inter-institutional conflicts in the state, fear of loss of power, attempts to keep the status quo are what can be seen in the play that also can be seen in the modern world. To give an example, in today's United States of America, known to have a very strong constitutional body of government, there is a strong association between President Obama and Caesar. Based upon the following words, some blame him for having autocratic tendencies:

> When Congress refuses to act — and as a result, hurts our economy and puts our people at risk — then I have an obligation as president to do what I can without them. I have an obligation to act on behalf of the American people. I'm not going to stand by while a minority in the Senate puts party ideology ahead of the people that we elected to serve. Not with so much at stake, not at this make-or-break moment for middle class Americans. We're not gonna let that happen (Obama, 2012).

This is no different from what Julius Caesar says to Metellus, the conspirator haunted by passion, jealousy, ambition and revenge, hiding his insidious intentions behind what we call today as ideological and political dissents, claiming that Caesar has dictatorial tendencies:

Caesar:

> I must prevent thee, Cimber.
> These couchings and these lowly courtesies
> Might fire the blood of ordinary men,
> And turn pre-ordinance and first decree
> Into the law of children. Be not fond,
> To think that Caesar bears such rebel blood
> That will be thaw'd from the true quality
> With that which melteth fools; I mean, sweet words,
> Low-crooked court'sies and base spaniel-fawning.
> Thy brother by decree is banished:
> If thou dost bend and pray and fawn for him,
> I spurn thee like a cur out of my way.
> Know, Caesar doth not wrong, nor without cause
> Will he be satisfied (3.1.40-53).

It is seen that, in the identity of Julius Caesar, Shakespeare creates a perception of imperialism, of totalitarian and autocratic ruling and of anti-republicanism. Cassius, Decius, Flavius, Marullus, Brutus and Cinna think Julius Caesar holds such tendencies. *Julius Caesar* tells us about a tragedy of a military coup plotted upon this perception. In order to supply legitimacy for their perception and plotting, Cassius has to convince others:

Cassius:

> And why should Caesar be a tyrant then?
> Poor man! I know he would not be a wolf,
> But that he sees the Romans are but sheep:
> He were no lion, were not Romans hinds.
> Those that with haste will make a mighty fire
> Begin it with weak straws: what trash is Rome,
> What rubbish and what offal, when it serves
> For the base matter to illuminate
> So vile a thing as Caesar! But, O grief,
> Where hast thou led me? I perhaps speak this
> Before a willing bondman; then I know
> My answer must be made. But I am arm'd,
> And dangers are to me indifferent.

Casca:

You speak to Casca, and to such a man
That is no fleering tell-tale. Hold, my hand:
Be factious for redress of all these griefs,
And I will set this foot of mine as far
As who goes farthest.

Cassius:

There's a bargain made.
Now know you, Casca, I have moved already
Some certain of the noblest-minded Romans
To undergo with me an enterprise
Of honourable-dangerous consequence;
And I do know, by this, they stay for me
In Pompey's porch: for now, this fearful night,
There is no stir or walking in the streets;
And the complexion of the element
In favour's like the work we have in hand,
Most bloody, fiery, and most terrible (2.1.103-131).

Cassius tries hard to create a perception in the plebeians' minds that Caesar will be a tyrant by claiming that he sees the Romans as sheep though he cannot say directly that Caesar is a wolf or a lion, which draws a direct connection with cruelty, wilderness, violence and tyranny. Cassius describes the plot against Julius Caesar as 'honorable but dangerous, bloody, fiery and most terrible' like any military coup. He knows very well that they cannot achieve their purpose without Brutus; hence it is necessary to have Brutus in their side. Brutus will guarantee the legitimacy of the assassination of Caesar:

Cinna:

O Cassius, if you could
But win the noble
Brutus to our party--

Cassius:

Be you content: good Cinna, take this paper,
And look you lay it in the praetor's chair,
Where Brutus may but find it; and throw this
In at his window; set this up with wax
Upon old Brutus' statue: all this done,

Repair to Pompey's porch, where you shall find us.
Is Decius Brutus and Trebonius there? (1.3.140-149)

The cornerstones of the perception management and agitation propaganda have already been placed very carefully, at least in the mind of Cassius: "...take this paper,/And look you lay it in the praetor's chair,/where Brutus may but find it; and throw this/ In at his window." At home on the other side of the city, with mixed emotions and thoughts that make it hard for him to fall asleep, Brutus walks up and down in his garden. Shaking his head, he speaks to himself: "That kind of power must not be allowed. Caesar could become too dangerous" when a servant comes in and hands Brutus a paper reading: "Brutus, Wake up! Shall Rome Stand In Awe of One Single Man? Speak Out. Take Action" (Wirkner, 2003: 21). Brutus thinks it is a message from the people themselves urging him to do something about the present condition. This is, he says to himself, a political action. The paper Brutus receives is a very good example of agitation and propaganda: agitation because it urges Brutus to do something expected by Cassius and others addressing to his emotions, propaganda because it intends to create a good reason in Brutus' mind for the plotting. What Cassius tries to do clearly complies with what happens in Cunningham's definitions of propaganda (2002: 1): "Spin, spin doctoring, brainwashing, mind control, indoctrination, belief manipulation, impression management, information control, mass persuasion, the engineering of consent, manufacturing consent, compliance-gaining strategies, ..."The Roman nobles have already started their agitation propaganda dealing with the question of empire and autocracy in the Roman Republic. They try hard to make reference to the imperial nature of Caesar's ruling, the political and governmental crises, the inevitability of freeing the nation from Julius Caesar and the necessity for the transformation of the corrupted Roman society, as they perceive it to be, back into a free republican society. Therefore, the study argues that the play combines two similar in nature but distinctive in their effect terms and actions. One is propaganda, which means "systematic scheme or concerted movement, for the propagation of some creed or doctrine" (Hallas, 1984: 10) and the other is agitation, which means "to excite people about something or stir something up" (Hallas, 1984: 10). Shakespeare ably employs both of them in the play, sometimes interchangeably. Agitation begins with the necessity of convincing Brutus of the inevitability of removing Julius Caesar from the Office. In fact, as Cassius puts it, Brutus is already confused with what has been created as perceptions about Caesar through Cassius' activities of propaganda:

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 crown'd:
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 with.
The abuse of greatness is, when it disjoins
Remorse from power: and, to speak truth of Caesar,
I have not known when his affections sway'd
More than his reason. But 'tis a common proof,
That lowliness is young ambition's ladder,
Whereto 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 degrees
By which he did ascend. So Caesar may.
Then, lest he may, prevent. And, since the quarrel
Will bear no colour for the thing he is,
Fashion it thus; that what he is, augmented,
Would run to these and these extremities:
And therefore think him as a serpent's egg
Which, hatch'd, would, as his kind, grow mischievous,
And kill him in the Shell.(2.1. 10-34)

As for the idea, it is that Julius Caesar is more likely to be an autocrat and tyrant. nevertheless, Brutus still holds a sense of guilt, or something like that and says "I know no personal cause to spurn at him,/But for the general. He would be crown'd: /How that might change his nature, there's the question", which seems to be an act of penance in advance.

Actually, propaganda starts with the play itself at the very beginning with Marullus and Flavius. What creates the environment and reasons for such propaganda and agitation, we are not given at the beginning of the play by Shakespeare. He takes it for granted that the audience or the reader already knows it. But, a little background knowledge is required for the validity and reliability of the thesis which the present study argues. The Roman Republic was founded in 509 BCE with an oath to make the people free of any tyranny. There were three institutions in the republican government: the Senate, the tribunes of the people, and the consuls. On the way to imperialism, near the last stage of the Republic, due to the existing nature and world balance of the time, there was also a dictator, the position that Julius Caesar held at the time of his assassination, which is the source of conflict and the beginning of the end in the play. There was a strong parallelism between Shakespeare's

stormy and rebellious Rome and political turmoil in the England. Just a very short period of time before Shakespeare began his career, in 1534, Henry VIII had established the Church of England, and made himself head. This led to many Catholic conspirations in the following period to regain the control of the crown. Then Elizabeth I ruled Britain from 1558 to 1603. It was in this period that Shakespeare began to write his plays. On his return to Rome, Caesar found himself in the struggle for rights and the sharing of power between the Plebeians and the Patricians, on which much of Roman politics, particularly during the republican age, centered on. The Plebeians and the patricians were rather like two political parties. Despite being a patrician, Julius Caesar stood for the Plebeians. This gave him some sort of public immunity, and popularity that most democratic leaders enjoy in modern times. Such an immunity is what Cassius thinks is uncontrollable. And the play implies that Caesar might have benefitted from this immunity and popularity in his idea of being an autocrat or a dictator. However, Shakespeare's Rome in the play had already undergone the procedure and the changes from a republican society to an autocratic society. This was a dissolution of the republican regime into autocratic one. The republican dissolution into autocracy can be explained through Eric Voegelin's words. He described the cycles of empire as follows:

> a phase of heroic monarchy, or feudal monarchy (When Caesar returned to Rome, the Senate granted him triumphs for his victories), then it is followed by the consolidation of political community into political parties (in the case of Rome in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, these are the plebeians and the patricians, then this turns into a political alliance or triumvirates in the case of Rome (the first of which was Caesar, Crassus, and Pompey, formed in 60 bc,), and finally follows the establishment of a new monarchy by one of the leaders. (1998: 125)

This leader was Julius Caesar and it was called as Caesarism or a Caesarist type of monarchy, namely autocracy**.** He recognizes two forms of Caesarism: progressive and reactionary. In progressive Caesarism, there is strong ruling over an orderly development of a new state. What is known is that, in Caesar's era, the Rome was reborn out of its ashes. In reactionary Caesarism, the existing power is stabilized. This is what drives Caesar's political rivals to a state of paranoia deriving from the idea that Caesar will usurp the state power. It is in this last phase that Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* opens its curtains. Flavius and Marullus, Cassius, Cinna, Decius Brutus, Metellus Cimber, Trebonius, and Caius Ligarius are aware of what is happening: Julius Caesar is about to become King and seize the rights and authorities of all others who have a place in the establishment. The first

sign of this fear comes from the two tribunes, Flavius and Marullus revealing the deep mistrust and fear that many in Rome have about Caesar's growing popularity. Theyexcoriate Rome's citizens for praising Caesar:

Marullus:

Wherefore rejoice? What conquest brings he home?
What tributaries follow him to Rome,
To grace in captive bonds his chariot-wheels?
You blocks, you stones, you worse than senseless things!
O you hard hearts, you cruel men of Rome,
Knew you not Pompey? Many a time and oft
Have you climb'd up to walls and battlements,
To towers and windows, yea, to chimney-tops,
Your infants in your arms, and there have sat
The livelong day, with patient expectation,
To see great Pompey pass the streets of Rome:
And when you saw his chariot but appear,
Have you not made an universal shout, That
Tiber trembled underneath her banks,
To hear the replication of your sounds
Made in her concave shores?
And do you now put on your best attire?
And do you now cull out a holiday?
And do you now strew flowers in his way
That comes in triumph over Pompey's blood?
Be gone! Run to your houses, fall upon your knees,
Pray to the gods to intermit the plague
That needs must light on this ingratitude.(1.1.36-58)

Marullus and Flavius complain that they celebrate Caesar and this celebration is perfidious because they once celebrated Pompey, with whom Caesar contended for the leadership of the Roman Republic, which resulted in a civil war. Lawrence Danson (2004: 218) writes that the opening scene of the play is "the sort of apparently expository scene in which Shakespeare actually gives us the major action of the play in miniature." This miniature presents a state of confusion in Rome's symbolic and actual governmental system. Marullus and Flavius try to clear this confusion by claiming, when the commoners say they are there for a memorialization of Caesar's triumph, that there is nothing of triumph in Caesar's ruling but a corruption of republican order. While the questions of whether Shakespeare did intend *Julius Caesar* as propaganda is still polemical, the very beginning of the play cannot and should not be taken in isolation from what is meant by political propaganda in terms of the effect the speech is intended to create on its audience. This

effect serves to construct a Caesar in the eyes of the people not as a protagonist but as an antagonist with an image of a ruler who follows unethical ways in his contest of power.

The idea that Caesar has some dictatorial tendencies can be seen in his statues in the streets of the city of Rome, which are adorned like the statues of the gods, and which can easily be seen as a fascist visual propaganda in this modern world. This is a custom Caesar has borrowed from the customs of the ruler cults of the eastern Hellenistic monarchies (Salmon, 1956). Also, the Senate has been continually voting him new honors. Gaius Marullus and Lucius Flavius, two tribunes, oppose these measures, and start their struggle with Caesar by 'driving away the vulgar from the streets':

Flavius:

It is no matter; let no images
Be hung with Caesar's trophies.
I'll about, And drive away the vulgar from the streets:
So do you too, where you perceive them thick.
These growing feathers pluck'd from Caesar's wing
Will make him fly an ordinary pitch,
Who else would soar above the view of men
And keep us all in servile fearfulness (1.2-72-79).

The vulgar is Caesar, and he is believed to place the cornerstones of the road to the dictatorship, one-man ruling, namely autocracy, which will keep them in "servile fearfulness." In autocracy, the power the ruler exercises is away from any control or check by any other institution. There is usually a form of constitution, but the ruler stands above it. People do not have representation in the government and the primarily political leader has complete authority to make all decisions for the country. However, in the play, the idea of empire or dictatorship does not belong only to Caesar. Indeed, there is no dialogue or monologue Shakespeare reveals this inclination through the mouth of Julius Caesar. It is clear from the play that the idea first comes from the citizens of Rome, from the common people. What is it that makes Caesar so popular among the citizens of Rome, so popular that they are willing to declare him as their king? The answer is people themselves:

Brutus:

What means this shouting? I do fear, the people
Choose Caesar for their king.

Cassius:

Ay, do you fear it?
Then must I think you would not have it so.

Brutus:

I would not, Cassius. (1.2.78-82)

Actually, Cassius, Brutus, Flavius, Marullus and others are trapped between the fear of empire and empire of fear. Fear of empire is the right term to explain their psychology. They think Caesar is striving to acquire the rule and power of an empire:

Cassius:

Why, man, he doth bestride the narrow world
Like a Colossus, and we petty men
Walk under his huge legs and peep about
To find ourselves dishonourable graves.
Men at some time are masters of their fates:
The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
But in ourselves, that we are underlings.
Brutus and Caesar: what should be in that 'Caesar'?
Why should that name be sounded more than yours?
Write them together, yours is as fair a name;
Sound them, it doth become the mouth as well;
Weigh them, it is as heavy; conjure with 'em,
Brutus will start a spirit as soon as Caesar(1.2.135-147).

By saying "he doth bestride the narrow world/Like a Colossus, and we petty men/Walk under his huge legs and peep about/To find ourselves dishonorable graves", Cassius manifests his own empire of fear that Caesar will usurp all the power.

The dramatic and political point of view in the play is hidden in the conflict between imperial idea and republican, autocratic regime and participant democracy.

However, it is a widely accepted conviction among political theorists and Shakespeare critiques that Caesar's rule was based on the will of people rather than on legality and tradition. This is why Caesar can also be called as one of the greatest popularis of all ages,a combination of popular support and tyranny (Baehr, 1998), the champion and the favorite of the Roman demos (Pelling, 1986). On the opposite side of Julius Caesar's quality of being a popularis stand Brutus, Cassius, Flavius, Marullus, Casca, Cinna, who are involved in the coup. They are optimates, the dominant group in the Roman Senate trying to block the wills of the others, namely the Populares. The difference between these two groups can easily be seen in the play in the revolutionary vision Brutus brings to the Roman Republic. The Optimates try to keep the oligarchy; the Populares try to gain popular support against the dominant oligarchy. What is surprising is that either party claims to be concerned about the people themselves. For the Populares, it is people for the state, and for the Optimates it is the state for the people. Robert Morstein-Max (2003: 204-205) explains this conflict as follows:

> Our chief contemporary witnesses to the political life of the late Republic, Cicero and Sallust, are fond of analyzing the political struggles of the period in terms of a distinction between optimates and populares, often appearing with slight variations in terminology, such as Senate, nobility, or boni versus People or plebs. But what precisely is denoted and connoted by this polarity? Clear enough, one who is designated in these sources as popularis was at least at that moment acting as 'the People's man,' that is a politician — for all practical purposes, a senator — advocating the rights and privileges of the People, implicitly in contrast to the leadership of the Senate; an 'optimate' (*optimas*), by contrast, was one upholding the special custodial and leadership role of the Senate, implicitly against the efforts of some *popularis* or other. The polarity obviously corresponds with the dual sources of institutional power in the Republic — Senate and People — and was realized in practice through contrasting political methods … and distinctive types of rhetorico-ideological appeals suited to tapping those alternative sources of power … . It is important to realize that references to *populares* in the plural do not imply a co-ordinated 'party' with a distinctive ideological character, a kind of political grouping for which there is no evidence in Rome, but simply allude to a recognizable, if statistically quite rare, *type* of senator whose activities are scattered sporadically across late-Republic history … The 'life-long' *popularis* … was a new and worrying phenomenon at the time of Julius Caesar's consulship of 59: an underlying reason why the man inspired such profound fears**.**

Why Julius Caesar inspires so much profound fear can be explained only in one way: It is a political paranoia, like the one Robert S. Robins and Jerrold M. Post (1997) interpret in McChartism in the United States of America in the 1950s, the one which can be seen in Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot, which has its dynamics in Julius Caesar, in what is called as 'Caesarism'. Samuel Smiles (1859: 5) calls Caesarism" worship of mere power, … everything for the people, nothing by them, a doctrine which, it is taken as a guide, must,

by destroying the free conscience of a community, speedily prepare the way for any form of despotism."

Shakespeare makes no mention of Caesar's dealing with widespread debt and unemployment in Rome, his seeking to make Rome a cultural and educational center of the Mediterranean world by building Rome as a center of attraction for intellectuals, doctors, and lawyers to the city. It is true that Caesar tried to combine all the power granted to him by the constitution to establish a strong state, an omnipresent and omnipotent body of government. Does this make Caesar a dictator? Or is he a Jesus for the Roman Republic? Still we have no clear answers to these questions, but what this study argues is that all this paranoia, all this empire of fear that leads to the assassination of Caesar in the play have no their quid pro quos. Just after the assassination of Caesar, Antony addresses to the plebeians, which tells the audience a lot about what they do not know:

Antony:

But Brutus says he was ambitious;
And Brutus is an honourable man.
He hath brought many captives home to Rome
Whose ransoms did the general coffers fill:
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.
You all did see that on the Lupercal
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.
I speak not to disprove what Brutus spoke,
But here I am to speak what I do know.
You all did love him once, not without cause:
What cause withholds you then, to mourn for him?
O judgment! thou art fled to brutish beasts,
And men have lost their reason. Bear with me;
My heart is in the coffin there with Caesar,
And I must pause till it come back to me. (3.2.192-113)

Cassius, also as part of his act of agitation propaganda, is trying to mythologize Brutus, which is an act of intrusion in the Roman state order and affairs regarding his and other conspirators' personal views. Scott (2007: 268) explains this, within the context of

American deep-state operation in 9/11, with reference to the term "over world", as follows: "The realm of wealthy or privileged society although not formally authorized or institutionalized by the people to run the government, is the scene of successful influence of government by private power." When they think that Caesar defies any influence, as a result of their paranoia, they have concluded that Rome needs a second state: "Rome, thou hast lost the breed of noble bloods! "Cassius implies that apart from Caesar's state ruled by one man, there must be and there is another alternative state: "Now is it Rome indeed ...?/...there was a Brutus once that would have brook'd/ The eternal devil to keep his state in Rome/As easily as a king. "The nature of deep state operations, why they happen, the deep logic behind them, can best be expressed through Daniel Juan Gil's assertion. Gil (2010: 150) argues that:

> The fundamental problem is not that Caesar wants too much power but that he organizes state power on a footing that deprives aristocrats like Cassius and Brutus of their opportunity to use the state in service of their own honor.

Caesar's popularity in the eyes of the Roman people, his idea of a powerful and omnipotent state of Rome turns out to be a nightmare for the Optimates of Rome because they are likely to lose their opportunity to use the state in service of their own honor. Deep-state operators conceive that the state is constituted by themselves to maximize their power and authority. What Cassius and Brutus and other optimates try to do is just an operation of delegitimizing Caesar's popularity, which is the result of an act of 'deep politics'(Scott, 2007). Deep state can also be taken as a 'dual state' as well, which Fraenkel (2006: xiii) calls as both "normative" and "prerogative", systems acting with no or very little legal limitation and endowed with unlimited power. This presumption of unlimited power prevents Cassius and Brutus from envisioning themselves and their exercise of power outside the power exercised by the state itself (Bloom, 2010). According to Bloom, the conspirators in the play define a public opinion and arena which reject Caesar's efforts to expand the Roman state power, which this study argues, will shadow their power. The following words from Bloom can be taken as a disclosure of the existence of a deep state in the play: "Caesar's absolutist program is counterbalanced by the civic republicanism of Brutus and the conspirators, for whom the state exists to offer an aristocratic elite opportunity for the exercise of virtue and thus the pursuit of ethical perfection" (150).This is what urges them to take action against Caesar's expansion of state power. The

conspirators, like any deep-state operators in any country, are trapped between public obligation and their private desire. However, the public obligation they are preoccupied with is not given to them officially by the state itself, rather it is one that they give to themselves to benefit from their participation in the political activities. They achieve this just by creating an image of themselves that claims to be the heroic defenders of the state (Kahn, 1997). The relationship between Cassius and Brutus, as the conspirators and deep-state operators in the play, and the state is ideologically oriented, and can be considered as a malignant one at times, especially when it undermines the official policies of the state, when it is based on violent functions, when it is more shadowy, more indefinable that is not explained in the constitution and when it operates according to its own compass no matter who is in power. It becomes an illusion of state power and authority, one which distorts all realities in politics and state affairs, thus it becomes an intrusion in the normalcy of the political system. In today's world such operations are conducted via such institutions as departments of defense, departments of state, security departments, intelligence agencies, supreme courts and military institutions. In the play, since Rome was not so sophisticatedly institutionalized, the operation is conducted by individuals who explicitly or implicitly hold some sort of state power and authority in their hands.

What happens in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, therefore, from a contemporary point of view, is that which we call now "deep state operation." Caesar is the representative of the political party of Popularis, and Brutus, Cinna, Casca, Cassius and others are those of Optimates. From the Roman times, the members of Optimates have constituted the main body of the deep states. Though the term emerged recently, it has widely been used in political discussions. O'Neil (2013) defines the term as "a set of coercive institutions, actors, and relationships beyond those formally charged with defense, intelligence and policing. "This definition highly complies with what Shakespeare puts on the stage in *Julius Caesar*. The party of Optimates establishes what O'Neil defines as a 'set of coercive institutions', and Brutus, Casca, Cinna, Cassius and the others are the actors. Their relationship with Caesar and with the system is one that can be defined as 'covered', 'hidden', and 'self-commissioned'. This clash between the forces that hold responsibilities in the establishment and the government inevitably serves as a malicious infection in the body of the state, which leads to the destruction of the two parties and thus the state and the system. Morera (1990: 76) argues that Garmsci explains this situation with the term

Caesarism, in which the struggle between the two forces, Popularis and Optimates in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, take a catastrophic nature which results in the destruction of the two sides. To defend the regime or to save the Republic has always been an effective pretext for military or non-military coup d'etat. Almost all of them lead to collective violent behavior. The very nature of Julius Caesar's assassination is by no means different. Suetonius (2007) writes in his *Life of Caesar, Julius* that when Metellus Chimber grabbed Caesar by the shoulder, he says to Chimber, "Why, this is violence!." In the play, Caesar says, "Et tu, Brute! Then fall, Caesar" (3.1.76). Here, the question is, both in the real historical context and in Shakespearean context, whether an act of violence can be regarded as a democratic one or not, whether it can be tolerated since it intends to safeguard democracy, republic, or any other regime that rules a country, and whether it can really lead to the protection it intends to provide.

CONCLUSION

Studies examining the concepts of politics refer to two comprehensive terms: power and the struggle to control and exercise it. Power is associated with society for it is exercised within society, with politics for it creates some sort of monopoly for the use of physical, legal and economic force within a given society, with order for it is a key concept in the establishment of any form of order, and with ideology for it is a medium to maintain and operate "everyday notions and experience and elaborate intellectual doctrines, both the circumstances of social actors and the institutionalized thoughts, systems and discourses of a given society" (Therborn, 1999: 2). "Too much film and television is cursed. Society's mirror now is the stage" says Michael Billington (2014: para.1), and adds that what makes British theatre great and strong is its readiness to put the British society under the investigation and its willingness to speak truth to power, which means that drama is no exception in terms of its relationship with power and the concepts of politics, sociology, ideology and order. Drama has also its own 'order theory' and 'order thesis' since it naturally has the characteristics of being social, political, and philosophical, for the first dramatists in ancient times were philosophers and politicians. The worlds created in dramatic works, and the nations, countries, peoples, societies, classes, families, and individuals in these worlds have their own perceptions and understandings of the concept of order. Of course, the writers of these dramatic works cannot be left outside. They, too, have their own understandings, ideas, beliefs and perceptions of order. However, dramatic criticism does not allow us to have fixed, never-changing political ideas of authors. Instead, critics come up with some conflicting conclusions and inferences as to where the author of a given dramatic work stands or what the text itself reveals in terms of politics, ideology, sociology and order. In this respect, this study dealt with the concepts of politics in Shakespeare's three plays *Coriolanus*, *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, what political concepts Shakespearean texts hide between their lines.

Upon considering the concept of power struggle in Shakespeare's three Roman tragedies with regard to New Historicism and Cultural Materialism, the present study has

referred to two kinds of complexities: political and discursive complexity. As regards political complexity, *Coriolanus* reveals it through the social disturbance Caius Martius causes with his arrogant, anti-egalitarian, militarist, elitist and compulsive conservative attitudes towards the plebeians. His rejection of the rights that the Roman constitution has given to the plebeians also creates another tension and crisis in the play. In *Julius Caesar*, political complexity is a deeper one, for it poses a threat to the viability of the state itself. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, it is a political chess Mark Antony, Octavius Caesar and Cleopatra play in which each has to plan their moves very carefully. As for discursive complexity, Shakespeare weaves political complexities in the three plays with his very special discursive complexity in which this study has highlighted the notions such as egalitarianism, militarism, elitism, etatism, authoritarianism and military tutelage in *Coriolanus*; uncovered the issues of orientalism and cultural and ethnic positioning in *Antony and Cleopatra*; demonstrated the instruments of perception management, agitation propaganda and deep state operation in *Julius Caesar*. It has been observed that Shakespeare connects these complexities to one another in the plays in a way that he renders his major characters well aware of the power of discourse in achieving their goals since many of the characters are deliberately depicted to be registered to political activities in the plays.

In *Coriolanus*, the plebeians' upheaval in the first scene is the first challenge to the ruling class. This challenge is, by its very nature, an egalitarian one. This should not be seen as a form of dissolution of the Roman social order, as both Menenius and Caius Martius perceive it to be, but rather a demand for reorganization of the society based on reasonable, sustainable and constitutional equal rights. With Caius Martius, who acts as "the de facto head of the army and of the Senate" (Dobski and Gish, 2013: 12), with his vociferous contempt for the plebeians' economic demands, with Menenius closing his eyes to the economic and political warnings and complaints from the starving masses and to the social unrest that strikes its roots deep in the Roman society, the Roman political and economic system collapses. This is the beginning of a new era, a fraction in the history of mankind, a move towards enlightenment and freedom from localized, hierarchical, authoritarian and non-egalitarian bonds. This can also be related to the concept of "body politic" Dobski and Girsh (2013). The use of the "belly" metaphor in the play, therefore, as

Dobski and Girsh argue, can be regarded as a sign of anti-egalitarian attitude towards the distribution of the economic goods within the Roman economic system.

Moreover, in *Coriolanus*, the plebeians are not depicted as important figures, as the natural and essential parts of Rome: they are deprived of civic virtue. This is a process of removing public interest, public devotion, and public energy from public spheres and governmental issues. It can be concluded that the plebeians find no honour, no glory, no common interest, and no good for them in Caius Martius' victories over the Volcsicans, or what he claims to have done for his own country. Rome's inability to maintain this body politic is, in part, caused by the failure of establishing lawful, just, and logical relationships between the main body and its parts, the failure of creating awareness of their status in the whole and of the need for their roles to establish a state order. This failure is the result of an elitist set-up in the governmental system. Reading a literary work with a focus on New Historicism and Cultural Materialism or Marxist Theory, or Feminist Theory, all of which consider a literary work as an end product of the political, economic, social or ideological atmosphere of its time, is an act of interpretation that leads critics to a myriad of political, economic, social, and ideological considerations. One of these considerations this study focuses on is that, in the play *Coriolanus*, with where Caius Martius, Menenius, Lartius, Cominius, and Volumnia stand, Shakespeare portrays a historic picture of elitism. This is an elitist paradigm Shakespeare creates in *Coriolanus*. This paradigm requires some "diverse moral points of view with factual matters" (Field and Higley, 2013: viii) which are subjective and egocentric. Field and Higley argue that the elitist person is the one who "is confident of his ability to conduct his relations with society in personally satisfying ways... from his point of view, but not from other points of view" (viii). Cassius Martius is a man of this kind. He comes from a noble family. Hence, he is an elite by birth. He is also a power elite, for his military qualities and roles feed his social and political position. Being a great soldier, his devotion to the state and to the Roman virtue, which has its roots in the Roman history as the virtue of pietas, yet he has his own understanding and perception of the Roman virtue, are the sources of his elitism. For him, those who do not have the same qualities as he does are not Romans. He creates his own reality. He isolates himself from the rest of the Roman people. This isolation is partly due to the fear of losing his actual power by sharing it with the plebeians.

The concept of "power elite" is also of note in *Coriolanus*, as monarchic, conservative, totalitarian, and destructive understanding of power and authority reinforces narcissistic humility, snobbish intransigence, embodiment of a god-like omnipotent dictator, and an implacable heroic source of power. The study has revealed that autonomy of elites in a so-called democratic society, despite the presence of elected parliaments and other elected offices, abuses the implacable heroic source of power aforementioned. This issue is embodied in the character of Caius Martius, who fits very well with the term power elite. Mosca (1923 and 1939), Pareto (2001), and Weber (1947, 1964, 1978) emphasize the undeniable and inescapable roles and autonomy of elites in a so-called democratic society and argue that, in an elite-dominated democratic society, there are elected parliaments, like Shakespeare's senators and consuls in *Coriolanus*, and other elected offices, like the Tribunes, but voters, namely public and the plebs in the play *Criolanus*, do not really choose their representatives, rather than politicians and the power elites impose them on voters. This is just what happens in *Coriolanus*, when Cassius Martius is nominated as a council by the senators and other power elites. In Act I Scene 2, Cassius Martius, Comminius, Brutus and Menenius are in the Capitol. There, the readers of the play or the audience of the performance witness the act of imposing Cassius Martius on the plebeians though there are two other candidates: The system, the power relations and the conflict between the plebeians and the elites in the identity of Cassius Martius Shakespeare reveals in the play can also be read through the terms oligarchy and plutocracy. Though these two terms seem to be alike to ordinary people, there is a thin line between them in terms of their operational definitions. 'Oligarchy' is defined as when the government or a system is controlled by a small group. Plutocracy refers to the control of the state by the wealthy. In its historical nature, both become one. It is the oligarchy of the powerful, and wealthy as in the play. Caius Martius' deep conviction of superiority to the common people makes him immovable, politically inflexible and self-righteous. By saying "They'll sit by the fire and presume to know/What is done i' the Capitol; who is like to rise, /Who thrives and who declines; side factions and give out/Conjectural marriages; making parties strong" (1.1.195-198), he equips himself with a perception of the plebeians as unreasoning and fractious. His monarchic, conservative, totalitarian, and destructive understanding of power and authority proves his narcissistic humility, his snobbish intransigence towards the plebeians, which shows him as the embodiment of a god-like omnipotent leader and an implacable heroic source of power. The character of Caius Martius fits very well with

Mill's definition of power elite. Instead of using the term ruling class, he prefers the term power elite since "class is an economic term, but rule is a political one" (2). Caius Martius tries to transform his military power into political power in the play, but the only obstacle is that the plebeians view him as a threat to the political rights they recently have acquired. He believes that Rome should be governed by what Mills defined as the three ruling blocks. His intolerance for the civil rights, his exaggerated belief in elitist ruling and in power, his disbelief in participatory democracy, all turn out to be what constitutes his tragic flaws in this tragedy. Contrary to tragic characters in most of his tragedies, Shakespeare creates in *Coriolanus* a character with multiple tragic flaws. Based upon all these arguments which this study brings forward, a burning question may occur to the inquiring minds as to for whom Caius Martius speaks in the play: Does he speak for Shakespeare or for himself? Does Shakespeare utter these words that smell elitism, arrogance, humiliation, contempt, ignorance, repulsion, aversion, each of which alone can be a tragic flaw in any tragedy, just to reveal his own feelings and ideas? As a playwright and actor, as a leading dramatic and artistic figure, Shakespeare, who himself was exposed to similar elitist humiliations, as a victim of intellectual and artistic elitism, can't have lent all these words to Caius Martius to express his own ideas. Otherwise, how could Robert Greene's elitist stance towards Shakespeare be viewed considering that he despised Shakespeare by saying. " ... for there is an upstart Crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his Tygers hart wrapt in a Players hyde, supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blanke verse as the best of you: and beeing an absolute Johannes factotum, is in his owne conceit the onely Shake-scene in a countrey" (Honan,1998: 159). Greene was an Elizabethan playwright, a university educated man, a university wit, with an MA from both Oxford and Cambridge, a source of pride for him. This must have created in him a sense of elitism, and thus a sense of jealousy upon seeing Shakespeare's rise to prominence in the London theater though he did not receive a university education. From this perspective, Caius Martius in the play and Greene in Shakespeare's London, though they play different roles in different quarters, the former in the military and political and the latter in the literary and intellectual, can be likened to one another in terms of elitism: Therefore, Shakespeare cannot have had Caius Martius speak for himself.

The study has also revealed how reactionary militarism takes place in Shakespearean political world(s). It can be concluded that deeply rooted inclination for

militarism hampers the establishment of republican and democratic institutions and paves way to abuse of military power. It is of vital importance for the development, quality, and survival of democratic systems to control the armed forces and make them serve in line with the principles of the science of politics. Otherwise, the democratic system becomes vulnerable to the interventions, and plotting of power-thirsty generals. This is what happens in *Coriolanus*. As Thomas C. Bruneau (2006: 1) puts it, "the proper balance between civilian leadership and military effectiveness in achieving roles and missions will clearly vary from one country to another and from one era to another." In *Coriolanus*, Shakespeare shows us how this balance in the Roman Empire, in his own time and era, and also in modern times, varies. Bruneau also claims that some sort of equilibrium is required for the success of authentic democratic governance, and that there are various ways in which a wide range of institutions structuring civil-military relations may achieve a balance between democratic civilian control and military effectiveness. In the play, Caius Martius represents military intervention in the democratic normalcy. This intervention is sometimes in the form of a coup d'etat, sometimes in much more subtle forms, and sometimes it is invited or encouraged by deep factions in the establishment of the state. In *Coriolanus*, it is a cooperation between military oligarchy, de jure oligarchy, in which only an elite group enjoy power, for in Rome consulship had a militaristic characteristic in that consuls were the commanders-in-chief of the army. Thus, the military glory Caius Martius enjoys in the play would provide him with the greatest boost in his political career. This is why he always deliberately inflames militaristic tensions with the Volcsicans:

What Edward Said offered with orientalism was to give a novice name to an old notion having been explored so far. Orientalism as a cultural and political phenomenon dates back to the ancient times long before the rise of European civilization, to which Shakespeare is one of the greatest contributors, albeit, to some critics, adaptation of Said's ideas on orientalism seems to be anachronic. This study has therefore attempted to tackle and test the concept of orientalism and questioned whether it can be applied to *Anthony and Cleopatra* using critical discourse theory, the underlying premise of which suggests that language and language use not only communicate people's social, cultural and mental realities but also "create" them (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002; emphasis mine). The study has shown that Shakespeare's political world(s) provide a good realm of constructed patterns of discourse and thought. It is also seen that the characters in *Anthony and*

Cleopatra exercise and exert the cultivation of the superiority of a given social, cultural, or ethnic group, namely privileged one, over others. Harold Bloom (1994: 62) mentions in Western Canon multiculturalism as a quality that makes Shakespeare different from all other representatives of Western Literature, which places him, Bloom says, "at the center of Western Canon." Bloom also refers to the term multiculturalism as a substance that makes Shakespeare's plays easily understandable in all languages throughout the world. However, characterization of oriental figures, the human traits Shakespeare gave to them, and the themes of his plays are not the only multiculturalist elements of his plays. With the rise of multiculturalism, of racial, ethnic, cultural, and national awareness in literary criticism and in historical criticism, Shakespeare's attitudes towards multiculturalism, his non-English or non-European characters and their moral, ethnic, religious, cultural and national values, also gained a critical momentum. Historical and cultural approaches to Shakespeare's plays make this relatively new critical perspective crucial because race, ethnicity and oppression are said to be the central themes to almost all of written history. Problematic and challenging as it may be at times, these approaches have brought the concept of Orientalism to a central position as a new point of analysis with reference to the representation of the East, 'the other', through the lenses of the West, notably 'the self'. In *Anthony and Cleopatra*, with words that feed the crystallization of ideas, Shakespeare builds an ontological, an epistemological, a cultural and a political Orient which is highly problematic according to Edward Said's determinations. Shakespeare does this by depicting Egypt as a place of romance, an exotic place inhabited by exotic characters with haunting and remarkable life experience and memories. Rowse (1978: 469) calls this as "oriental colouring." This oriental colour, this oriental life-style and landscape, all experiences Antony has there, even the sense of love, are corruptive when considered from a western point of view. Racial profiles, and perceptions created by these profiles and manipulation of these perceptions according to ideology and politics have long been a topic in social, political and cultural studies. Especially after 9/11, "Racial profiling has become a form of discrimination" says Kinsley(2003: 54). Kinsley also argues that this discrimination assumes that a person's race shows whether s/he has a tendency towards the violation of law. Suspicions of the violation of law are not the only problem with racial profiling. It also leads to political, social, cultural and economic discriminations, which constitute the basis of the orientalist idea. Cleopatra's crime, her violation of law, is her love for Antony and Antony's crime, his violation of law is his love for Cleopatra. This

means that Antony is subject to orientalization and, Cleopatra is a victim of racial profiling (Roller, 2010; Ramirez, McDewitt and Farrell, 2000).

The study has also dealt with the concepts of perception management, agitation propaganda and deep state operation. Each in the play paves the way for one another. With today's political terminology, Cassius' role in *Julius Caesar* can be explained as the main function of propaganda: a means of seduction of masses (O'Shaughnessy, 2004). What urges the main plotting character, Cassius, to intrigue the others into developing false ideas is that he thinks he has lost his political power which, for him, is a means of exercising and developing his virtue. With his attempt to seduce Brutus into conspiracy, Cassius reveals his "appeal to the Republic" which leads to Brutus' proclamation of a personal "commitment to the general good", and this "can be read as ideological in Althusser's sense: an imaginary conception of their real relation to the Roman state" (Kahn, 1997: 86). All what has happened in the play is nothing but a very successfully and carefully designed and achieved perception operation combined with equally successful and careful acts of propaganda and agitation that have their roots in a politically paranoiac mind-set. The play was also a deep state operation in that behind the curtain, apart from the one whose ruler was Julius Caesar, there was another shadowy, and difficult-to-define government in Rome with a hybrid nature made up of the nobles, the tribunes and the Optimates, which can be referred to today's sub-governmental and non-governmental institutions. Shakespeare does not disclose the members of this deep-sate to his audience, but through agitation and propaganda the study has already mentioned above, Cassius tries to appoint Brutus as the head or the most important figure of it. Shakespeare gives us almost nothing well-grounded as to the arguments that support the act of violence apart from mere paranoia and schizophrenia. Brutus, who is trapped between his loyalty to Caesar and to his idealism, for fear that Caesar will become a tyrant, Cassius, who believes Caesar is incompetent and weak, thus strongly wishes the removal of Caesar from the office, Flavius and Marullus, who at the very beginning of the play set the context with their words to protect the plebeians from Caesar's tyranny, Cinna who tries hard to convince Cassius to get Brutus involved in the conspiracy, who delivers some of Cassius' forged letters for Brutus to find them, Metellus Cimber, another conspirator, who is poisoned and corrupted by revenge upon his brother's banishment by Caesar, all exhibit paranoiac and schizophrenic tendencies. Theirs is a political paranoia and a political schizophrenia that lead to one of

the most successfully plotted 'perception engineering', 'agitation propaganda' and 'deep state operation'.

To conclude, Shakespeare presents the reader/audience with such political world(s) that can be analyzed and interpreted through the terminologies offered by the science of politics and sociology. These fictional worlds, as is shown by the present study, can be compared to contemporary political world(s) and portray the very nature of political structures and universal power relations similar to those of the actual ones. It is seen that power is associated with social structure represented in the plays, for it is exercised within socio-political characters; with the exploration of politics, for it has much to do with the issue of monopoly and physical, legal and economic relationships between the characters within a given society; with the depiction of order, for it is a key concept in the development of any form of order, and with the suggested ideology for it is a medium to maintain and operate commonplace notions, experiences, doctrines, social acts, institutionalized thoughts, systems and discourses (Therborn, 1999). British Drama in general, and Shakespeare in particular, then, provides us with invaluable insights into society and political mechanisms which cannot be envisaged regardless of power relations. On the other hand, social sciences in general, and political theory in particular, provide us with practical terminologies to penetrate into the veins of the "imitated" (Aristotle) action performed by the characters. The present study has revealed that dramatic and political theory can be brought together to lay out a contextual reading to decipher the "dramatic nature of politics" and "political nature of drama."

REFERENCES

Adorno, Thedor W. et al. (1950), **The Authoritarian Personality**, New York: Harper

Agarwal, Kaushal (2009), **Perception Management: The Management Tactics**, New Delhi: Global India Publications.

Allman, Eileen (1999), **Jacobean Revenge Tragedy and the Politics of Virtue**, Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Althusser, Louis (1984), **Essays on Ideology**, London: Verso.

Anderson, Elizabeth S. (1999), "What Is the Point of Equality?", **Ethics**, 109(2), 287-337.

Archer, John Michael (2005),**Citizen Shakespeare: Freeman and Aliens in the Language of Plays**, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Arendt, Hannah (1990), **On Revolution**, London: Penguin Books.

_____(1969), On Violence, New York: Harcourt, Brace &World.

Aristotle (2014), **Nicomachean Ethics** (Trans. C.D.C. Reeves), Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

Armistead, Leigh (Ed.) (2007), **Information Warfare: Separating Hype from Reality**, Washington, DC: Potomac Books, Inc.

Arneson, Richard (2009), **"Egalitarianism"**, in Edward N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (103-128),URL=<http: //plato.stanford. edu/archives/sum2013/entries/egalitarianism/>.

Ashton, Sally Ann (2008), **Cleopatra and Egypt**, Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Asquith, Clare (2005), **Shadow-play: The Hidden Beliefs and Coded Politics of William Shakespeare**, New York: Public Affairs.

Baehr, Peter R. (1998), **Caesar and the Fading of the Roman World: A Study in Republicanism and Caesarism**, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Baldson, John. P. V. D. (1979), **Romans and Aliens**, Chapel Hill: University of North Caroline Press.

Barish, Jonas (1991), "War, Civil War and Bruderkrieg in Shakespeare", in Vincent Newey and Ann Thompson (Eds.), **Literature and Nationalism**(11-21), Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Barry, Peter (2002), **Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory**, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bell, Jeffrey (1992), **Populism and Elitism: Politics in the Age of Equality**, Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing.

Bernal, Martin (1987), **Black Athena: The Afro-Asiatic Roots of Classical Civilization**, 2 Vols., London: Duke University Press.

Billington, Michael (2014), "Speaking truth to power: this is the rebirth of political theatre", **The Guardian**, (7. 11. 2014).

Bloom, Allan and Jaffa, Harry V. (1964), **Shakespeare's Politics**, New York: Basic Books Inc.

_____(2000), "The Unity of Tragedy, Comedy, and History: An Interpretation of the Shakespearean Universe, in John Alvis and Thomas G. West (Eds.), **Shakespeare as Political Thinker** (29-57), Wilmington, DE: ISI Books.

Bloom, Harold (1994), **Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages**, New York: Harcourt Brace.

_____ (2010), **William Shakespeare's Julius Ceasar**, New York: Infobase Publishing.

Bloomfield, Jem (2012), **Why Study Shakespeare**, https: //quiteirregular.wordpress.com/, December 5, 2012.

Boon, Richard and Plastow, Jane (2004), **Theatre Matters: Performance and Culture on the World Stage**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bow, Leslie (2001), **Betrayal and Other Acts of Subversion: Feminism, Sexual Politics, Asian American Women's Literature**, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bowie, Angus. M. (1993), **Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual and Comedy**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brome Weigall, Arthur (1914), **The life and times of Cleopatra: Queen of Egypt; A study in the Origin of the Roman Empire**, Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons.

Bruneau, Thomas C. and Tollefson, Scott D. (Eds) (2006), **Who Guards the Guardians and How: Democratic Civil-Military Relations**, Austin: University of Texas Press.

Burstein, Stanley (2004),**The Reign of Cleopatra**, London: Greenwood Press.

Cahn, Victor L. (2001), **The Plays of Shakespeare: A Thematic Guide**, Westport: Greenwood Press.

Carroll, William. C. (1996), **Fat king, Lean Beggar: Representations of Poverty in the Age of Shakespeare**, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Cartledge, Paul A. (1993), **The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others**, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chapman, John Jay (1915), **Greek Genius and Other Essays**, New York: Moffat, Yard & Company.

Chilton, Paul A. and Schaffner, Christina (Eds.) (2005), **Politics as Text and Talk: Analytical approaches to political discourse,** Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V.

Cohen, Gerald (1989), "On the Currency of Egalitarian Justice", **Ethics**, 99(4), 906-944.

Colebrook, Claire (1997), **New Literary Histories: New Historicism and Contemporary Criticism,** New York: Manchester University of Press.

Cox, John D. (2002), "Shakespeare and Political Philosophy", **Philosophy and Literature**, 26 (1), 107-124.

Cunningham, Stanley (2002), **The Idea of Propaganda: A Reconstruction**, Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Dahl, Robert (1957), The Concept Of Power, **Behavioural Science**, 2, 201-215.

Danson, Lawrence (2004), "Julius Caesar", in Harold Bloom (Ed.), **William Shakespeare** (217-230) Broomal: Chelsea House Publishing.

de Light, Luuk (2012), **Peasants, Citizens and Soldiers: Studies on the Demographic History of Roman Italy**: **225 BC-AD 100**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Del Lucchese, Flippo (2009), **Conflict Power and Multitude in Machiavelli and Spinoza: Tumult and Indignation,** New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Delueze, Gilles (1999), **Foucault**, London: Continuum

Dewar, Mary (1964), **Sir Thomas Smith: A Tudor Intellectual in Office**, London: Athlone Press.

Dillon, Michele (2014), **Introduction to Sociological Theory: Theorists, Concepts, and Their Applicability to the Twenty -First Century**, Malden: Wiley.

Dobski, Bernard J. and Gish, Dustin A (2013),**Shakespeare and Body Politic**, Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Dollimore, Jonathan (1994), Introduction. Shakespeare, Cultural Materialism and New Historicism, in Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield (Eds.), **Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism** (2-17), Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Dollimore, Jonathan and Sinfield, Alan (Eds) (1994), **Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism,** Manchester: Manchester University Press.

_____(1985), "History and Ideology: The Instance of Henry V", in John Drakakis (Ed.), **Alternative Shakespeares** (206-227), London: Methuen.

Domhoff, William G. (2005),**Who Rules America?**, New York: McGraw-Hill

Dworkin, Ronald (1981), "What is Equality? Part 2: Equality of Resources", **Philosophy and Public Affairs**, 10(4), 283-345.

Eagleton, Terry (1991), **Ideology: An Introduction**, London: Verso.

_____ (1996), **Literary Theory: An Introduction**, Minnesota: Blackwell Publishings.

Eatwell, John et al. (1987), **A Dictionary of Economics**, London: McMillan Press.

Eckstein, Arthur M. (2006), **Mediterranean Anarchy**, **Interstate War and the Rise of Rome,** Berkeley: University of California Press.

Egan, Gabriel(2004), **Shakespeare and Marx,** New York: Oxford University Press.

Erikson, Robert S. and Tedin, L. Kent (2003), **American Public Opinion**, New York: Longman.

Euben, J. Peter (1986), **Greek Tragedy and Political Theatre**, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Everson, Stephen (Ed.) (1988), **Aristotle: The Politics**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eyre, Richard and Wright, Nicholas (2000), **Changing Stages: A View of British Theatre in The Twentieth Century**, London: Bloomsbury.

Fairclough, Norman (1989), **Language and Power**, London: Longman.

_____(1993), **Discourse and Social Change**, Cambridge: Polity Press.

_____(1995), **Critical discourse analysis: The critical Study of Language**, London: Longman.

Fairclough, Isabela and Fairclough, Norman (2012), **Practical Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students**, New York: Routledge.

Flanagan, James G. (1989), "Hierarchy in Simple Egalitarian Society", **Annual Review of Anthology**, 18,245-266.

Foucault, Michel(1984), "The Subject and Power", in Brian Wallis (Ed.), **Art After Modernism: Rethinking Representation**(417-442), New York: The Museum of Contemporary Art.

_____ (1982), The Subject and Power, **Critical Inquiry**, 8 (4), 777-795

_____ (1980), **Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977**, London: Harvester Press.

_____ (1979), **Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison**, (Trans. Alan Sheridan), New York: Vintage Books.

Fraenkel, Ernst (2006), **The Dual State**, (Trans. E.A. Shils), New Jersey: The Lawbook Exchange, Ltd.

Friedman, Milton (1962),**Capitalism and Freedom**, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Frye, Northrop (1987), **Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays**, Taipei: Bookman.

Fukiyama, Francis (2011), **The Origins of Political Order: From Prehuman Times to the French Revolution**, New York: Straus and Giroux.

Gallaher, Catherine and Greenblatt, Stephen (2000), **Practicing New Historicism**, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Garfield, Andrew (2002),"The Offence of Strategic Influence: Making the Case For Perception Management Operations", **Journal of Information Warfare,** 1 (3), 30-39.

Giddens, Anthony (1985), **The Nation State and Violence: Volume Two of A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism**. Cambridge: Polity.

Giddens, Anthony (2001), **Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in Late Modern Age,** Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gil, Daniel Juan (2010), "**Bare Life: Political Order and Specter of Antisocial Being in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar**, inHarold Bloom (Ed.), **William Shakespeare's Julius Caesar**(147-159), New York: Infobase Publishing.

Goldman, Emily O. (2004), **National Security in the Information Age**, London: Frank Cass Publishers.

Greenblatt, Stephen (1987), "Towards a Poetics of Culture", **Southern Review**, 20 (1), 3-15.

Greenblatt, Stephen (2007), "Shakespeare and The Uses of Power", **The New York Review of Books**, 54 (6).

Gurr, Andrew (1975), "Coriolanus and the Body Politic", **Shakespeare Survey**,28, 63-69.

Hadfield, Andrew (2005), **Shakespeare and Republicanism**, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hallas, Duncan (1984), "Agitation and propaganda: What do we mean by ...?",**Socialist Worker Review**, 68, 10.

Harre, Rom and Moghaddam, Fathali (2003), Introduction: The Self and Others in Traditional Psychology and Positioning Theory, in Rom Harre and Fathali Moghaddam (Eds.), **The Self and Others: Positioning Individuals and Groups in Personal, Political and Cultural Contexts** (1-12), Westpoint: Praeger Publishers.

Harre, Rom and van Langenhove, Luk (1999), **Positioning Theory: Moral Contexts of International Action,** Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Havel, Vaclav (2012), "Politics and Theatre", **The Vienna Review**,(1.2. 2012),

Hayek, Friedrich A (1948), **Individualism and Economic Order**, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hazlitt, William (1817), **Characters of Shakespeare's Plays**, London: C. H. Reynell.

Higgins, John (1999), **Raymond Williams: Literature, Marxism and Cultural Materialism,** New York: Routledge.

Holmes, Jeremy (2001), **Ideas in Psychoanalysis: Narcissism**, Cambridge: Icon Books.

Hoffman, John and Graham, Paul (2006) **Introduction to Political Theory**, Harlow: Pearson.

Holland, Norman N. (1992**),The Critical I**, New York: Columbia University Press

Honan, Park (1998), **Shakespeare: A Life**, New York: Oxford University Press.

Hopkins, Lisa (2005), **Beginning Shakespeare,**NY: Manchester University of Press.

Howarth, David and Stavrakakis, Yannis (2000), Introducing Discourse Theory and Political Analysis, in David R. Howarth, Aletta J. Norval and Yannis Stavrakakis (Eds.), **Discourse Theory And Political Analysis** (1-37), Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Jacobson, Roman (1960), Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics, in Sebeok T. (Ed.), **Style and Language** (350-377), Cambridge: MIT Press.

Johnson, Michael (2005), **Syndromes of Corruption: Wealth, Power and Democracy**, Cambridge: CUP

Jones, Virgil L. (1922), "Methods of Satire in the Political Drama of Restoration", **The Journal of English and Germanic Philology**, 21(4), 662-669.

Jorgensen, Marianne and Phillips, Louise (2002), **Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method**, London: Sage Publications.

Kahn, Coppélia (1997), **Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds and Women**, New York: Routledge.

Kamps, Ivo (Ed) 1995, **Materialist Shakespeare: A History**, London: Verso.

Kastan, David (1999), **Shakespeare After Theory**, New York: Routledge.

Keating, Karl (1988), **Catholicism and Fundamentalism**, San Francisco: Ignatius Press.

Kidwai, A. Raheem (2009), **Literary Orientalism**: **A Companion**, New Delhi: Viva.

Kinsley, Michael (2003), "Discrimination We Are Afraid To Be Against", in Amitai Etzioni and Jason H. Marsh (Eds.),**Rights vs. Public Safety After 9/11**(53-55), Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Knights, Lionel Charles (1965), **Further Explorations: Essays in Criticism**, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Knowles, Richard Paul (2004), **Reading the Material Theatre: Cultural Materialism,** NY: Cambridge University Press.

Kott, John (1974), **Shakespeare: Our Contemporary**, New York: Norton.

Labov, William (2001), **Principles of Linguistic Change: Cognitive and Cultural Factors**, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Liebknecht, Karl (1918), **Militarism and Anti-militarism**, Cambridge: Rivers Press Limited.

Linz, Juan (1964), **Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes**, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Lye, John (2002),**On the Uses of Literature**, http: //www.jeeves.brocku.ca/english/jlye/ uses.php (11.11. 2003)

Mabillard, Amanda (2000), Shakespeare's Sources for Antony and Cleopatra, **Shakespeare Online,** http: //www.shakespeareonline. com/sources /coriolanussources. html (02.10.2014).

Machiavelli, Niccolò (1985), **The Prince**, (Trans. Mansfield, Harvey), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maguire, Laurie E. (2004), **Studying Shakespeare: A Guide to the plays**, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Makaryk, Irena R. (1993), **Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms**, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Marangos, John (2013), **Consistency and Viability of Capitalist Economic Systems**, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marlin, Randal (2002), **Propaganda and Ethics of Persuasion**, New York: Broadview Press.

Martinich, Aloysius P. and Battiste, Brian (Eds.) (2011), **Thomas Hobbes: Leviathan Revised Edition**, Toronto: Broadview Press.

McGann, Jerome J. (1988), **The Beauty of Infections**: **Investigations in Historical Method and Theory**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mills, C. Wright (1956), **The Power Elite**, New York: Oxford University Press.

Milner, John (1993), **Cultural Materialism**, London: University College London Press.

Montrose, Louis (1996), **The Purpose of Playing: Shakespeare and Cultural Politics of The Elizabethan Theatre**, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____ (1992) "New Historicisms", in Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn (Eds.),**Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies** (392-417), New York: Modern Language Association.

Moreno, Cerezo (2014), **Critical Approaches To Shakespeare: Shakespeare For All Time**, Spain: UNED.

Morera, Esteve (1990), **Gramsci's Historicism: A Realist Interpretation** . London: Routledge.

Morey, William C. (1901),**Outlines of Roman History**, New York: American Book Company.

Morstein-Marx, Robert (2003), **Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic**, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mosca, Gaetano (1923). **The Ruling Class**, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Munck, Gerardo L. (1998), **Authoritarianism and Democratization: Soldiers and Workers in Argentina, 1976-1983**, Pennyslvania: The Pennyslvania State University Press.

Murley, John. A. and Sean, Sutton D. (2006), **Perspectives on Politics in Shakespeare**, Lanham: Lexington Books.

Murray, Patrick (1972), "Coriolanus: A Play for Our Time", **Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review**, 61 (243), 253-266.

North, Thomas (1579), **Plutarch: Lives of The Noble Greeks and the Noble Greeks and Romans,** in James Winny (Ed.), **Elizabethan Prose Translation**(46-58), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oates, Joyce Carol (1964), "The Tragedy of Imagination: Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra", http: //celestialtimepiece.com/2015/01/27/the-tragedy-of-imagination-shakespeares-antony-and-cleopatra/, (17.11.2013).

Obama, Barack H. (1. 4. 2012), The White House, **Remarks by The president On the Economy.**

O'Neil, Patrick H. (7. 20. 2013), **The Deep State: An Emerging Concept in Comparative Politics**, SSRN: http: //ssrn.com/abstract=2313375.

O'Shaughnessy, Nicholas Jackson (2004), **Politics and Propaganda: Weapons of Mass Seduction**, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

O'Toole, Emer (2012), Shakespeare, universal? No, it's cultural imperialism, **Guardian,** (5.1.2012).

Pandian, Jacob and Parman, Susuan (2004), **The Making of Anthropology: The Semiotics of Self and Other in the Western Tradition**, New Delhi: Vedam Books.

Pareto, Vilfredo (2001), **The Rise and Fall of Elites: An Application of Theoretical   Sociology**, Totowa, NJ: Bedminster Press.

Parsons, Talcott (1963), "On the Concept of Political Power", **Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society**, 107 (3), 232-262.

Parvini, Neema (2012), **Shakespeare's History Plays: Rethinking Historicism**, Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Patterson, Michael (2003), **Strategies of Political Theatre: Post-war British Play wrights**. Cambridge: CUP.

Pelling, Christopher B.R (1986), "Plutarch and Roman Politics", in I.S. Moxon, J.D. Smart and A. J. Woodman (Eds.),**Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing, Papers Presented at a Conference in Leeds (159-187)**, 6–8 April 1983, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pierce, Robert B. (1971), **Shakespeare's History Plays: The Family and The State**, Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Pieters, Jürgen (2001), **Moments of Negotiation: The New Historicism of Stephen Greenblatt**, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Plato (1993), **Republic,** (Trans. Robin Waterfield), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Porter, Carolyn (1990),"History and Literature: After the New Historicism", **New Literary History**,21(2), 253-272.

Preston, Diana (2009), **Cleopatra and Antony: Power, Love, and Politics in the Ancient World**, New York: Walker & Company.

Przeworski, Adam (2003),**Democracy and Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America**. In The Democracy Sourcebook, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Rabinow, Paul (2000), **Essential Works of Foucault: 1954-1984**, New York: The New Press.

Ramirez, Deborah et al. (2000), **A Resource Guide on Racial Profiling Data Collection Systems: Promising Practices and Lessons Learned**, Report prepared by Northeastern University with support by the U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Rawls, John (1971),**A Theory of Justice**, Massachusetts: Harward University Press.

Rinehart, Keith (1972), "Shakespeare's Cleopatra and England's Elizabeth", **Shakespeare Quarterly**, 23 (1), 81-86.

Roberts, Simon (1979), **Order and Dispute: An Introduction to Legal Anthropology**, Harmondsworth: Penguen Books.

Robins, Robert S. and Post, Jerrold M. (1997), **Political Paranoia: The Psycho-politics of Hatred**, London: Yale University Press.

Roemer, John E. (1996). **Egalitarian Perspectives: Essays in Philosophical Economics**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rogers, Rebecca (2011), **An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education**, New York: Routledge.

Roller, Duane W. (2010), **Cleopatra: A Biography (Women in Antiquity)**,New York: Oxford University Press.

Rowse, Alfred. L. (Ed.) (1978), **The Annotated Shakespeare**, 3, New York: Clarkson Potter.

Sachs, Joe (Trans.) (2006), **Aristotle: Poetics**, Newburyport: Focus Publishing.

Said, Edward (1978), **Orientalism**, New York: Patheon.

Salmon, Edward T. (1956), **A History Of The Roman World From 30 B C To A D138**, Ontario: Barnes and Noble.

Schrift, Alan D. (1994), "Reconfiguring the subject: Foucault's Analytics of Power", in Ricardo Miguel-Alfonso and Silvia Caporale-Bizzini (Eds.),**Reconstructing Foucault: Essays in the wake of 80s** (185-200), Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Scott, Peter Dale(2014), **The American Deep State**, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

_____ (2007), **The Road to 9/11**, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shakespeare, William (1608), "Coriolanus", in A. L. Rowse (Ed.),**The Annotated Shakespeare,** Vol. III (547-615), New York: Clarkson N. Potter.

_____ (1607), "Antony and Cleopatra", in A. L. Rowse (Ed.), **The Annotated Shakespeare**, Vol. III(473-539),New York: Clarkson N. Potter.

_____ (1599), "Julius Caesar", in A. L. Rowse (Ed.), **The Annotated Shakespeare**, Vol. III(141-187), New York: Clarkson N. Potter.

Sinfield, Alan (2006), **Shakespeare, Authority, Sexuality: Unfinished Business in Cultural Materialism**, New York: Routledge.

Smiles, Samuel (1859), **Self-Help**, Boston: Ticknor and Fields.

Steegmuller, Francis (Trans. and ed.) (1979), **Flaubert in Egypt: A Sensibility on Tour.** Chicago: Academy Chicago Ltd.

Storey, Ian C. and Arlene, Allan (2005), **A Guide to Ancient Greek Drama**, Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Suetonius, Gaius Tranquillus (2007), **The Twelve Caesars**, (Trans. Robert Graves), Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Therborn, Göran (1999), **The Ideology of Power and The Power of Ideology**, New York: Verso.

Thompson, Edward Palmer (1993), **Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture**, New York: New Press.

Thomson, James Alexander (1956), **Shakespeare and the Classics**, London: George Allen.

Tillyard, Eustace M. W. (1954),**The Elizabethan World Picture,** USA: Vintage Books.

Tirado, Francisco and Gálvez, Ana (2007), "Positioning Theory and Discourse Analysis: Some Tools for Social Interaction Analysis", **Forum: Qualitative Social**

Research, 8 (2), http: //www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/248/547.

Toffler, Alvin (1991), **Powershift**, New York: Bantam Books.

Tyldesley, Joyce (2008), **Cleopatra: Last Queen of Egypt**, New York: Basic Books.

URL (n.d.), **Agitprop**, Encyclopedia Britannica Online, http: //global.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/9224/agitprop, (20.12.2013).

Van Dijk, Teun .A. (2008), **Discourse and Power**, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Voegelin, Eric and Wizer, James L. (1998), **History of Political Ideas: Hellenism, Rome and Early Christianity**, Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

von Mises, Ludwig (1944), **Omnipotent Government: The Rise of the Total State and Total War**, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Walker, Jack L. (1966), "A Critique of the Elitist Theory of Democracy", **The American Political Science Review**, 60 (2), 285-295.

Weber, Max (1947), **The Theory of Social and Economic Organization**, (Trans. and Ed. Talcott Parsons), New York: Oxford University Press.

_____ (1958), "Politics as a Vocation", in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Eds.), **From Max Weber: Essays on Sociology** (77-128), New York: Oxford University Press.

_____ (1964), **The Theory of Economic and Social Organization**, New York: Free Press.

_____ (1978),**Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology**, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

_____ (2004), Politics as a Vocation, in David Owen and Tracy Strong (Eds.), **Vocation Lectures: "Science as a Vocation", "Politics as a Vocation"** (32-94), Indianapolis: Hackett.

Walker, Greg (2013), **Reading Literature Historically: Drama, and Poetry form Chaucer to the Reformation**, Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Wilders, John (1977), **Shakespeare: Antony and Cleopatra**, London: Penguin Books.

Williams, Raymond (1954), **Drama in Performance**, London: Watts.

Williams, William Proctor (1992), "Shakespearean Textual Ideology", in Robert Merrix and Nichola Ranson (Eds.), **Ideological Approaches to Shakespeare: The Practice of Theory**(127-136), NY: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Williams, Raymond (1983), **Culture and Society**, New York: Columbia University Press.

Wilson, Eric (2012), "The Concept of the Para-political", in Eric Wilson (Ed.), **The Dual State: Parapolitics, Carl Schmitt and the National Security Complex** (1-28),Surray: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Wirkner, Linda (2003), **William Shakespeare's Julius Caesar**, New York: A/V Concepts Corp.

Wodak, Ruth (2006), "Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis", inJefVerschueren and Jan-Ola Östman (Eds.), **Handbook of Pragmatics** (1-24), Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wright, Erik Olin and Rogers, Joel (2011), **American Society: How It Really Works**, New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Yeğenoğlu, Melda (1998), **Colonial Fantasies: Towards a Feminist Reading of Orientalism,** New York: Cambridge University Press.

Young, Michael (1994), **The Rise of Meritocracy**, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Fehmi TURGUT was born in Arsin, Trabzon. He had his primary and secondary education in Arsin. He studied ELT in the Faculty of Education, Atatürk University, Erzurum. He worked as an English teacher at government schools for several years. In 1997, he became an instructor at the School of Foreign Languages, KTÜ, Trabzon. In 1999, he started to deliver lectures in the Department of English Language and Literature. He had his MA Degree in 2004 in Applied Linguistics. Currently, he is delivering *Shakespeare*, *Translation* and *American Culture and Literature* courses in the Department. He is also the Head of the Department of Translation and Interpretation and the Vice Director of the School of Foreign Languages at KTÜ.