

CONTEMPORARINESS IN THE LITERATURES OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO JULIUS CASER

Dr. Srinivasappa G
Asst. Prof. of English
Govt. First Grade College
Chikkanayakanahalli,
Tumkur Dist-572214

Abstract

It is an attempt to see, compare, contrast, correlate and justify contemporariness which can be traced and tasted in William Shakespeare which reflects in Julius Caesar. That term contemporariness is the core of literature. Literature probes into the life and discover a man to expose all human activities to community and let it to explore with all kinds of human nature and stand where he is pleased himself with the truth of human experience and propagate it to the world. The principles of flowing and cultivating human mind and create a ground for finest fruits to bliss himself and enlighten the heart and mind of his fellow beings and regenerates in all the generations. It produces and re-produces fresh thoughts. It is a driving force of aesthetic energy. It sustains and converts one's energy into various driving forces as an aesthetic sense to feel in the different socio- economic, political cultural and intellectual context. There is theory of re-discovery in discovery, thinking in re-thinking for innovative spirit of life. Literature involves an act of holistic excellence in the entity of life. In the light of the above context it is an effort to think of literature of William Shakespeare 'not of an age but for all the ages' as Ben Johnson sensed for his ever evolving contemporariness in his thoughts. It is the sense of universality of the literature. There is a democratic essence of force is constantly driving in Julius Creaser which reflects present political context.

An orient understands the ideas of West to lead the actual life in East. Re-reading Shakespeare by an orient and re-interpreting Shakespeare (west) in the Present Context has immense value. Shakespeare is just a pre-text to understand practical life today and lead meaningful and harmonious life in the present world today. Due to Liberalization, Privatization and Globalization, the whole system has become rotten. Human values are degenerated and there is no faith in human relations. Human bond is torn into pieces. Family bond itself is degenerated and demoralized. The globalization process is said to be the major cause for

environmental destruction and leading to a growth in inequality both across the world and to the erosion of democratic processes. **Why Shakespeare?**

Shakespeare does not establish single truth but he presents a gallery of *diverse truths*. He flows as rive fresh. Hence, Shakespeare and his ideas are ever green and ever fresh for all the time. The notion of his death is misconception. He can be read and re-read for the fresh ideas which are inevitable for the contemporariness today. He can rejuvenate one who reads him. He is in every lay man and every reader of him. Today the imperial force (West) makes East intellectual slaves. But re-reading of Shakespeare gives tools to fight against imperial power which makes one to feel inferior. There are multiple power sources in his plays which give strength to come out of inferiority complex. Usually power never generates the growth of language but it curbs one's innate force of language learning. There is a power politics in not prescribing Shakespeare's plays in the syllabus of Under Graduation and Post Graduation studies today. The intention behind this is to avoid innate feeling in the creativity. Language is the means of creative power where one can get knowledge from outside and expressing his innate knowledge from inside. That natural instinct of man is curbed by corporate language today. Creative power is degenerated by it. The very purpose of imperial-power (force) to day at world level with impact of globalization is to encourage broken feelings with modern communicative and web-language. During Shakespeare's time, English language was just like Dravidian Language of South India. It was suppressed by Greek and Latin like Sanskrit in Indian languages. Greek and Latin were dominant over English as Sanskrit was dominant over the rest of Indian languages. Then in the opinion of the rival poet-playwright **Ben Johnson**, Shakespeare was "**Small in Latin and less in Greek**" *¹ and in turn Shakespeare established English language with his writings and then in the Elizabethan time English itself flourished as classical language like Greek and Latin. Though he borrowed the sources from Chronicles and Histories, with his enormous genius he broke the tradition. He introduced his own style, in new ideal, universal and eternal truth in life. He modified and contributed a lot to the world of English literature. Again there was a rival poet of his period **Robert Green**, one of the University Wits remarked that "*An Upstart crow beautified with other feathers*". *² But Shakespeare as a creative writer painted wonderful and realistic characters that reflect all kinds of joys and sorrows of mankind. The character would become inspiring and rejuvenating force in man today. Classical English language has become the language of trade and commerce in the corporate world. The corporate language creates the broken feelings. It occupies the place of classical English and rules the minds. It is essential to understand the basic process of Colonization in order to understand how the world today might be seen as different from the past. Globalization is not new phenomenon but merely a new form of Colonization. Post-Colonization is also used to refer a mode of literature especially that emerging from former colonies and textual interpretative strategies that have been developed to interpret and discuss such texts.

There is no sense of introspection in today's world for the serious disastrous errors. There is no trace of suffering, repentance and realization of one's responsibility for crime, sin, and blunder in human activity. But there is only quest for 'Power'. There is a full of conspiracy and corruption to get the power. 'Power' on the other hand is based on capitalism and this capitalism stands on imperialism. Today at global level imperial force imposing various pressures on the Eastern Countries. The impact of colonization on the Eastern Countries is the cause for emerging Liberalization which is wide spread today. People have begun to think of democratic-principles and its values. There is a sense of enquiry into rationality. In the illusion of democracy, modern man is misusing his liberty. His liberty becomes nuisance to others.

Everyone longs for money and power. Modern man is under the impression that he can be happy with the power and position and the end of life is to lead comfortable and luxurious life. He does not understand the truth that superficial life is not practical and real. It is purely worldly life but not the spiritual one. There is *Things Fall Apart* every where in the world. Due to the rapid development in information technology and communication with its fast mass-media, the world has become a *Global Village* today.

As everything is under the fast fabric-mode, modern man is not free enough to think and act. Taking immediate action to execute any work is most dangerous. The decision that he takes in either of common or crucial context, is not thoughtful and there is no weight in those words.

Here in the context, it can be related through the words of ‘Claudius’-from the play ‘*Hamlet*’, by William Shakespeare that “**Words without thoughts never to heaven go**”.^{*3} Here in the words of Claudius, one can understand that words without compact feelings become dry and there is no sense in them. Even the providence will never approve them. It means, the words of modern man are purely mechanical and they have no value. Hence, there is no proper communication between the people. There is a complete lack of communication and misunderstanding in any kind of relations today. There is a conflict and confusion in the mind of modern man. The language that he speaks is for rapid communication, where there is no scope for expression and understanding of one’s tender feelings at heart. Modern communicative language is for mind and not for heart. It is superficial, as a result, the words that come out of mere mind are purely mechanical and more relatively objective. The state of modern man is more objective than subjective. Language is the fundamental and basic aspect of culture. Culture is venerable. It is expressed through the language. Language plays a significant role in the development of culture and culture produces culturally good man who is certainly human and humble moreover he communicates with tender feelings. Hence, there should be a good linguistic atmosphere for the growth of man. The growth in the sense is the growth of one’s personality where one can behold the human love and expect a cultured man in a system.

Such a desirable cultural background can be set by reading and understanding William Shakespeare in the present context. It is the need of the hour to think of Shakespeare’s noble thoughts and ideas for the best of human existence and his survival. But there is a common notion that Shakespearean’s language is quite difficult to use for the present. People think that it can’t be a communicative language and it never serves the purpose of modern trade and commerce. It is not suitable and necessary from the modern point of view. There is an opinion that Shakespeare is out-dated. He is an artist. An artist lives through his work of art and becomes universal.

There are many other recreation modes occupying the plays of performance. Then plays like Shakespeare can not be liked by all the people only when it is brought into curriculum values in the academic institutions, it can reach the mass and class. It can be more creative and tentative enough because in the world-class-rooms, the mentor is free to explain the thought and message of Shakespeare at least some often quoted lines very effectively with wonderful examples and draw the attention of students towards Shakespeare’s value in the class-rooms.

. In *Julius Caesar*, freed from the embarrassments of a patriotic theme and with the problem projected into a ‘Roman’ setting, Shakespeare examines more closely the contradictions and illusions involved in political action. The matter cannot be properly argued here, but it seems to me undeniable that the play offers a deliberate contrast between the person and the public persona, the face and the mask that tragic illusion and error are shown to spring from the wrenching apart of the two worlds- the personal and the public and that **Brutus**, in particular, is a

study in what **Coleridge** describes as the politics of pure- or abstract- reason, with the resulting sophistries and inevitable disappointments.*⁴ There is a hope that even from so cursory a survey of some of the play preceding the great tragedies, one point has become clear that even in plays where the political interest is most evident it is never exclusive or as it were self-contained. The implied question is what does this political action or attitude mean? Is it invariably reduced to personal terms? How does this affect relations between men? What kind of man acts in this way? How does he further make himself by so acting? *Swift says of the party man when he is got near the walls of his assembly he assumes and affects an entire set of very different airs.* He conceives himself being a superior nature to those without and acting in a sphere where the vulgar methods for the conduct of human life can be of use.*⁵ It is Shakespeare's distinction that when dealing with rulers and matters of state, he constantly brings us back to the vulgar methods for the conduct of human life that he refuses to accept a closed realm of politics. Indeed, it is only by a deliberate focusing of our interest for a particular purpose that we can separate 'political' from 'non-political' plays, the two kinds being in fact mixed by common themes and preoccupations. Thus, in the Second Part of *Henry IV* Shakespeare's interests are plainly setting away from his ostensible subject towards a more fundamental exploration of the human condition that points towards the great tragedies and *Julius Caesar* shares with later non-political plays, a preoccupation with the ways in which men give themselves to illusion. So from *Julius Caesar* onwards, it is possible to trace Shakespeare's political themes only in plays that with the exception of *Coriolanus* are not primarily political plays. There are ways to understand politics namely private and public. Politics as a context in which individuals live and operate an obstruction with a potent force where individuals are subject to politics. Politics as a battle ground of conflicting ideologies which makes it subject to individuals and their power games.

In 'Julius Caesar' Rome is a real political formation in both the senses, a composite of different social layers exerting pressures in distinct ways as collectivities subject to manipulation by individuals. Thus the idea of Caesar as an overweening megalomaniac individual is poised against the person of Caesar, reacting in predictable and unpredictable ways to demonstrate how he is turned into a political construct by Cassius, by Brutus, and by Antony. This is however should not blind us to the fact that Brutus, as a politician, is equally a construct of Cassius who claims to the present and even takes evidence of public expectation from the honorable man. In Plato's Republic-good politics is said to be impossible unless there is a fortuitous coincidence between philosophers and the people. The philosophers must be willing to rule and the people must be able to recognize the philosopher, a thing not easy for the unwise to do in as much as there are so many takers, and wish to be ruled by him. The evidence that Brutus is a fake philosopher in the sense of being incapable of logical thinking is seen in his inability to see the trick in Cassius putting him for liberal political sentiments against Caesar whom he condemns for lack of gladiatorial physical powers, pitting Brutus's mind against Caesar's body. In the political cause Brutus accepts from Cassius suggestions emanating from his personal venom against Caesar body. In a political cause Brutus accepts Cassius suggestions emanating from his personal venom against Caesar but rejects everything he recommends that is politically sound within their conspiracy.

Likewise in the case of Caesar, praised, honoured and flattered the military genius has fallen victim to the public image of the great man. As he assumes the public mantle more completely his perspicacity is diminished. Caesar has the political wisdom and personal perception to see right through Cassius but these qualities are blunted by his belief in the invulnerability of the great man. When Shakespeare is dealing with political ideas, as in 'Julius

Caesar' and in the history plays in particular and in most other plays to varying extents and with varying significance, the ideas are not abstractly debated. They are convincingly incarnated in living characters facing practical choices and propelled by complex motives and motivations characters that continue to inhabit our imaginations individuals and also as examples of difficult choices, often exercised self defeating. The murder of Caesar is a public event in a public place witnessed collectively by the conspirators and by the populace. But these public collectivities also appear to be temporarily and temporizing conjured constructs abstractions which collapse once the political mileage has been squeezed out of them. In the time extending before and after the assassination it is seen that the wrenching pictures of individuals struggling for collectivity and the price they pay in terms of distortion, disloyalty and disintegration. The question is not so much whether Brutus's estimate of Caesar is right and politically clear-headed enough to lead to the desired result. Is Brutus as the prevailing condition and his estimate of it-but that too is not forth coming from the play.

Each of the conspirators for instance, remains obsessed with Caesar both before and after the assassination. The viewer's weakness is revealed more surely than is the correctness of his view. The metaphorical aptness of self confessed physical infirmity, such as the weak eyesight of Brutus and Cassius is manifest to the audience and in the absence of explicit choral commentary provides indicators of interpretative complexity. Such complexity also resides in the matter of exercising choice. Among the major characters, choice is exercised by Brutus, Cassius and Antony and not by Caesar except in the very limited sense of refusing the crown and going to the senate. Moreover, even of these decisions had been different in the course of action which is historically given would have been no different. It would only have perhaps changed the method and locate in the murder, thus calling a different symbolism into operation.

Historical characters are human individuals to their contemporaries who must struggle to see them as embodiments of political ideas and arrangements. In actual fact a political system can never be an abstraction as it is deployed and demonstrated by individuals and groups made of flesh and blood much more than are merely being parts of a system. Proximity and distance in time and space will influence how an actor in a political drama will be assessed. The historical personages in the play pose for history and anticipate its verdict. The play itself is being on such verdict based on interpretative rearrangement of the earlier verdict of Plutarch. Is Shakespeare rewriting history, as modern critical parlance has it or is he indicating that all retrospective historicizing is fictional? The past is recalled and distorted in the service of political contests and contestations.

Brutus acted as a leader of the conspiracy but his impracticality not with standing, he assumes command of the conspiracy. Critics sometime and again attribute his failure to his gentleness and idealism in the conspiracy of Antony in allowing him to give the funeral analogy on the forum. These are but the strategic mistakes after the ideological stand has been taken. The flow is in the ideology itself and in Brutus's inability or unwillingness to think it through for the correspondence between theory and practice before establishing equations about Caesar about reprehensibly one kind of political arrangement and another. In the first half of the play Caesar is the only character to have a realistic perspective at the personal level as demonstrated by his comment on Cassius, and the political level as indicated by his ability to change the mood of the crowd. The metaphysical level as revealed in his sense of attitude to death.

In the second half of the play Antony is the realist. Cassius's realism and Anthony's realism have in common that they bank on the least admirable qualities in human nature, individual and collective. An instance of this, even subtler than tempting Brutus is provided by

Cassius's move to make the conspirators swear an oath. He recognizes each man's superstitious fear of superhuman ire and punishment if a sworn oath is violated. Brutus in rejecting the proposal counts on their pride as constant Romans and therefore on their loyalty being self legislated. He never examines their need to have him lead them which reflects their weakness rather than the strength that assumes. Cassius is as shrewd a judge of people as is Caesar though he lacks the latter's ease and humour. Astute political realist and able-military strategist that he is, Cassius is fully aware of both his own manipulative skills and also his lack of credibility. His rancor springs from a sense of unrewarded and unrecognized merit and he compensates by manipulating others through their credulity, idealism of superstition. Cassius and Brutus come face to face with Caesar only in III Act, scene I, where they act on an elaborate parody of the servility they deplore and would shake off.

Since he sees through people clear-sightedly it is more important to notice that all Cassius's fulminations against Caesar harp on personal physical comparisons rather than on the political danger posed by him. Even in whetting Brutus he relies on the argument that Brutus belongs to a family that resists tyranny rather than on citing specific instances of Caesar's tyranny. In fact it is Brutus who disavows personal animosity against Caesar who needs to conjure vague disembodied apprehension of what may happen were Caesar to gain absolute power. Brutus intuitively feels that Caesar is not tyrannous but works ascendancy rests neither on physical nor on moral superiority but on personal confidence and political acumen. Cassius does have the political acumen but lacks the personal confidence to push on to Brutus. He contemplates neither the deed nor the consequences of the performance nor non-performance of that deed but only the man against whom it is directed. He does not realize that the murder will not usher in a republican Utopia, so taken up is he with the concept of ritual sacrifices. It may be recalled that even Caesar's ghost is not spiteful or vengeful as is Hamlet's. If Caesar's grandiloquent assertions about his steadfast unshakeability are seen as compensatory efforts to balance his inescapable awareness of physical decay, Brutus's self-congratulatory endorsements of his own moral probity and political commitment should also be seen to betray his self doubts not about choice between private and public commitments but about having any kind of commitment at all. Such a dilemma is not at all usual when someone is suddenly confronted with the urgency to choose a course of action. In Brutus's case inaction would indicate either his inability to subordinate private loyalty to Caesar to the public good or a lukewarm attachment to republican ideals-either of which implication would destroy himself image. Brutus successfully skirts all questions which might force him into an unfavorable self-assessment.

Brutus and Cassius strive to couch personal insecurities and desires in the language of patriotic liberalism and equality. Their self-inflicted avocation as 'liberators' forces them to discomfort the truth of their own feelings in this world of male competitiveness so much so that Portia also rests her appeal on the values of this macho world. The ability to inflict violence on self and others become a proof of the great Roman virtue of constancy in this play. But constancy as loyalty conflicts with unweaving resolution. Thus Brutus must subject his emotional constancy to Caesar and even to Portia to his steadfastness as the champion of republicanism. Not surprisingly, the evidence Brutus provides of having subordinated personal feeling to political integrity is his desensitization to violence in his readiness to murder Caesar and in his self-dramatizing stoic response to the violent suicides of Portia and Cassius. "It might even be suspected that Brutus would not have got involved in the conspiracy if Caesar had not been his friend and benefactor. He is always at pains to subordinate personal affection and create an impression." Brutus claims to be indifferent to both honour and death if general good

is served. At the time of his suicide he does not assess whether the purpose has been served but is preoccupied with maintaining personal honour through self-sought death, the ultimate justification being entirely personal glory in his competition with the ‘vile’ conquerors. People faced with certain death tend to draw up a balance sheet, an account of time, effort, aspiration and sacrifice invested in the pursuit of an end and the worth wholeness or success of the pursuit. Brutus does no such thing.

Brutus is often compared with Hamlet as a man of contemplation too refined for the task he is called on to perform. But Brutus never feels declassed and laments what rogue and peasant slave he is. Brutus also does not have Hamlet’s passion of dislocation, his incisive intelligence, and his sense of humour his verse and zest. Unlike Hamlet, Brutus’s quarrel is not really with himself. Though Brutus employs the metaphor of civil insurrection with in him he is not in pursuit of self-knowledge or self-acceptance as Hamlet is. He can readily don the stoic stance which is a stance vis-à-vis the world and not the self, as is so evident in the difference between **Horatio** and **Hamlet**. The returning tide after the two world wars saw the change in critical approaches to Caesar moving from total empathy for Brutus towards a dramatically and textually more responsible assessment of the balance of forces. On the stage ‘**Julius Caesar**’ was represented by **Glen Byam Shaw** in production in 1956 at the Shakespeare memorial theatre at Stratford-upon-Avon. The regality and centrality of Caesar were emphasized through costume, sets, and lighting culminating in the appearance of the Northern star in a reddened sky at the end of Antony’s oration. The star reappeared as Brutus fell at a lower level than Caesar had.

The most daring and contemporary departure from the text was to have Antony eulogize Brutus while the latter is still alive and instead of allowing him to commit suicide among friends have him pulled by ropes to his death in a public lynching. It is as if this dramatizes the ambivalent attitudes evoked by Brutus and summed up. “**Repentance**” is the absolute character of humanity. Constant suffering out of sin leads to repentance and repentance to realization of one’s flaws and misconception in life. It is well furnished in Shakespearean tragedies. It is usually started with sufferings of tragic heroes. Tragedy is essentially a tale of suffering and calamity conducting to death. Generally, in a tragedy hero and anti-hero are being suffered but for the audience, the only suffering of hero is exposed. There are two ways of suffering in both in Hero and Anti-hero. Everyone is to suffer. Nobody is free from suffering. The hero in a tragedy suffers for the inhuman activity of anti-hero.

‘Plotting’ against one to suffer is itself a tragedy. Here he has to undergo suffering to make others to suffer. In the play “**Julius Caesar**”, Brutus suffers a lot than Caesar. It is better to refer the words of Lear at this juncture, that is “**Brutus is more sinned than sinning.**” ‘**Caesar**’ suffers for his own political flaw where as ‘**Brutus**’ suffers for his moral flaw. The moral degradation in him has let him to suffer more than Caesar. There are two kinds of sufferings: (a) **External Suffering** and (b) **Internal Suffering**. Firstly one starts suffering out of external force like Caesar and the other is an act of internal evil force like Brutus. The grave grief of “**Brutus**” and his wife ‘**Portia**’ is internal. When “**Brutus**” is in his orchard in Act-II, Scene I of the play “**Julius Caesar**”, it is in the night that he calls impatiently for his servant Lucius and sends him to light a candle in his study. When Lucius has gone, Brutus speaks one of the most important and controversial soliloquies in the play. He says that he has “**No Personal cause to spurn at, him but for the general**”⁶ meaning that there are general reasons for the public good. Thus for him Caesar has seemingly been as virtuous as any other man but Brutus fears that after he is “**augmented**” (crowned) his character will change, for it is in the nature of things that

power produces tyranny. The power corrupts him therefore he decides to agree to Caesar's assassination, *"To think him as a serpent's egg which hatched, would as his kind, grow mischievous, and kill him in the shell"*.

When the conspirators have departed, Brutus notices that his servant, Lucius has fallen asleep. At this moment, **Portia**, his wife enters, disturbed and concerned by her husband's behavior, to know what is troubling him. She asserts her strength and reminds Brutus that because she is **Cato's** daughter, her quality of mind raises her above ordinary women. She asks to share his burden. Deeply impressed by her speech, Brutus promises to tell her what has been troubling him. The disturbances in the stormy night skies parallel in the *internal discord* of Brutus. Alone after Lucius leaves, Brutus begins his contemplation of what to do about Caesar with the declaration, "It must be by his death! Indicating that he has made up his mind. As his soliloquy proceeds, however, he proves to be far less certain than he would perhaps like to be. His lack of a particular personal grievance against Caesar, combined with Caesar's generally benevolent rule makes it difficult for him to accept the necessity of assassination but he fears that the nobles of Rome may give Caesar so much potential power for evil that he will no longer be able to resist the temptation to suppress the rights of Roman citizens, especially the rights of the nobility. In the portray of Brutus, Shakespeare creates him both a public man of affairs in the Roman Government and a private man, compassionate for his fellow beings and fond of his wife and home life. He meets tragedy because of his qualities that make him a good man and a good husband which are the very qualities that condemn him to failure when he is pitted against **Antony** whose decisions are always pragmatic, expedient and untainted by moral considerations. Brutus's relationships with **Lucius** and **Portia** delineate the private man. He envies the peace of mind that allows his servant to relax and to sleep so easily for he realizes that it is his concern for the world which keeps him from sharing that serenity. Likewise Brutus's episode with Portia at the conclusion of the scene gives the audience further insight into him as a private man. He cannot put off her questions with simple falsehood. She knows him too well. She is also aware of the value which **Brutus** associates with honour and she appeals to his sense of humour while demonstrating her own, by displaying the scars of the self-inflicted wound in her thigh [a symbol of loyalty to Brutus] in an effort to learn what has changed him so much that it threatens the well-being of their marriage. Brutus's withdrawal has already begun to disrupt his pleasant home life. Shortly the assassination will destroy both the private Brutus, in addition to the public Brutus, as well as the Republic which he hopes to protect.

The internal suffering of Brutus and Portia ceases out of Brutus himself and ultimately he finds the fact that Cassius is held responsible for all his disaster in Rome and for his support of crime and conspiracy, he commits suicide with his constant suffering. With conspiracy of Cassius, his life becomes more tragic than Caesar. Because the tragedy of Caesar is only external. He only suffers externally for his lack of reasoning and rational thinking about his kingdom and its subjects in Rome. He is killed for wrong judgment of his followers and rejecting the words of his wife Calphurnia. 'Suffering' plays a different role in the life of Brutus and Caesar and had its own effects on them. The very term **INTROSPECTION** is associated with psychology. It is effectively inserted in Shakespearean characters. Shakespeare as a psychologist who has closely observed every step of human-behavior in his time and has promptly exposed in his plays both the faces of man and its effects on himself and on the society. When Shakespeare speaks through *"Casca"* in the play **"Julius Caesar"** in the very first Act Lean Cassius can read the minds and mend them. *"He reads much: He is a great observer and he looks quite through the deeds of men."*⁷

Here, it is said that how Shakespeare has created “**Cassius**” as a close observer of mankind and who understands strength and weakness of them and acts to sow the seeds of conspiracy against the **Caesar**. He has a profound knowledge of human behaviour and thus he understands well both Caesar and Brutus. A noble **Brutus** becomes conspirator just because of Cassius. He rages Brutus with his sharp sense of his words and resolves himself to kill Caesar on the **Ides of March in Rome**.^{*2} **Cassius** can assess the behaviour of men and its out-come is far and against the system. When Cassius sows the seeds of conspiracy Brutus never gets a nap till the assassination of Caesar and it is followed even after his end.

However, **Brutus** has not lost the sense of introspection throughout the play. For the right and just cause he is instigated but not for power. Though he kills Caesar, he is not treated as ignoble. Anthony at the funeral says, “The nobility and honesty in the personality of Brutus is inculcated just because of his experiencing and ever undergoing experiment introspection in every concrete and complex context. When Cassius has raised money to support their armies using methods not compatible with Brutus sense of honesty, Brutus is disturbed because he fears that Conspiracy has become prompt, perhaps ever more prompt than the tyrant they hoped to replace”. (Caesar) For the first time, Brutus implies that one of the reasons for the assassination is Caesar's dishonesty, when he says, “**Didn't great 'Julius Caesar' bleed for justice sake?**”^{*8} **Brutus** has developed the handsome personality just because of his ever conscious over introspection on his every deed. **Brutus** is a man who nobly accepts his Fate. He chooses personal honour over a strict adherence to an abstract philosophy. He acts calmly and reasonably to **Cassius'** death, as he had earlier in a moment of crisis when **Popilius** revealed that the conspiracy was no longer a secret. In the last moments, he got satisfaction of being certain in his own mind that he has been faithful to the principles embodying the honour and nobility on which he has placed so much value throughout his life. Brutus even prepares himself finally the eventuality of defeat. His *stoic-philosophy* requires that he shows fortitude that specifically forbids suicide. He resolves to choose personal honour over philosophical consistency and has a will to commit suicide before he will allow **Antony** and **Octavius** to drag his body through Rome. **Brutus's** sense of despair and his fatalism are further emphasized by his desire to end the war one way or another and by his resigned acceptance of the fate of which they will learn soon enough. Showing concern for any needy is a natural phenomenon. It is a law of Nature. It is also a gift of nature. Nature provides it profoundly for all living creatures. Nature never betrays anybody in showing concern. It is the web of nature which connects and controls relatively all the objects of nature. Man should have this privilege. Showing pity and concern for everyone at every time is nonsense. Because it creates laziness and there is no room for individual growth. They can also be less creative and more dependent and submissive. When the man is inactive, lazy and the more dependable on others for everything is a sign of creating autocracy in the place of Democracy.

Shakespeare is a psychologist and humanist. He is an exponent of human psychology. So he closely observes and understands man's behavior and portrays as they are to show the transformation of man to beast and beast to man. When Shakespeare speaks through ‘**Caesar**’, in the play ‘**Julius Caesar**’ in the very first Act that Caesar says about Cassius ‘**He reads much; He is a great observer and he looks quite through the deeds of men**’.^{*9} Here it can be observed that how Shakespeare has created ‘**Cassius**’ as a close observer of man kind and understand the strength and weakness of them. “**Mob is emotional**” when Shakespeare says this, it is very much clear that he could well understand human emotions and behavior. Shakespeare alone had such profound knowledge of human-character. Hence, he has created and sketched every

character in his plays. My study of Shakespeare attempts to place him as a great poet, playwright and the thinker of mankind in the current context. There is an holistic approach to Shakespeare's vision of life. His vision of life and its approach to creative work of art is relevant. Modern philosophical approach to life is also aiming at formulating the holistic approach because modern life is chaotic, fragmented and purely mechanical. Modern sense of understanding the world is departmentalized as, history, psychology, science, chemistry, zoology, geography, politics, economics, sociology and so on. It is known as varied branches of knowledge. Because modern vision of life is based on analytical understanding of man and society. But there is no fragment of man in the vision of Shakespeare. His view of knowledge of human life is inclusive hence there is a holistic approach in understanding and interpreting life. Shakespeare never made make discriminations among his characters like King, Queen, Fool, Puck, Tam Kent, False staff, Portia, Nerissa and Cobbler and so on. Each character in his artistic world is inclusive and typical. The forewords of *Kuvempu*, the great Kannada writer from his classical novel "**Malegalalli Madhu Magalu**" can be referred in this context. The forewords begin with; *None is great, None is little, Nothing is Trivial. (Yaru Mukyaralla. Yaru Amukyaralla. Yavudu yakaschitavalla)*. This study obviously reflects the holistic philosophy of life. It is common in major writers of the world. As it is in *Kuvempu*, so it is meaningfully found in Shakespeare also. For Shakespeare, man is amalgamation of all the passions like love, hate kind, unkind, friend and foe, anger, jealousy, guilt, ego and pride etc. Modern thinking is also trying to formulate an inclusive vision of life. Shakespeare's relevance lies in the understanding of life in this holistic approach.

Traditional method of understanding of Shakespeare is de-constructed by Derrida. But the present study of Shakespeare goes a little beyond the place of Shakespeare with a new kind of approach. It also deviates from traditional approach and it is reconstructed to look at Shakespeare in a very different way and analyzing it in the new light of thought and approach. Hence, the new theory is evolved with his study. There is cosmic-culture and secular kind of approach in his work of art. Hence, Shakespeare is much relevant in the present crucial context.

He is the most inevitable for he is a *great tradition* and *cultural-treasure* of the world. '*The Waste-Land*' of T.S. Eliot reflects spiritual fall of man at one hand and on the other hand "*The-Corporate Waste Land*" exposes self-destructive nature of global man that can be replaced by the re-reading and re-interpreting Shakespeare today. Shakespeare speaks the truth of life through his characters by following the theory of "*Character is destiny*". It is a wonderful truth that every one should understand that man suffers for his own faults i.e. '*tragic flaw*'. This makes him so popular for his thoughts and his philosophy of life and his work of art. He has become more relevant and immortal, as he himself says in his sonnet No:-18, "*So long as men can breath or eyes can see, so long lives this and this gives life to thee*".

So he is with us and he is always with us for ever for his golden thoughts.

Reference with End notes

1. Ben Johnson- 1986-*'To the Memory of My Beloued, The author William Shakespeare and What He Hath Left us'*-pp.43-3 prefixed to the First Folio,1623. The works of Ben Jonson-vol.3-, Chatto and Windus-1910. 287-289Oxford University Press, London.
2. Dr.Samuel Johnson- 1961 *'Preface to Shakespeare'* -PP.86-Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.
3. Harold and Jenkins-1909 *'Hamlet-Prince of Denmark'*-Act-III, Scene III, Page-64-line-96. Methuen and com., London.
4. Ben Johnson- 1054 *'To the Memory of My Beloued, The author M. William Shakespeare and What he hath left us'*-pp.43-3. London Oxford University Press-1623.
5. Dryden-1662, *'Dramatic Poesy'*-(1668) about Chaucer's art gallery in prologue to the Canterbury tales London Press- pp.10.
6. Edward Said-2003 *'Orientalism'*-Foregrounds and predominantly focuses on the complex turbulent relationship between the West and East. Said avers still survive today in Western media reports of Eastern, especially Arab lands, despite formal decolonization decades ago. So the machinery of colonialism does not simply disappear as soon as the colonies become independent' Viva Book Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.
7. T.S. Eliot-1989 *'The Family Reunion'*-this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. St. John iii, 19. Cambridge University Press.
8. Ben Johnson- 1986-*'To the Memory of My Beloued, The author WilliamShakespeare and What He Hath Left us'*-pp.43-3 prefixed to the First Folio,1623. The works of Ben Jonson-vol.3-, Chatto and Windus-1910. 287-289Oxford University Press, London.
9. Dr.Samuel Johnson- 1961 *'Preface to Shakespeare'* -PP.86-Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.
10. Harold and Jenkins-1909 *'Hamlet-Prince of Denmark'*-Act-III, Scene III, Page-64-line-96. Methuen and com., London.
11. Ben Johnson- 1054 *'To the Memory of My Beloued, The author M. William Shakespeare and What he hath left us'*-pp.43-3.London Oxford University Press-1623.
12. Dryden-1662, *'Dramatic Poesy'*-(1668) about Chaucer's art gallery in prologue to the Canterbury tales London Press- pp.10.
13. Edward Said-2003 *'Orientalism'*-Foregrounds and predominantly focuses on the complex turbulent relationship between the West and East. Said avers still survive today in Western media reports of Eastern, especially Arab lands, despite formal decolonization decades ago. So the machinery of colonialism does not simply disappear as soon as the colonies become independent' Viva Book Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.
14. T.S. Eliot-1989 *'The Family Reunion'*-this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. St. John iii, 19. Cambridge University Press.
15. *'Hamlet: Prince of Denmark'*, Ed. Una Ellis Fermer, Arden Shakespear Edn., Methuen and Co., London, 1909.