SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINLARI

SEFAD, 2023; (50): 27-42
e-ISSN: 2458-908X
DOI Number: 10.21497/sefad.1407702
Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi

An Al-Farabian Analysis of Social Disorder in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*

Mehmet Akif Balkaya[*]

[*] *Assist. Prof.* | *Dr. Öğr. Üyesi*

Necmettin Erbakan University, School of Foreign Languages, Department of Foreign Languages | *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Yabancı Diller Bölümü*

makif.balkaya@hotmail.co.uk
Konya / TÜRKİYE

Received / Gönderim:
26.06.2023
Accepted / Kabul:
05.08.2023
Field Editor / Alan Editörü:
Hüseyin Altındiş

Abstract

Like many political philosophers, Al-Farabi was influenced by Greek philosophy and tried to define the best regime and ruler. However, much has changed in Al-Farabian scholarship since the 1970s, and 80s through deeper analyses of his philosophy, and translations of his works. The early Islamic philosopher Al-Farabi (870-950) played a key role in the revival of Plato and Aristotle's works within Islamic philosophy, guiding others by studying and providing commentary on these texts. Al-Farabi and his political philosophy deal with the existence of human, ruling, and ruled organs in the body, the city and state which exemplify hierarchy, the features of a ruler, and the differences between excellent and ignorant cities in his *on the Perfect State*. In this sense, focusing on an Al-Farabian political reading of *Julius Caesar*, the aim of this study is twofold. Firstly, it examines the abovementioned socio-political issues to present the idea that such political qualities are also represented and questioned in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. Secondly, the paper argues that the two works exhibit socio-political similarities inasmuch as Caesar's portrayal of power relations within the play can be related to Al-Farabian understanding of the society, state, and rulership.

Keywords: Al-Farabi, Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, *On the Perfect State*, Shakespearean political drama.

Shakespeare'in *Jül Sezar* Oyunundaki Sosyal Düzensizliğin Al-Farabi Bakış Açısıyla Analizi

Öz

Pek çok siyaset felsefecisi gibi, Al-Farabi de Yunan felsefesinden etkilenerek en iyi rejimi ve yöneticiyi tanımlamaya çalışmıştır. Ne ki, 1970'ler ve 80'lerden bu yana Farabi incelemelerinde, felsefesinin daha derin analizleri ve eserlerinin çevirileri yoluyla pek çok şey değişti. Erken İslam filozoflarından Farabi (870-950), bu metinleri kapsamlı bir şekilde inceleyerek ve bunlar hakkında yorumlar sunarak başkalarına rehberlik etmiş; Platon ve Aristoteles'in eserlerinin İslam felsefesi içinde yeniden canlandırılmasında kilit rol oynamıştır. Farabi ve onun siyaset felsefesi, *İdeal Devlet* adlı eserinde insan, yönetici ve yönetilen organların bedendeki varlığını, hiyerarşiye örnek teşkil eden şehir ve devleti, yöneticinin özelliklerini, mükemmel ve cahil şehirler arasındaki farkları ele alır. Bu anlamda *Jül Sezar* oyununun Farabici siyasi incelemesine odaklanan bu çalışmanın amacı iki yönlüdür. İlk olarak, yukarıda belirtilen sosyo-politik meseleleri inceleyerek, bu tür politik niteliklerin Shakespeare'in *Jül Sezar* oyununda da temsil edildiği fikrini ortaya koyar. İkinci olarak, makale, Sezar'ın oyundaki güç ilişkilerini betimlemesinin Farabici toplum, devlet ve hükümdarlık anlayışıyla ilişkili olabileceği ölçüde, iki eserin son derece sosyo-politik benzerlikler sergilediğini savunuyor.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Farabi, Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, *İdeal Devlet*, Shakespeare'in politik dramaları.

INTRODUCTION

From Aristotle and Plato to Nietzsche, from Hobbes to Hegel, political philosophy has been preoccupied with various questions that have no permanent answers. Political philosophy examines the forms of authorities and regimes to question justice, education, laws, and the goals of an ideal society. One of the great Muslim philosophers Abu Nasr Al-Farabi examined such issues to understand the ideal perfect society. Influenced by Greek philosophy, Al-Farabi examined Plato's, and Aristotle's works to shed light on their significance (Mahdi, 1990, p. 691). Related to this, Majid Fakhry remarks that Al-Farabi deserves acknowledgment as the true pioneer of "*Islamic Neo-Platonism*" (1965, p. 470). As for the relation between the intellect and the Greek essence, by perceiving "Plato and Aristotle" as embodying a singular philosophy, Al-Farabi embraces the Greek concept of essence, recognizing it as the unifying element for "*human intellects*" (Sweeney, 2011, p. 41). Yet, such an intellect, for Al-Farabi, depends on other factors. Once human beings exist, the first thing that arises is "*the nutritive faculty,*" such as the sense of touch, hearing, and sight. Then, another faculty that leads man "*to desire or to dislike*" the objects arise (Al-Farabi, 1985, p. 165). Afterward, the power of imagination is revealed. In this way, sensory products are combined or separated. All this is followed by thought and power through which a human gets the opportunity to know mental objects. Thus, art and science begin to develop, as "*the rational faculty arises in man*" (Al-Farabi, 1985, p. 165). According to Al-Farabi, man holds a unique position in the hierarchical structure because no other being surpasses those who possess the ability to think and communicate through language (1985, pp. 97-101).

The Human, the Ruler, Typology of Societies, and the Hierarchy in Al-Farabi's *on the Perfect State*

Al-Farabi likens the perfect city to a healthy and full body. Just as the heart is the leading organ, a similar full and healthy superior-subordinate relationship and assistance is required within the perfect city in which there is a superior person over other people whose hierarchy is similar to that of body organs. The superior and the subordinates should also act in accordance with the higher mind. In other organs, secondary chiefs expect those subordinates to them to perform actions appropriate to their rank, under the guidance of the chief. This is the way how an excellent city is expected to work. An effective hierarchy can be obtained by ordering those from the superior in order of rank downwards. The lowest ranks are the least valuable because they have no lower ranks serving them (Al-Farabi, 1985, pp. 231-33). The virtuous government ensures utmost happiness for its citizens, as it relies on the fulfilment "*of human nature*" (Sweeney, 2011, p. 42). The essence of humanity serves as the guiding principle for the philosopher ruler's governance. Ignorant governments are oblivious to the ultimate purpose of human beings, which lies in "*intellectual and moral virtue*" (Sweeney, 2011, p. 41). Some of these "*ignorant regimes*" seek happiness only in meeting basic needs, while others prioritize "*wealth, or sensual pleasure, or honor, or tyrannical power*" (Sweeney, 2011, p. 57). Therefore, governments that lack knowledge are unaware of the moral and intellectual virtue that is the goal of human existence. While some place a higher value on wealth, sexual pleasure, honour, or totalitarian authority, some of these ignorant governments only seek happiness in satisfying their most basic desires (Al-Farabi, 1985, pp. 233).

For Al-Farabi, the ruler of a perfect society has twelve characteristics. 1) The organs of the ruler must be complete; he needs to use them flawlessly; he must be physically strong. 2) The ruler should be able to understand anything very well and easily comprehend everything said to him. 3) The ruler should not easily forget anything he understands, sees, hears and realizes. 4) The ruler must be very intelligent. If he sees the slightest evidence of an issue, he should be able to handle it carefully. 5) The ruler should be able to express what is on his mind clearly and can speak effectively. 6) The ruler should love learning and should not see anything as an obstacle to learning. 7) The ruler should love righteousness and the right people. He should keep away the liars from himself and the city. 8) The

ruler should be away from his desires to eat and drink and sexual pleasures. 9) The ruler must be honourable and almighty. 10) The ruler should not aim for worldly riches such as gold, silver and money. 11) The ruler should love justice and it should be observed. The ruled ones should be free from oppression. He should be fair, and everyone should lead in this direction. He should, above all, support those who suffer from opposition, and injustice. 12) He should be determined without showing fear or weakness in matters he deems appropriate (1985, pp. 247-49). Al-Farabi states that it is difficult to have all these features in a single person. Therefore, it is sufficient for one person to have at least six of these conditions.

If, however, there is not a single person who meets all these features, two people, one with the ability to be a philosopher and the other to meet the other conditions, become rulers of the city. If these two people are not present, on condition that they agree, the people who have the specified characteristics separately will be the rulers. The most important feature among them is to be a philosopher because if there is no philosopher in charge, the city perishes (Al-Farabi, 1985, p. 253; Dunlop, 1952, p. 93). In accordance with such political concerns, *Julius Caesar* raises doubts about the feasibility of establishing a politically involved public that does not rely on a pre-existing "sovereign power" (Gil, 2013, pp. 36-7).

Al-Farabian Socio-Political Analysis of *Julius Caesar*

Civil unrest had its place within the Roman history. Prior to Caesar's reign, the preceding century witnessed a period of civil unrest, characterized by revolutionary upheavals (Kayser, 1956, p. 21). However, within the play, following Caesar's victory on Pompey, contrary to the general conception of the majority of the masses, during the celebration feast, two tribunes assert that Caesar wants to be the only ruler of Rome. However, the takeover of power by Caesar over Pompey in a stable polity is not called into question in *Julius Caesar*, "*but rather a far more fundamental process of transformation whereby the locus and nature of power, and thus the very nature of the polity itself, is up for grabs, indeed is in the process of being transformed*" (Lake, 2016, p. 440). In this respect, very similar to a tragic flaw, Caesar takes out Pompey through a military coup, which would most probably end up with a civil war. In line with this, a discontent with complete individual authority ignites a destructive civil conflict that engulfs Rome from within (Gray, 2018, p. 12). According to the Al-Farabian viewpoint on the qualities of an ideal city's ruler, it is proposed that Caesar, when faced with such a possibility of a civil war, should have responded with utmost rationality. This corresponds to Al-Farabi's fourth characteristic of a powerful ruler, which underlines the need of a leader being thorough and diligent in their evaluations, even when confronted with the slightest symptoms of an issue. (1985, p. 248). At this point, Caesar may be perceived responsible for his lack of judgment and failure to make firm decisions. Caesar also contradicts the seventh feature of an Al-Farabian ruler which stresses the accuracy and righteousness in that Caesar neglects the results of a military coup. He disregards any possibility of a rejection of any tribunes in killing Pompey. Therefore, such a neglect leads his rulership to be questioned. In this respect, Cassius and other conspirators who wait insidiously for Caesar to commit a tragic flaw seek to ignite a flame for questioning Caesar's decisions and such physical disabilities as Caesar's being deaf in one ear, and his epilepsy, as the first quality of an Al-Farabian ruler demands the ruler "*should have limbs and organs which are free from deficiency*" (1985, p. 247). Therefore, from an Al-Farabian perspective, the harmony for the common interest begins to dissolve. Through its endeavour to establish a collective and authoritative sovereign power, "*the radical civic republicanism in Julius Caesar*" undermines the legitimacy of absolute governance; however, it falls short in providing a viable alternative system to replace it (Gil, 2013, p. 38). Al-Farabi puts forward that the ruler must have a full physical integrity because a disability observed within a ruler endangers the happiness of the community, as realized after Caesar's victory over Pompey within the context of Act 1. Caesar's attempts to modernize the Roman

state fail, and the Roman world descends into anarchy and civil war in addition to his own assassination (Lake, 2016, p. 437). Thus, Act 1 emphasizes Caesar's moral and physical flaws, including his epilepsy, deafness, pride, and susceptibility to flattery (Wells, 1986, p. 103).

As the play opens, two tribunes question the Roman society. For them, Caesar was deceived by flattery, as people quit work and celebrate Caesar's victory. Among the needful things, however, to construct a perfect Al-Farabian society, comes cooperation among people, as he purports,

> [M] *an cannot attain the perfection, for the sake of which his inborn nature has been given to him, unless many (societies of) people who co-operate come together who each supply everybody else with some particular need of his, so that as a result of the contribution of the whole community all the things are brought together which everybody needs in order to preserve himself and to attain perfection.* (1985, p. 229)

Since cooperation is interrupted, Flavius' reproach to the commoners puts forth the social and cultural values of ancient Rome. Whereas his reproach reflects the importance placed on work and social status, the commoners neglect the social expectations, and the Roman society's social and class hierarchies. Flavius' admonishment of the "*idle creatures*" suggests that he believes some members of the society should not be wasting time on leisure activities, especially during a working day (I.i.1-5). He then questions the workers' professions, implying that they should be identifiable by the sign or symbol of their trade. The negligence of such social hierarchies is among the acts belonging to the people of "*the ignorant cities*" because as Al-Farabi remarks, "*mutual affection and attachment do not exist*" within the ignorant cities (p. 291). Since Flavius is aware that the destruction of such a "*mutual affection*" may lead the state to be weakened, he warns the commoners. Flavius, and Marullus are aware that the commoners do not present a mutual reaction against political issues since the same commoners once celebrated Pompey although they now celebrate Caesar.

Flavius' emphasis on working on a "*laboring day*" (I.i.4) and being identifiable by one's profession reflects a society in which individuals were defined by their occupation and social class. The idea that someone who is "*mechanical*" should not be walking around without a sign of their profession indicates that it was essential to know who belonged to which social class. Therefore, such are among the manners, from an Al-Farabian perspective, that destroy the "*perfect association*" because, as Al-Farabi believes, "*in order to preserve himself and to attain his highest perfections every human being is by his very nature in need of many things which he cannot provide all by himself*" (1985, p. 229). Furthermore, the phrase "idle creatures" also highlights the Roman attitude towards idleness and laziness (I.i.1). In Roman culture, it was considered shameful to be idle or unproductive, and this was often associated with the lower classes. In this context, Al-Farabi's idea of "*the imperfect society*" gets along with the manners of the commoners represented in Act 1, scene 1. Flavius' statement reflects this belief and suggests that those who are idle are not only wasting their own time but also disrespecting the social hierarchy as a requisite to construct "*the perfect society*" (al-Farabi, 1985, p. 229). Flavius and Marullus rebuke these commoners because they "*make holiday to see / Caesar and to rejoice in his triumph*" (I.i.34-5) although Caesar has no "*tributaries*" that "*follow him*" (I.i.38). As Crewe has put it, the values of the Roman Republic are evidently centred on the tribunes Flavius and Marullus, rather than the general population because while they are dedicated to upholding these values, which are embodied in the defeated Pompey, their goal is also to safeguard their own political standing, which clearly contradicts the idea of dictatorship (1971, p. 32). Marullus is conscious that the commoners act in line with those who have a mob mentality within an "*imperfect society*" that may easily, within an Al-Farabian view, turn into "*ignorant*" and/or "*erring city*" because of their "*ignorant actions*" (Walzer, 1985, p. 49). Marullus and Flavius assess the crowd as ignorant, and they express their discontent by pointing out that public

political loyalty is inconsistent, as they previously admired Pompey just as they currently admire Caesar.

For Al-Farabi, in terms of his existence, man is "in need of many things" for the continuation of himself and to reach perfection because he cannot do it alone, so he needs other people (Al-Farabi, p. 229). For this reason, people come together to help each other. As each person fulfils the needs of the other through union, some perfect and some imperfect societies emerge. Related to such a taxonomy, Al-Farabi remarks, "*there are three types of perfect society: great, medium, and small*" (1985, p. 229). Great society is formed by the coming together of all nations. The middle society is formed by the coming together of a single nation. Small society, on the other hand, is formed by the gathering of the people of a single city on the territory of a nation. However, according to Al-Farabi, a community formed by the people of a village, a neighbourhood, or a household constitutes an incomplete society (1985, p. 229). Related to Al-Farabi's typology of societies, Caesar's Rome may stand for the medium one, as the Romans stand as a single nation ruled by Caesar. As represented, Rome is a society that serves the public with its state administrators, soldiers, various business lines and its members.

Within such a medium society, the division of labour is represented to be suspended. Al-Farabi read and studied Aristotle's *Politics*, and Plato's *Republic* in which the division of labour is among the musts of a good city. In his book *Politics*, Aristotle examined the idea of the division of labour that refers to the specialization of jobs and responsibilities within a society or community. According to their skills and abilities, people are given specialized occupations or responsibilities, and they collaborate to build a functioning society. Marullus and Flavius realize that such functions of the Roman city are threatened by Caesar's "triumph" over a fellow Roman general, Pompey. Brutus, Cassius, Flavius, and Marullus are among the ones who suspect a one-man-rule of Caesar. However, the Roman plebians are easily manipulated, and apt to change mind in connection with what anyone hierarchically above them utters, as Flavius realizes, "*See whether their basest metal be not moved; / They vanish tongue-tied in their guiltiness. / … / Disrobe the images / If you do find them deck'd with ceremonies"* (I.i.66-70). By the phrase "*basest metal*", Flavius refers to the human nature that may change its direction because of self-interest. Flavius urges Marullus to remove Caesar's decorations as a test for the loyalty of the Roman populace. He asserts that if the populace truly supported Rome, they would not have been influenced by the flimsy ornaments of the statues. However, the division of work, in Aristotle's view, would promote social harmony and cooperation. A more integrated society would result from people developing connections based on respect and mutual dependence (Aristotle; 1984, p. 1253a). Similarly, Al-Farabi puts emphasis on such a cooperation as a crucial factor in constructing "*the excellent societies*" (Walzer; 1985, p. 47). For Al-Farabi, the excellent city's "*parts are arranged according to ranks*," "*association and co-operation*" (Walzer; 1985, p. 47). The civil war, the quarrel between the tribunes, and the plebians represent that people begin to lose harmony, as they begin to be divided, as would be the case within an "*imperfect society*" through "*ignorant actions*", and "*the wrong principles*" (Walzer; 1985, p. 49).

The tribune Flavius goes on being critical with Caesar's power, as the urge to be loyal to his declaration that "*always I am Caesar … / a man free from fear*" (I.i.211-2), absolutely consistent in his commitment to the general good and the ideals of justice and morality that always guide his conduct—dominates his behavior and decisions. As such, for Flavius, Caesar will no longer be able to "*soar above the view of men*" and will instead "*fly an ordinary pitch*" if these resources are taken away from him (I.i.77-80). In other words, Caesar will no longer be exceptional or unbeatable without the aid of his supporters and resources. Therefore, the play depicts a republican political setting in which almost everyone occasionally employs elaborate rhetorical arguments to persuade others (Lake, 2016, p. 453). As Antony gets in preparation for running in the games for the feast of Lupercal, Caesar tells him to touch Calpurnia so that she will lose the curse of sterility (I.ii.8-11). However, Caesar's such manners are

regarded among his weaknesses by Cassius. Additionally, as a soothsayer among the crowd tells Caesar to "*beware the ides of March*" (I.ii.21) Caesar replies "*He is a dreamer, let us leave him*" (I.ii.29) so as not to get personal attraction and to enrich his public image. Related to such prophesies, Al-Farabi discusses on revelation while talking about senses, and intelligibles. According to him, people with very high imaginations may see extraordinary things. This kind of imagination is the pinnacle of perfection. The person with this feature may see images from the present or the future (1985, pp. 223-27). People who see and report such extraordinary images may be blind. They express the news with words and similes such as allegory, and riddles (1985, pp. 223-27). The Soothsayer, therefore, may stand as such an example.

As the play progresses, Cassius' comments present a widening breach between the two characters. Cassius acts like a cunning manipulator, as he attempts to persuade Brutus to join him to assassinate Caesar. Shakespeare contrasts the ethical, yet inexperienced Brutus with the politically smart Cassius. However, Cassius's political intelligence ultimately depends on Brutus, establishing a permanent link between cunning and innocence in their tragic end (Bell, 2016, p. 145). Cassius, therefore, is doubtful of Brutus' shifting attitude toward him and worries that he might be unable to convince Brutus to join him (I.ii.37-41). Cassius' utterance **"***Tell me, good Brutus, can you see your face?*" (I.ii.57) stands as a metaphor for introspection and self-reflection. As realized, the characters attempt to mask their own selfishness or "ambition" by posing themselves who care about the public (Cantor, 2017, p. 38). Cassius gives Brutus advice to examine himself more closely and think about his own ambitions and reasons. Cassius challenges Brutus to reflect on his own behaviour and consider whether he is serving Rome and its citizens by asking if he can see his own face. Brutus' reply "*No, Cassius, for the eye sees not itself / But by reflection, by some other things*" (I.ii.58-9) acknowledges that one can only view his/her own face indirectly through a mirror or another reflective surface. This dialogue, in Al-Farabian view, reflects the connection between the mind and self-awareness. To describe the actual mind, Al-Farabi uses the analogy of the sun and light. The eyes can see the colours that can be seen. However, the sun and light are needed for the act of seeing to take place. With the light received from the sun, the eye can see what appears in colours. As in this metaphor, the actual mind gives the material mind the ability to comprehend itself. Thus, just like the colour that is ready to be seen but needs light to see, "*the material intellect*" is there, yet it also needs such an ability to "*become actually intelligible*" through the senses, the power of thinking and imagination (1985, pp. 199-203). To this end, the dialogue may be interpreted as a metaphor for one's own awareness of his/her own limitations and of his/her own perception. Brutus is arguing that it is challenging for people to view themselves objectively and that they demand assistance from others to understand themselves better. Also, he notes that the relationships among people with others and the feedback they receive from them usually impact how they see themselves. Thus, Cassius says, "*since you know you cannot see yourself / by reflection, I your glass / Will modestly discover to yourself / That of yourself which you yet know not of*" (I.ii.73-6). However, the desire to do what is best for Rome and its citizens drives Brutus as the man of principles. He is not motivated by personal ambition or self-interest, and he is open to hearing what other people say and considering them. Brutus displays his humbleness, and openness to picking the knowledge from others.

As a defender of the Roman Republic, Brutus opposes tyranny, as he says: "*I do fear the people / Choose Caesar for their king*" (I.ii.85-6). *Julius Caesar* covers the change from the republic to the empire, and the contradiction taking part in-between the republic and the empire maintains much of the action in the play (Cantor, 2017, p. 12). In this sense, Brutus' concern that the populace will choose Caesar as their ruler stems from his conviction that it would pose a danger to the stability and democracy of the Republic. His "*fear*" highlights the theme of possible dangers of an uncontrolled authority at the hands of one-man-rule. Brutus "*fear[s]*" that Caesar will have all authority over the Roman Empire if the Romans elect him to be their ruler. Therefore, as seen, the characters usually disagree about what

promotes the good of Rome, and as a result, conflict, intrigue, and revolt jeopardize the public interest (Cantor, 2017, p. 38). However, had Caesar been open to dialogue to discuss the requirements and reasons of his one-man-rulership, he would have been fairer for the conspirators, as Al-Farabi within his eleventh quality of a ruler states, "he should by nature be fond of justice and of just people, and hate oppression and injustice" (1985, p. 249). As a fair leader, it would have been more reasonable to be foresighted to realize that one-man rule would be interpreted differently by some people, and to openly explain the masses the reasons of his rulership, which stands out to be the lacking deed of Caesar in this context. However, as a man of principle, Brutus is devoted to maintaining the principles of the Republic. He is ready to be against the Roman plebians, and to oppose their wishes if it will benefit Rome and its citizens. By doing so, Brutus displays his morality and readiness to put the needs of the Republic ahead of his own desires.

Cassius, however, through his argument (I.ii. 104-13), aims to convince Brutus to take part in the plot against Caesar. Cassius wants to convince Brutus that they have a right to oppose Caesar's authority by emphasizing their equality with Caesar. Cassius's emphasis on equality and being "*born free as Caesar*" may be related to Thomas Hobbes' emphasis (1588-1679) in *Leviathan* (1651) and John Locke's (1632-1704) *Two Treatises of Government* (1689) on the state of nature. For both philosophers of politics, by birth man is equal to one another, and in case of lack of authority one has the right to attack another to attain whatever the other has; therefore, a state of war as a threat to authority emerges. Thus, Cassius acts in line with the state of nature, as he neglects the public good. He manipulates Caesar's personal flaws to take advantage of getting Brutus involved in the conspiracy. To persuade Brutus, he gives the example of river Tiber: "*Caesar cried, Help me, Cassius, or I sink!*" (I.ii.119).

Cassius tries to persuade Brutus that they may change their own fate and topple Caesar through the line: "*The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves*" (I.ii.149). He rejects the notion that their destiny is predetermined by the stars. He asserts that they are in charge of their own activities to be much more honourable, as the core of the honour code functions "*as a self-correcting mechanism*" for the development and upkeep of virtue (Lake, 2016, p. 457). To this end, Cassius utters, "*The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, / But in ourselves that we are underlings*" (I.ii.149-50). However, Al-Farabi presents similar views on "*the celestial*" (Al-Farabi, 1985, p. 119), and "*sublunar bodies*" (Al-Farabi, p. 145) that goes along with Cassius' rejection of the notion that fate is predestined by the stars. Al-Farabi also believes that people have agency and free will. Concordantly, according to Cassius, the reason they are slaves is not due to the stars or fate, but rather their own responsibility for doing nothing to alter their situation. Furthermore, Cassius challenges the idea that Caesar is superior to Brutus, saying their names are both "*fair*" (I.ii.152). In the same scene, Caesar tells Antony that Cassius is a "*dangerous*" man. Related to the human nature, Caesar says, "*Let me have men about me that are fat, /Sleek-headed men and such as sleep a-nights. / Yond Cassius has a lean and hungry look*" (I.ii.192-4). Caesar's categorization of Romans as "lean" or "fat" demonstrates his comprehension of the complexities of governance, as he perceives the nuances in human behaviour and links each individual's attitude towards eating with their political position. He assesses an individual's political perspective by observing their whole conduct, specifically in regards to their eating habits (Cantor, 2017, pp. 39-40).

Caesar interprets Cassius' "lean and hungry look" as an indication that he is not drawn to the typical range of "*human pleasures*". To examine Cassius, Caesar compares him to Antony, who appears to have been on the verge of developing a reputation for excess in many ways (Cantor, 2017, p. 40). For Caesar, Cassius has a "*lean and hungry expression*" (I.ii.204) which signifies that he is constantly desiring for more authority and influence. Caesar remarks that Cassius "thinks too much" which, in his opinion, renders him dangerous (I.ii.204). Cassius "*seldom … smiles*" and has little interest in seeing "*plays*" or listening to "*music*" (I.ii.213-5). This lack of enjoyment and leisure time, for Caesar, is evidence that

Cassius is wholly preoccupied with his personal and political ambitions. Caesar deduces that because men like Cassius are constantly trying to outdo people who are more powerful than themselves, they can "*never… [be] at ease*" (I.ii.218). Because of their willingness to go to any lengths to accomplish their objectives "*they [are] very dangerous*" (I.ii.220). Although Caesar discerns the danger, he takes no action. As among the six distinguishing qualities of a sovereign, Al-Farabi states that a good leader "*will be good at deliberating and be powerful in his deductions*…" (1985, p. 251). By being so, such a leader would "*have in mind the good of the city*" (1985, p. 251). Caesar's ignorance may be among the reasons why Rome would turn into an ignorant city.

However, apart from the people of Rome, the conspirators are also after their personal gains, as they strive to get rid of Julius Caesar. To convince Brutus, Casca and Cassius tell Brutus about Caesar's such physical illnesses as his being deaf in one ear and epilepsy, as Casca says, "*Caesar… swounded fell down at it / … / He fell down in the marketplace and foamed at mouth / and was speechless*" (I.ii.259-64). As for Al-Farabi, "*the sovereign of the excellent city…[has] twelve natural qualities…found together, with which he is endowed by birth*" (1985, p. 247). As Casca and Cassius cannot acknowledge a physical deficiency of their sovereign, Al-Farabi would not accept it, as he says, the sovereign "*should have limbs and organs which are free from deficiency and strong, and that they will make him fit for the actions which depend on them, when he intends to perform an action with one of them, he accomplishes it with ease*" (1985, p. 247). Cassius, therefore, cites Caesar's failure in the swimming race as an example with his abovementioned deficiencies. To him and the other conspirators, Caesar is not an excellent sovereign.

For Cassius, Caesar is "*a man no mightier than thyself or me*" (I.iii.79). Related to Caesar's power, Cassius says that in personal matters, Caesar is no mightier than themselves, yet Caesar becomes threatening like the strange happenings around. Cassius is attempting to persuade Brutus that Julius Caesar is not as strong as he appears to be, and that the Roman populace has given him an excessive amount of power. He contends that rather than having any greatness, Caesar's strength comes from his reputation and the dread he has instilled in people. Cassius puts emphasis on the uncontrollable nature of Caesar's power by comparing him to natural disasters like "*strange eruptions*". Cassius is attempting to persuade Brutus that they must move against Caesar before he grows more powerful and deadly. However, Brutus does not feel at ease: "*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*" (II.i.10-13). Al-Farabi emphasized the value of morality and the function of a moral leader in society. Brutus is stating that he thinks Caesar ought to be slain for the good of the populace, not because he has any personal hostility toward him. As Al-Farabi believed that a moral leader's objective should be to advance society, his view would probably concur with Brutus' justification in that Brutus cares "*the welfare of the state*" (Wells, 1986, p. 47). Brutus supposes that Caesar's death would be for the general welfare but not for personal gain. For him, from an Al-Farabian perspective, Caesar's state of nature would turn into an ambition that may be a threat to Roman state. Brutus expresses his concern that Caesar's character might deteriorate if he were to become king (II.i.19-29). Since Al-Farabi believed that even the most honourable of leaders might be corrupted, Brutus's deduction is coherent with Al-Farabi's view. For Al-Farabi, a competent leader should be aware of the possibility of corruption and take steps to prevent it. Similarly, Brutus supposes that once Caesar is crowned, he may cause trouble as he wishes to, as power may be abused. Although he knows that Caesar does not control public affairs through heart, he takes the view that ambition may lead Caesar to be fully independent, and that he may be poisoned by the high position that he reaches. Therefore, he concludes: "*therefore think him as a serpent's egg / Which hatch'd would as his kind grow mischievous, / And kill him in the shell*" (II.i.34-6). Brutus thinks Caesar as a "*serpent*" that may grow dangerous and decides to take position within the conspiracy. Brutus' servant Lucius finds a "*paper*" that Cassius indeed has put. As Brutus reads the paper, he wonders why Rome shall "*stand under one man's*" fear and respect (II.i.54). Like Al-Farabi's

views on the relation of heart and the mind, Brutus thinks on their debate: "*The genius and the mortal instruments / Are then in council, and the state of man, / Like to a little kingdom, suffers than / The nature of an insurrection*" (II.i.69-72). As Al-Farabi takes the heart as the leading organ of the body, any conflict within the heart and mind may cause trouble, as Brutus supposes, as well. "The state of nature" is a term of political philosophy that Thomas Hobbes and John Locke among others refer to. In the state of nature man thinks of himself, as he ignores the good of the public. As Al-Farabi discusses on the difference between the perfect and the imperfect cities, Brutus, similarly, is afraid that Rome would become "*a little kingdom*" because of Caesar's state of nature that may destroy the perfect city of Rome.

Brutus hovers between calling his plan "*dark*" or "*light*", as he knows that murder of a leader is not an easy decision to make. He calls theirs not a plan but "*conspiracy*" since he is aware that their action is illegal (II.i.84-86). Brutus knows that such "*dangerous*" plans hide their ideas through smiles in a dark cave. For Al-Farabi, the first intelligibles in human are for his perfection. Achieving this kind of perfection is happiness which is a degree of perfection in which one does not need any other substance to give strength (1985, p. 205). This perfection level of happiness is achieved through voluntary actions. However, there are also actions that prevent happiness. For Al-Farabi, happiness is the desired good for itself. That is why actions that lead to happiness are beautiful actions whereas those that prevent happiness are bad actions. These bad deeds are of deficiencies, vices, and vile qualities. Based on all of these, Al-Farabi states that the nourishing force in man serves the body. Sense and imagination serve both the body, and the mental strength (1985, p. 207). Mental strength is tied to the body and stands with it, as the mind is established through the power of desire that serves the power of sense, imagination, and reason. The acts of cognition are performed, as through the help of the force of desire the will is directed to the perceived object or event by the force of desire. When happiness is known with the mind and the purpose is determined by the power of desire, good and beautiful actions are performed by the power of desire to reach the goal with the help of thinking, imagination, and sense. Conversely, when happiness is not known or desired for a good purpose, actions are bad (1985, p. 207).

When considered in line with Al-Farabi's ideas, the conspirators who assert that they act for the happiness of the Romans, they indeed plan for bad actions, as murder of a ruler would cause chaos. The conspirators Cassius, Trebonius, Decius Brutus, Casca, Cinna, and Metellus Cimber gather in Brutus' orchard. As Decius asks, "*Shall no man else be touch'd but only Caesar?*", Cassius tells them to kill "Mark Antony, so well beloved of Caesar" (II.i.169). Yet, Brutus sets against the idea to kill Antony: "*Antony is but a limb of Caesar. / Let us be sacrificers, but not butchers*" (II.i.178-9), as he supposes that Antony may not do any harm once Caesar's head is removed. As it is the fifteenth of March, the conspirators become suspicious whether Caesar would come to the Capitol because of the warning of the soothsayer. When Cassius tells the others that "*Caesar…is superstitious*" (II.i.212), Decius says, "*I will bring him to the Capitol*" (II.i.228). Shakespeare employs various elements to portray Caesar's vulnerability, including his superstitions, indecisiveness, the impact of epilepsy on his mental faculties, and his uncontrollable emotional response when presented with the crown (Hartsock, 1966, p. 58). Such, for Al-Farabi, are the weaknesses that a ruler should be away from, as a ruler should be among the most powerful ones in a perfect city.

Al-Farabi puts emphasis on the correlation between the heart and mind so that one may be at ease and powerful. Shakespeare has a similar view as Portia's utterance to Brutus reveals: "*You have some sick offense within your mind*" (II.i.288). Killing Caesar is not an easy task for Brutus, yet he supposes that he is doing it for the good of Rome. Therefore, Brutus is in the grip of a war between his heart and mind. Therefore, he cannot sleep, feels anxious, and is not at peace. Similarly, Caesar may not sleep that night. He talks to his servant, and then to his wife, as in the previous scene Brutus did. In both wife-husband relations, the wives try to dissuade their husbands from the unknown danger they feel. Related

to "male and female", Al-Farabi supposes that "*the faculty of each of them*" differs because of the various "*function of each of them*", which is interestingly represented in these two scenes, as well (Walzer, and al-Farabi, p. 45). The parallelism of these following two scenes represents states of mind of Caesar and Brutus, Portia and Calpurnia in a similar way. Caesar talks to himself as Brutus did in the previous scene: "*Nor heaven nor earth have been at peace tonight. / Thrice hath Calpurnia in her sleep cried out, / "Help, ho! They murther Caesar!""* (II.ii.1-3). From an al-Farabian perspective, the order and ranks of such materials both on "*earth*", and "*heaven*" are not at ease. And such disorders within the nature leads "*the faculties of the human soul*" to feel uncomfortable as represented through Brutus' and Caesar's utterances (Walzer, and al-Farabi, p. 43). "*The heavenly bodies in general*" react, as represented, to the conspiracy (Walzer, and al-Farabi, p. 43). As Caesar refers to the uneasiness of the earth and the heaven, al-Farabi similarly puts emphasis on the "*justice, perfection and completeness*" of the existences of both "*heavenly bodies*", and "*the human soul*" that interact one another once justice is broken (Walzer, and al-Farabi, pp. 41-43). Although Calpurnia does not want Caesar to go to the Capitol, Decius persuades Caesar to go there since "*the Senate have concluded / to give this day a crown to mighty Caesar*" (II.ii.98-9). Therefore, Caesar says, "*I will go*" (II.ii.112). As Caesar calls Brutus, Publius, Ligarius among other "*friends*" (II.ii.135), in an aside, Brutus says, "*That every like is not the same, O Caesar, / The heart of Brutus yearns to think upon!*" (II.ii.136-7). Brutus regrets because what seems to be just may be unjust as he enunciates.

In Act III, Caesar is warned by the soothsayer, and Artemidorus. Yet, because of caring his public image, Caesar ignores their warnings: "*What touches us ourself shall be last served*" (III.i.8). Caesar remarks that any issue personally important is to be dealt with last. By the time Metellus, and Brutus ask Caesar to forgive Publius Cimber, Caesar says, "*These couchings and these lowly courtesies / Might fire the blood of ordinary men /… / Know, Caesar doth not wrong, nor without cause / Will he be satisfied"* (III.i.40-1/52-3). Caesar supposes himself to be a true, and one unique leader that may not be persuaded within his decisions, as he calls himself not an "*ordinary*" man. He praises his leadership by saying that he does not make any mistake in public affairs. Caesar supposes himself to be "*free of every kind of deficiency*", a feature that al-Farabi relates to the First Existent (1985, p. 57). By doing so, Caesar puts himself at the top of hierarchy as "*the highest kind of excellent existence*", a kind which is again attributed to God again by Al-Farabi. That may be one of the reasons among others that the conspirators desire to kill him. Yet, the conspirators act in accord with the norms of the imperfect society, as will be mentioned. Caesar, before the senators, and the noble Romans, go on praising himself by banishing Cimber: *"But I am constant as the northern star, / Of whose true-fix'd and resting quality /There is no fellow in the firmament"* (III.i.66-8). Caesar, from an al-Farabian perspective, puts himself into the position of "*the First Cause as the Origin of All Being*" (al-Farabi, 1985, p. 89). Caesar overpraises and figures himself as the Northern star that has no equal in the sky through a true, and immovable nature:

> *The skies are painted with unnumber'd sparks;*
> *They are all fire and every one doth shine;*
> *But there's but one in all doth hold his place.*
> *So in the world, 'tis furnish'd well with men,*
> *And men are flesh and blood, and apprehensive;*
> *Yet in the number I do know but one*
> *That unassailable holds on his rank,*
> *Unshaked of motion; and that I am he.* (III.i.69-76)

As the northern star stays in the same place so does Caesar, as he calls himself to be. Caesar, similar to al-Farabi, is aware of the hierarchy within humanity that is *"flesh and blood"*; yet through his intelligence Caesar puts himself unique that holds his unmoved position. Therefore, he says that other people would change their minds, but Caesar is not such a man. Caesar's comparison of men and the

stars is like al-Farabi's in that al-Farabi says, "*the natural sublunary bodies are the elements, such as fire, air, water, earth…*" (1985, p. 107). Yet, Caesar relates his existence to "*the northern star…true-fix'd*" which has no equal in the sky (III.i.66-7). Within the order of hierarchy Caesar calls himself to be above everyone, and even above the earth. Concerning such an order, Al-Farabi remarks, "*the least valuable of them is placed first; then the other existents follow in an ascending order of excellence until the most excellent existent is reached which is not surpassed by anything more excellent*" (1985, p. 113). From an al-Farabian perspective, Caesar supposes himself to be "*the most excellent of*" all existents (1985, p. 113). These are Caesar's last lines before he is stabbed to death by the conspirators. After breaking free from any political structure, the riot redSirects the course of social existence and alters the cohesive force that binds individuals (Gil, 2013, p. 31). The civil war depicted in the final two acts of the play emerges as an examination of a twisted social structure that operates as a means of opposing the evolving "*political modernity of the nation-state*" (Gil, 2013, p. 33). Soon after, Cinna shouts, "*Liberty! Freedom! Tyranny is dead!*" (III.i.86). As Brutus says, "*ambition's debt is paid*" (III.i.91), Antony flees to his house, as "*men, wives, and children stare, cry out, and run*" (III.i.106). Brutus says,

> *… let us bathe our hands in Caesar's blood*
> *Up to the elbows, and besmear our swords;*
> *Then walk we forth, even to the marketplace,*
> *And waving our red weapons o'er our heads,*
> *Let's all cry, Peace, freedom, and liberty!* (III.i.118-22)

For Al-Farabi, "*the appetitive faculty … has a ruling faculty" through which "desire or dislike of a thing occurs*" (1985, p. 171). Brutus' "*appetitive faculty*" desires "*Caesar's blood*" which indeed surpass his assertion to be a reasonable ruler. For Al-Farabi, this is the willpower which directs one to know or to do something because the appetitive faculty "*makes the will arise; for will is an appetite towards or away from what has been apprehended either by sense-perception or by representation or by the faculty of reason*" (1985, p. 171). Together, they create intellectual strength with mental states such as combining or resolving something. Intellectual power makes it possible to think, evaluate and examine. Such attributions the organs of the body are similar to those in Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* who discusses on the differences of stomach, and the heart to give his idea on hierarchy. However, just like Coriolanus' utterances, Al-Farabi puts emphasis on rationality, and knowledge, as he puts, "*knowledge of something may be brought about by the rational faculty*" (1985, p. 171-73).

Al-Farabi carefully discusses the hierarchy and order of cities, just as he does the hierarchy among organs. For him, some of the cities that are the opposite of the perfect and virtuous city are the ignorant city, the corrupt city, and the city with a changed character. The people of these different cities are also opposed to the people of the virtuous city. The ignorant city and its people do not know and think about happiness. They do not seek happiness; they do not believe that it will happen. All they know and believe about happiness is physical health, wealth, pleasures, and pursuits of desires (1985, pp. 253-7). For Al-Farabi, the people of "*the ignorant city…missed the right path through faulty judgement*" (1985, p. 253). In the case of Caesar's Rome, Pompey's relationship to the Roman populace is portrayed as one of shifting allegiances, with the Roman citizens first backing Pompey but ultimately switching their allegiance to Caesar following Pompey's loss. As a counterpoint to Caesar, Pompey's downfall and loss emphasize Caesar's ascent to power and the shifting political climate in Rome. However, soon after Caesar is murdered in Act 3, at Caesar's burial, Antony, a devoted follower of Caesar, speaks to the Roman populace. He contrasts Pompey with Caesar by saying, "*You all did love him once, not without cause; / What cause withholds you then to mourn for him? / O judgement, thou art fled to brutish beasts, / And men have lost their reason. …; / My heart is in the coffin there with Caesar*" (III.ii.105-109). Antony makes the implication that the Roman populace once backed Pompey but now lamented Caesar's passing.

Therefore, from an Al-Farabian view, the Romans act in line with the ones in an "*ignorant city*", as their "*judgments*" change direction in accord with the one who speaks to them. As Al-Farabi remarks, the "*inhabitants [of the ignorant city] do not know true felicity"* because "*[e]ven if they were rightly guided to it*", as Marullus and Flavius in the beginning, then Brutus, and now Antony did, "*they would …not understand it… not believe in it*" (Al-Farabi, p. 255). First, Flavius disperses the crowd, then Brutus persuades them that they are to follow him, and in Act 3, Antony leads their desire to "*burn*" the houses of the conspirators (III.ii.). The rebellion led by Brutus serves as a revelation, highlighting the existence of unchecked sovereign power within the state apparatus. It exposes the absence of accountability and the arbitrary nature of this authority, prompting a systematic exploration of the implications associated with exposure to such dominion (Gil, 2013, p. 38). Therefore, they are represented to be the ones in an Al-Farabian ignorant city that "*follow one's desires*" each time (1985, p. 255). However, although Brutus called the others not to become butcherers, like a man of al-Farabian imperfect state, he calls his friends to bathe their hands in Caesar's blood, and he suggests them to walk to the Marketplace by their red weapons and hands to shout "*peace, freedom, and liberty*" as if they had some victory on an enemy. His speech and behaviour remind the opening scene of the play in which Brutus despised Cesar to kill the Roman Pompey. Cinna, Brutus, and Cassius among others act in line with men of imperfect society by killing their leader, and through their barbaric, uncivilized manners. Yet, they call themselves "*the men that gave their country liberty*" (III.i.132).

Soon after Mark Antony comes, and shakes hands with Marcus Brutus, Cassius, Decius Brutus, Metellus, Cinna, and Trebonius. Antony asks Brutus to "*produce [Caesar's] body to the marketplace, / Speak in the order of his funeral*" (III.i.251-2). Although Cassius protests this request, Brutus accepts it, "*It shall advantage more than do us wrong"* (III.i.267). As all the conspirators exit, Antony looks down at Caesar's dead body, and says, "*A curse shall light upon the limbs of men; / Domestic fury and fierce civil strife / Shall cumber all the parts of Italy*" (III.i.290). The acts of the conspirators are related to the ones that would be done by the people of imperfect society that ignore the public good. Therefore, Antony believes that a curse from "*the First Existent*" (1985, p. 57) would fall on men of Rome, then an imperfect city in which a terrible civil war would burden everywhere, as the perfect state has been destroyed by the actions of the conspirators. As Ocativus Caesar's servant enters, Antony tells him "*Here is a mourning Rome, a dangerous Rome, / No Rome of safety for Octavius yet*" (III.i.316). Following Caesar's murder, Rome becomes dangerous, and unsafe, as it becomes an imperfect city once the populace is easily misled, gullible, and impolite in their reactions (Lake, 2016, p. 470).

According to Al-Farabi, perfection is achieved in the city. Happiness may not be obtained in every city, as people may be helping each other to achieve bad ends. Therefore, it is necessary to establish cities where happiness can be achieved with kindness and people help each other for this purpose (1985, p. 231). Such a city is a virtuous and perfect city, and the society of this city is a perfect society. It forms a perfect and virtuous nation in all cities that help each other for the purpose of happiness. In this way a perfect, universal society is formed (1985, p. 231). In Act III, scene 2, a group of citizens who are disturbed by Caesar's death enter. To them, Brutus says, "*Romans, countrymen, and lovers, hear me for my cause, / … Censure me in your wisdom, and awake your / senses, that you may the better judge*" (III.ii.15-9). His way of addressing the crowd illustrates his aptitude for rhetoric and persuasion. Brutus asks the crowd to evaluate his acts and motivations, acknowledging their intelligence and insight by saying, "*Censure me in your wisdom*" (III.ii.18). He gives the impression that he is open to criticism and appreciates the audience's ability to create thoughtful opinions. The significance of reason and logic in the decision-making process is also emphasized in this approach. As Al-Farabi puts emphasis on the reason, and logic, and the way a ruler uses them, so does Brutus who attempts to win the confidence of the crowd and support for his cause, which is the defence of Caesar's assassination in the purpose of maintaining the Roman Republic, by appealing to the sense of shared group identity, welcoming critique, and

highlighting the necessity of attentiveness. He goes on as such, "*Not that I loved Caesar less, but that I loved / Rome more. Had you rather Caesar were living and /die all slaves, than that Caesar were dead to live all freemen? … /…death for his ambition*" (III.ii.23-6; 30). Brutus contends that his acts were motivated by his ardent love for Rome and his conviction that Caesar's overthrow was necessary to preserve the Republic rather than by personal hostility toward Caesar. Brutus positions himself as an unselfish patriot prepared to take a risk for Rome's overall independence and well-being.

Thanks to the power of his rhetoric, all the citizens praise Brutus while they curse Caesar, "*Live, Brutus, live, live*!" (III.ii.50), and one of the citizens says, "*Caesar's better parts / Shall be crown'd in Brutus"* (III.ii.54-5). The Romans are represented to be a mob, as they now call Caesar "*a tyrant*" (III.ii.76), and "*We are blest that Rome is rid of him*" (III.ii.78). Therefore, the conspirators realize that they have only ushered in a fresh type of tyranny – the mob (Wells, 1986, p. 48). It is now Antony's turn to speak:

> *The noble Brutus*
> *Hath told you Caesar was ambitious; (III.ii.86-7)*
> *…*
> *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 honorable man.*
> *You all did see that on the Lupercal*
> *I thrice presented him a kingly crown,*
> *Which he did thrice refuse. Was this ambition?* (III.ii.97-106)

Caesar brought captives to his country whose treasury was filled by their ransoms. Therefore, Antony reminds the crowd how such a man may be ambitious, as he did not use influence and power, and did not graft in public life. Antony also reminds them that on the Lupercal festival, he offered Caesar a crown three times which was refused. Antony realizes that the crowd acts in line with mob mentality which is what Al-Farabi calls the deeds of the imperfects society who does neither think nor act in accord with the public good. The people of the corrupt city, similar to the ones represented in the above lines, save their souls from matter due to the spiritual attitudes they have gained from their virtuous views, but the attitudes of the people of the corrupt city are just like those of the people of the ignorant city due to their bad actions. That is why the bad spiritual attitudes of the people of the corrupt city clash with the good attitudes. The soul is in great anguish because of such a conflict. On the other hand, the people of the city, who could not find the right way, have wrong views. They know what happiness is, but they do not strive to achieve it, especially when they are glad to be under an authority, as such a society considers it civil. As Shakespeare uses it, "*civic republicanism*" revolves around the concept of sovereignty, focusing on exposing and evaluating the consequences of being subjected to absolute authority. It strives to establish an alternative form of institutionalized power that is collective in nature (Gil, 2013, p. 35). "*Early modern civic republicanism*" finds its foundation in the bureaucratic structure of the monarchy, which entails the assignment of "*status, roles, and positions*" to the elites within the system established by the monarchy itself (Gil, 2013, p. 36). As being subject to absolute authority, the citizens that follow only worldly things are misled. As a result, they are far from happiness (1985, pp. 273-75). Antony remarks, "O judgement, thou art fled to brutish beasts, / And men have lost their reason. Bear with me; / My heart is in the coffin there with Caesar" (III.ii.114-6). The crowd is now likened to animals without reason. Antony, as Al-Farabi does in *on the Perfect State*, puts emphasis on

the harmony of "*heart*" and "*reason*" to have better "*judgement[s]*" on such critical public-issues. Antony reasonably persuades the crowd that Caesar was not ambitious, and a citizen states that he was afraid as someone "*worse*" would "*come in his place*" (III.ii.122). As Marullus, at the beginning of the play, called the same crowd "*stones*", Antony now calls them that they "*are not stones*" to move them in their actions and thought (III.ii.154). Upon this, the crowd calls the conspirators "*traitors*", and "*villains, murtherers*", as they decide to "*revenge*" (III.ii.215). shortly before Antony's words, the crowd called the conspirators honest men, and now they all shout "*Revenge!...Burn! Fire! Kill!*", as they decide to "*burn the house of Brutus*" (III.ii.216-7). Their sudden hatred flares out once they learn that Caesar would give "*to every several man, seventy-five drachmas*" (III.ii.256). In this context, because the political ruler in *Julius Caesar* is shown as failing to consult honestly and freely, civil order completely collapses (Wells, 1986, p. 61). Meanwhile, Antony is informed that Octavius, and Lepidus have "*come to Rome*" (III.ii.278) The third act ends with Cinna the poet's murder by the crowd although he tells them that he is not "*a conspirator*" but "*the poet*" (III.iii.29-30).

Although Caesar was not aware of it, some of his people think and act like the ones in the ignorant city described by Al-Farabi. According to Al-Farabi, the people of the ignorant city claim that the position of beings is not protected and that some people are in an unworthy position. The people of the ignorant city do not believe that there can be love, devotion, and happiness among people (1985, p. 291). According to Al-Farabi, such people think that people unite because they need each other in a relationship of interest. Other than that, according to them, everyone hates each other. According to them, some people serve each other by forcibly subjugating them because they need helpers. Such people will then use their subordinates as slaves. That is why they do not believe in equality. According to the people of the ignorant city, anyone with physical strength, and a strong weapon may beat other people (1985, p. 291-92). Thus, such people oppress others and act on others. Therefore, they believe that they have been brought together by bullying (1985, p. 293). Other misconceptions held by such ignorant people include the following: some people think that they are brought together by marriage, some by kinship, and some by contract (pp. 293-95). As a result of these issues, it is a similar situation for one person to be different from another and for a community to be different from another community. Therefore, different groups try to defeat and eliminate each other to gain wealth, and honour (1985, p. 299).

In Act IV, Octavius and Antony execute "*an hundred senators*" (IV.iii.201), and march toward Philippi. Brutus sees the Ghost of Caesar, and in the final act, Brutus, after seeing the ghost, tells Cassius that he would never go to Rome as a prisoner, as "*he bears too great a mind*" (V.i.123). Brutus, like Al-Farabi, in public affairs puts emphasis on the importance of "mind" that governs a state and/or a battle. The beginning and the end of the play represent civil wars that lead order to be shaken by giving way to disorder. Related to this civil war, Cassius says, "*the villains*" run, my own people have become their own "*enemy*" (V.iii.1-2). This is a condition, in both Hobbessian and Al-Farabian view, that may lead to the state to be weakened. As such, the unity established by Cassius and Brutus collapses, as Antony and Octavius win the civil war and try to re-establish the dissected order.

CONCLUSION

This study, from an Al-Farabian socio-political perspective, has examined political issues, the function of statesmanship, and the search for political authority as represented in *Julius Caesar*. Al-Farabi states that a statesman must have twelve characteristics of which at least six of them must be present in that person. In this respect, Caesar lacks the first feature, because he has an epilepsy-like illness and has little hearing in one ear. He is also flawed in terms of the second quality, as Al-Farabi favours the leader should possess a profound perception and effortlessly grasp any information conveyed to him. Yet, he

must be well aware to avoid from the middle of March as to the vicious omen about which he has been informed persistently by others though, he disregards all the warnings. The Romans are known to attach importance to superstitions and dreams, as represented in the play. Yet, Caesar is reluctant to see, hear, or notice the prophecies let alone taking them into account. Al-Farabi's third feature that is required to be a ruler is a strong memory whereby he retains everything he comprehends, witnesses, hears, and realizes without ease. This again is problematical for Caesar. Next, Al-Farabi's fourth feature states that upon perceiving the faintest hint of something, the ruler should promptly seize it as suggested. Although Caesar tells Antony that he does not trust him, relying on his own greatness, Caesar does not take sufficient precautions. The fact that Caesar does not remove liars and untrustworthy people also contradicts the seventh article inasmuch as for the seventh feature, Al-Farabi states that the leader must embrace righteousness and hold affection for virtuous individuals. They should actively distance themselves and their city from deceitful individuals. However, having Pompey killed at the beginning of the play, and not giving a clear and understandable reason for it contradicts Al-Farabi's eleventh feature stating that justice and despotism should be avoided. The fact that Caesar suspects people like Cassius and thinks that he will get into trouble in the Senate, but does not take precautions despite these, contradicts the twelfth feature of a ruler.

Within the context of ruling systems, however, *Julius Caesar* explores the morality of resistance, the nature and management of political change, and the ideal structure of governance. In this sense to reach his target, Caesar never hesitates to kill Pompey nor does he refrain from revoking the democratic ambiance with the mere intention of reaching his ultimate form of a rich, uniform society subject to a centralised ruling mechanism. Yet, as for Brutus, the issue rests on a dilemma whether Caesar should be viewed as a despot who seriously threatens the freedom of the Roman people or whether he stands for a stability principle that protects the state from anarchy. Although Shakespeare places the play's action in Rome, engulfed in political upheaval, it is in the process of changing from one type of regime to another. Such a change brings disorder, and once the social order is disrupted, authority weakens as disorder prevails.

Article Information

Ethics Committee Approval:	Exempt from the Ethics Committee Decision
Informed Consent:	No Participant
Financial Support:	No Financial Support
Conflict of Interest:	No Conflict of Interest
Copyrights:	No Copyrighted Material Used

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aristotle. (1984). *Politics.* (C. Lord, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.

Al-Farabi, A.N. (1985). *on the Perfect State.* (Richard Walzer Ed.). Oxford University Press.

Bakhsh, A. O. (2013). The Virtuous City: The Iranian and Islamic Heritage of Utopianism. *Utopian Studies*, 24 (1), 41-51.

Bell, M. (2016). 'This was a man!' Goethe's Egmont and Shakespeare's Julius Caesar. *The Modern Language Review*, 111 (1), 141-61.

Cantor, P. A. (2017). *Shakespeare's Rome: Republic and Empire*. The University of Chicago Press.

Crewe, J. V. (1971). Shakespeare's 'Julius Caesar'. *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, 37, 31-44.

Dunlop, D. M. (1952). Al-Farabi's Aphorisms of the Statesman. *Journal of Iraq*, 14 (2), 93-117.

Fakhry, M. (1965). Al-Farabi and the Reconciliation of Plato and Aristotle. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 26 (4), 469-478.

Gil, D. J. (2013). *Shakespeare's Anti-Politics: Sovereign Power and the Life of the Flesh*. Eds. Michael Dobson and Dympna Callaghan. Palgrave Shakespeare Studies.

Gray, P. (2018). Shakespeare and War. *Critical Survey*, 30 (1), 1-25.

Hartsock, M. E. (1966). The Complexity of Julius Caesar. *PMLA*, 81 (1), 56-62.

Kayser, E. L. (1956). Julius Caesar: Politician or Statesman? *The Classical Weekly*, 50 (2), 20-22.

Lake, P. (2016). *How Shakespeare Put Politics on the Stage: Power and Succession in the History Plays*. Yale University Press.

Mahdi, M. (1990). Review: Al-Farabi's Imperfect State. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 110 (4), 691-726.

Rayner, F. C. (2022). *Shakespeare and the Challenge of the Contemporary Performance, Politics, and Aesthetics*. The Arden Shakespeare Bloomsbury Pub.

Shakespeare, W. (1985). *Julius Caesar: The Arden Shakespeare*. T. S. Dorsch (Ed.). Methuen.

Sweeney, M. (2011). Greek Essence and Islamic Tolerance: Al-Farabi, Al-Ghazali, Ibn Rush'd. *The Review of Metaphysics*, 65 (1), 41-61.

Wells, R. H. (1986). *Shakespeare, Politics and the State*. Macmillan.