SEFAD, 2020; (44): 55-70
e-ISSN: 2458-908X
DOI Number: https://doi.org/10.21497/sefad.845326

George Chapman's *Caesar and Pompey* and Cato as the Mediator

Dr. Hediye Özkan
Aksaray University, Faculty of Science and Letters
Department of English Language and Literature
hediyeozkan@aksaray.edu.tr

Abstract

The classical Roman past has been a rich source for the playwrights who desire to make literary connections between the ancient political characters and real life figures. George Chapman, a neglected playwright of the seventeenth century, uses the Roman Empire allegory in *Caesar and Pompey: A Roman Tragedy* (1631) to respond to the political dissagreements which lead England into the Civil War. Through *Caesar and Pompey*, Chapman conveys possible scenarios that correspond to specific political events in the history of early modern England. Using new historicism as a theoretical framework, this paper analyzes Chapman's play as a political allegory of the dispute between Charles I and Parliamentarians, leading the three kingdoms into war in 1642. Drawing a parallel between the Roman republic depicted in the play and the specific moments of early modern world, this paper discusses how Cato acts as Chapman's mouthpiece and the ardent supporter of political negotiation rather than conflict. Thus, the paper contributes to the scholarship about Chapman who uses the history of Roman republic as a warning for the future of English politics during the Elizabethan period.

Keywords: Caesar and Pompey, George Chapman, English Renaissance Drama, Roman Republic, new historicism.

George Chapman'ın *Ceasar and Pompey* Trajedisi ve Arabulucu Cato

Öz

Klasik Roma geçmişi, antik siyasi karakterler ve yaşayan gerçek şahsiyetler arasında edebi ilişkiler kurmak isteyen oyun yazarlarına zengin bir kaynak sağlamıştır. İhmal edilmiş on yedinci yüzyıl yazarlarından George Chapman, *Caesar ve Pompey: Bir Trajedi* adlı oyununda, Roma Cumhuriyeti alegorisini İngiltere'yi iç savaşa sürükleyen siyasi anlaşmazlıklara cevaben kullanmıştır. Bu oyun aracılığıyla, Chapman İngiltere tarihinin belirli siyasi olaylarına tekabül eden olası senaryoları aktarmaktadır. Bu makale, Chapman'nın oyununu, üç krallığı 1642'de iç savaşa sürükleyen Birinci Charles ve Parlamenterler arasındaki anlaşmazlığı anlatan siyasi bir alegori olduğunu yeni tarihselcilik açısından incelemektedir. Bu çalışma, oyunda resmedilen Roma Cumhuriyetini Erken Modern Dünya ile ilişkisi açısından okuyarak, Cato karakterinin nasıl Chapman'nın sesi ve ayrımcıdan ziyade sıkı bir uzlaşma taraftarı olduğunu tartışır. Bu bağlamda, Roma cumhuriyetinin kanlı tarihini Kraliçe Elizabeth döneminde İngiltere siyasetinin geleceği için bir uyarı olarak kullanan Chapman hakkındaki bilgiye katkı sağlanması amaçlanmıştır.

Gönderim Tarihi / Sending Date**:** 17/03/2020
Kabul Tarihi / Acceptance Date**:** 15/09/2020

Anahtar Kelimeler: Caesar and Pompey, George Chapman, İngiliz Rönesans Draması, Roma Cumhuriyeti, yeni tarihselcilik.

INTRODUCTION

The interest in classical Roma and Roman world permeated in early modern England due to "English self-fashioning in the age of expansion and exploration" (Jensen, 2012, p. 1). Inspired by the spiritual developments and philosophical and political structures in the Roman Empire, English humanists, intellectuals, and writers constructed their language of politics and art by using the rich examples and ideas of the Roman history. The classical Roman past includes opulent sources for the playwrights who desired to make literary connection between the ancient political characters and real life figures, as Cadman & Duxfield (2016) states, "Rome endured considerable turbulence and generated numerous figures who were represented in histories as moral exemplars, both good and bad" (p. 5). Moreover, classical Rome enabled early modern writers to highlight "the republican virtues of Roman senators" (Higgins, 1945, p. 184). Republicanism has a literary influence which provides a political framework for early modern authors such as Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson, Spencer, Fletcher, and Chapman to explore the question of civic liberty and political authority. Many plays of these writers reflect "a republican literary tradition that developed in the Elizabethan and Jacobean commercial theatre" (Hadfield, 2005, p. 86). Roman political history resonates in relation to early modern imperial propaganda and English national identity as Cantor (1976) puts it, "both growing imperial ambitions and nascent republican sentiments became bound up with the way the Elizabethans viewed Roman history" (p. 17). The resonance between ancient Rome and early modern England encouraged the dramatists to generate topical analogies and applications in their writings.

Besides the historical figures and republicanism ideals, the history of Roman republic allows early modern authors to express their critique of politics in a subtle way. The writers used past but meant "the present state" or the future. "The fictional veiling" for the political statement of the writers "was adequate, so that serious offence might not be offered to members of the court or friendly foreign dignitaries" (Dutton, 2000, p. 7). Drawing their subject matter from real history sets a layer of protection for the authors. The adaptation of Roman historical setting creates a safe space where the author articulates his political stance implicitly, often in disguise of a philosophical character who is critical about the leaders and their political decisions. The authors use tragedies as one of the best mediums to illustrate prophesies or warnings to the leaders and force the reader to envisage who Julius Caesar could stand for in the modern monarchical tradition of England.

George Chapman, a neglected playwriter of the seventeenth century, uses the Roman Empire allegory in *Caesar and Pompey: A Roman Tragedy* (1631) to respond to the political conflict which leads England into the Civil War. As Goldstein (1963) states, Chapman's "reponses were ethically, philosophically, and politically explicit" to the conflicts of his time (24). Through *Caesar and Pompey,* which was not performed in theatres, (Brown p. 469) Chapman conveys possible scenarios that correspond to specific political events in the history of early modern England. I argue that Chapman's play is a political allegory of the disagreements between Charles I and Parliamentarians which leads the three kingdoms into war in 1642. Reading the Roman republic in the play in terms of its relation to the specific moments of early modern world, I will discuss how Cato acts as the voice of Chapman and the ardent supporter of political negotiation rather than conflict. Conceptualizing my

analysis of *Caesar and Pompey* within the theoretical framework of new historicism, I will examine the mutual constitutive relationship between the text and historical context along with the cultural milieu, interplay of discourses, and power relations in England.

The term "the New Historicism" is coined by Stephen Greenblatt in 1982 and centered in Renaissance Studies. In new historicism, which emerged in the late 1970s and early 80s, the text is considered as a cultural production of particular historical conditions. Summarizing the principles of the theory, Howard (1986) writes,

> A new historical literary criticism assumes two things: (1) the notion that man is a construct, not an essence; (2) that the historical investigator is likewise a product of his history and never able to recognize otherness in its pure form, but always in part through the framework of the present. (p. 23)

Howard suggests that literature participates in the construction of a larger cultural, historical, and political reality. Howard (1986) continues arguing that "Rather than passively reflecting an external reality, literature is an agent in constructing a culture's sense of reality" (p.25). In parallel with Howard's argument, Berghahn (1992) suggests that literary texts are embedded in history and the result of social production claiming, "Literary texts do not originate above history, transcending it; they are part of the political, religious and social institutions that form, control, and limit them; they do not exist outside of but within the discourses of power" (pp. 144-145). Giving emphasis to the mutual interaction between text and context, Scheick (1993) mentions, "Event (as art) and art (as event) reinforce each other in their mutual reflection of hegemonic cultural properties" (p. 572). Literature should be studied within a social and historial context, and according to Greenblatt (1980), we should consider "both the social presence to the world of the literary text and the social presence of the world in the literary text" (p. 6).

For new historicism, the object of the study is "literature in history" (Brannigan, 1998, p. 3). Literature, in fact, becomes an agent to convey a specific part of history, and is used to underline "the significance of past for the present" (Brannigan, 1998, p.3). According to Brannigan (1998), new historicism uses "the past as an impetus of political struggle in the present" (p. 6). Stressing the importance of critical thought and conceptualization, Foucault (1982) mentions, "We need a historical awareness of our present circumstance" (p. 778). It is important to place a literary work in relation to other works and discourses so that the network of power relations can be observed and examined with all its varying aspects.

Drawing on the writings of Foucault (1982), particulary the concepts of "power and resistance," new historicists can do political criticism. Explaining power, Foucault writes:

> *Power exists only when it is put into action, even if, of course, it is integrated into a disparate field of possibilities brought to bear upon permanent structures. This also means that power is not a function of consent. In itself it is not a renunciation of freedom, a transference of rights, the power of each and all delegated to a few (which does not prevent the possibility that consent may be a condition for the existence or the maintenance of power); the relationship of power can be the result of a prior or permanent consent, but it is not by nature the manifestation of a consensus.* (p. 788)

Although consent and consensus are significant apparatuses in power relations, for Foucault (1972), "power is essentially that which represses. Power represses nature, the

instincts, a class, individuals" (pp. 89-90). Power in and of itself, "brings into play relations between individuals (or between groups)" (Foucault, 1982, p. 786). In terms of structures and mechanisms of power, Foucault states, "certain persons exercise power over others" (1982, p. 786), and "[t]he manifestation of power takes on the pure form of 'Thou shalt not'" (1972 p. 140). New historicism which allows humanists to "intrude on questions of politics and power" (Veeser, 1989, p. ix) along with Foucault's argument about power is relevant to my discussion about how Chapman investigates the literary representation of power relations in early modern England through *Caesar and Pompey.* MacLure (1966) states, "Chapman, like other pious and unsocial contemplatives, was fascinated by power, whether in the grandiose tragic hero or in the masters of ceremonies at a comic feast of fools. Is power, he wondered, the gift of Fortune or Virtue?" (p. 84). Chapman ardently traces the answer of this question in his plays, particulary in *Caesar and Pompey* by juxtaposing a philosophical virtuous character with a tyrannical leader. Situating my argument within new historicism and employing Foucault's concept of "power"allow me to analyze the play in relation to its reciprocated interaction with the historical, political, and cultural forces and power relations that constantly shape art which, in return, shapes these forces playing a vital role in its creation.

The early criticism about Chapman focuses on his style, quality of his verse, and dramatic skills. For example, the center of Swinburne's discussion is Chapman's abscure style and inconsistent characterization. Swinburne (1875) is critical about Chapman's "crabbed and bombastic verbiage, the tortuous and pedantic obscurity, the rigidity and laxity of a style which moves as if it were a stiff shuffle, at once formal and shambling" (p. 36). Commenting specifically on *Caesar and Pompey*, Swinburne (1875) writes, "those only who read the whole work will know all its merit as well as all its demerit; they will find fresh treasures of fine thought and high expression embedded among dense layers of crabbed and confused rhetoric, wedged in between rocky strata of thick and turgid verse" (p. 119). In his criticism, Parrott (1910), on the other hand, provides notes and introductions to each play and critical and texual commentary. Accusing Chapman of violating historical truth and disregarding his contemporaries like Shakespeare and Jonson, who also composed Roman tragedies such as *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus*, *Sejanus*, and *Catiline*, Parrott complains that Chapman "cared as little as Jonson for the creation of character, as little as Shakespeare for the reproduction of atmosphere; and he ventured upon liberties with the facts of history such as neither Shakespeare nor Jonson had allowed himself" (p. 658). For Parrott, Chapman's decision negatively impacts the "artistic unity" in *Caesar and Pompey.*

By criticizing early scholarship about Chapman and the play, Schwartz (1961) proposes that the unjust criticism is due to a misunderstanding of the play's structure and considers Cato as the protagonist of the play instead of Pompey, whose gradual development is ignored by many critics (p. 140). On the other hand, Ide (1985) argues that Chapman is not interested in character progression, psychological consistency, or continuity; rather, *Caesar and Pompey* is a classical history play, which gives it multiplicity rather than unity (p. 267). O'Callaghan (1976) traces the answer of what is Caesarism? (p. 320), while Crawley (1967) argues to examine the decisions of tragic hero to define the artistic consistency of the play (p. 277). Investigating Chapman's purpose of writing the play, Soellner (1985) suggests that the play is crafted as a warning to Caesarian aspirations of Prince Henry, Chapman's patron. Pointing out that "the Prince was from various sides being

urged to study Caesar's military accomplishments and even encouraged to think of himself as a future Caesar" (p. 137), Soellner (1985) creates a parallel between Prince Henry and Caesar within the context of military ambitions.

Although Chapman's other plays such *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois* and *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Byron* have been extensively studied, *Caesar and Pompey* and *The Tragedy of the Chabot* are among the neglected plays of Chapman who is still very much less discussed than his contemporaries. Despite valuable critical discussions, the newest criticism about the play was published two decades ago by Nina Taunton (2001) who examines the Elizabethan military conduct manuals and codes of masculinity through the theories of surveillance and containment. Compared to the scarcity of scholarhip, the arguments about the play vary. However, none of critical discussion addresses the play as a political allegory and prophesies about the future of England. Therefore, my argument provides a literary and historical analysis to demonstrate how Chapman crafts his play as a social commentary to address the political turmoil in England's history in disguise of classical Roman history and characters.

Caesar and Pompey was published in 1631, yet "probably crafted in 1604" when England was going through dramatic political, military, religious and social conflicts (Jensen, 2012, p. 135). Like every monarchy, England faced complex religious and political disagreements and rebellions because of "poverty, faction, and religious divisions" (Somerville, 2014, p. 9). Charles I came to throne when English protestants were fearful about Catholicism and pressuring over the invasion to Spain and Catholic authorities. Disappointing military experiences against Spain and France of Duke of Buckingham under the order of Charles I accelerated the tension between Parliamentarians who tried to impeach Birmingham. As a result, Charles I dissolved his two parliaments but called the third due to lack of money necessary for his war policies. This call was seen as an opportunity by the opponents who presented The Petition of Rights to Charles I in 1628 to restrict the arbitrary ruling policies of the King. Although Charles I pretended to accept it in order to get funding, he ignored its requirements later by dismissing his third parliament in 1629 and declaring his personal rule described as an "Eleven Year-Tyranny."

Besides the military and political conflicts, the religious strife escalated the existing contestation between Charles I and his opponents. Appointing William Laud Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633 and marrying the French Catholic princess Henrietta Maria, Charles I caused fear and anxiety among English Protestants who were concerned about the future of the religious practices. Laud's extreme religious doctrines ended up Scottish uprising against interventions in religious practices and the war between Scotland and England. This forced Charles I to recall the Parliament in 1640 that ended the eleven-year rule. Because of "the complete breakdown of dialogue between King and Parliament, an armed resolution to the conflict became inevitable" and in 1642, the Civil War broke out (Plant pr. 3).

Foreseeing this turmoil in advance, in the last years of his life, Chapman published *Caesar and Pompey* in order to articulate his prophecy about approaching civil war. Chapman's opinion on war was not enthusiastic due to the distructive properties of war rather than its benefits. He was clearly aware of the danger of an internal division in the nation because of the dispute between powerful political elite. As the voice of Chapman in the play, in the first scene, Cato summarizes the existing situation,

Now will the two suns of our Roman heaven,
Pompey and Caesar, in their tropic burning,
With their contention all the clouds assemble
That threaten tempests to our peace and empire,
Which we shall shortly see pour down in blood,
Civil and natural wild and barbarous turning. (p. 343)

Cato's depicts Roma like "heaven" which corresponds to the prosperous years of England before the war. The initial years of Charles's ruling of the country alone were successful as a "golden age" since peace, prosperity, and stability permeated the country. The contention between Pompey and Caesar mentioned in the second line stands for the tension between Charles I and Parliamentarians, specifically Cromwell. People were taking sides and the supporters of the two parties were assembling like "clouds" which is a sign of storm or flood that will probably cost many lives. Chapman anticipates that the ongoing conflict will create a threat for the peace of the Empire and pour the blood of brothers of England like "the two suns of Rome," implying the Civil War, where the two brothers fought against each other. In the opening passage voiced by Cato, Chapman suggests that nothing will remain the same when war breaks out which will mark a "barbarous" turning point in the history of England. Cato's concerns are valid because power relations between political authorities produce either consensus or "a relationship of violence" which "acts upon a body or upon things; it forces, it bends, it breaks on the wheel, it destroys, or it closes the door on all possibilities. Its opposite pole can only be passivity, and if it comes up against any resistance, it has no other option but to try to minimize it" (Foucault, 1982, p. 789). As a response to Cato's prophecy, the philosopher Anthenodorus asks, "From whence presage you this?", which gives the opportunity to Cato to advance his argument. Cato replies,

Pompey's brought so near
By Rome's consent for fear of tyrannous Caesar;
Which Caesar, fearing to be done in favour
Of Pompey and his passage to the empire,
Hath brought on his for intervention
And such a flock of puttocks follow Caesar. (p. 344).

Chapman juxtaposes two kinds of fear, one of which the English people feel about Charles I and his cruelty, while the other is Charles I's concern of being defeated by Cromwell and losing the crown. Cato not only articulates the leader's concerns but also the emotional state of the followers in the imminent crisis. As a critique about the Royalists, Cato continues,

Look how, against great rains, a standing pool
Of paddocks, toads, and water-snakes put up
Their speckled throats above the venomous lake,
Croaking and gasping for some fresh-fall'n drops,
To quench their poison'd thirst, being near to stifle
With clotter'd purgings of their own foul bane:

So still where Caesar goes there thrust up head
Impostors, flatterers, favourites, and bawds,
Buffoons, intelligencers, select wits,
Close murtherers, mountebanks, and decay'd thieves,
To gain their baneful lives' reliefs from him,
From Britain, Belgia, France, and Germany,
The scum of either country (choos'd by him,
To be his black guard and red agents here)
Swarming about him. (p. 344)

The supporters of the King are described as either "paddocks, toads and water-snakes" who are waiting for the right moment to take advantage of the situation, while "imposters, flatterers, favorites and bawds/Buffoons, intelligencer, select wits" are following him like a shadow, and "Close murtherers, mountebanks, and decay'd thieves" are after their lives rather than support. Chapman also predicts how Charles I was hoping to gain military help from Ireland and France. Through Cato, Chapman reflects his discontent about royalists; however, does not it mean that Chapman is on the side of Parliamentarians? According to Cato's student Statilius, Cato's "spirit will use this day against both the rivals",implying that Chapman is neither supporting Charles I nor Cromwell (p. 344). On the other hand, it might be a reference to Cato as well as Chapman's Stoic doctrines against any kind of injustice and corruption as he states at the end of the first scene, where Cato invites Minutius, who is a tribune—the person who defends the rights of people in Roman history. Cato says, "Come stand by me in what is fit/For our poor city's s safety, nor respect/her proudest foe's corruption, or our danger/Of what seen face soever" (pp. 345-46). Minutius accepts Cato's invitation, responding,

I am yours.
But what, alas, sir, can the weakness do,
Against our whole state, of us only two?
You know our statists' spirits are so corrupt
And servile to the greatest, that what crosseth
Them or their own particular wealth or honour
They will not enterprise to save the Empire. (p. 346)

Although Minutius is one of the official representatives of common people, he is critical about the statesmen, which is a reference to the corruption in House of Lords and Commons and Parliament of England. Emphasizing the impact of institutions, Foucault (1982) explains how the state exercises power: "power relations have been progressively governmentalized, that is to say, elaborated, rationalized, and centralized in the form of, or under the auspices of, state institutions" (p. 793). Minutius reflects his distrust towards the institutions and political leaders who choose their wealth and honor over the protection of the Empire, just like Metellus, who becomes the henchman of Caesar later in the first scene. The different political view between Minutius and Metellus corresponds to the separation of the Parliament as "the 'Presbyterians' who wanted to end the war through a negotiated settlement with the King and the 'Independents' who wanted an outright military victory"

(Plant pr. 4). Minutius represents the "peace party" while Metellus belongs to the "war party." The coalition between Cato and Minutius suggests the constructive efforts of officials in the Parliament as opposed to the separatists.

Cato is determined in the coalition efforts in the Senate where he sits *"betwixt* Creaser *and* Metellus"—another tribune (p. 347). Cato plays the mediator role between the two sides, emphasizing that his desire is reconciliation rather than conflict. Meanwhile, citizens shout, "Away, unworthy grooms," "No more!," "fear no greatest of them!/You seek'st the people's good, and these their own", suggesting that common people do not want war but agreement like Cato. Another citizen approves Cato's position, saying, "Brave Cato! What a countenance he puts on! Let's give his noble will our utmost power" (p. 347). Common people's support indicates that Cato is also the voice of the public. His attitude reflects Chapman's perception about both authorities represented by Charles I and Parliament. Cato rejects being the voice of the King or the Parliament; rather, he chooses to represent the citizens and their demands for negotiation. Cato epitomizes collective struggle against forms of dominations and institutionalized power, and these type of struggles, according to Foucault, "attack everything which separates the individual, breaks his links with others, splits up community life, forces the individual back on himself, and ties him to his own identity in a constraining way" (1982, p. 781). Standing with common people, Cato rejects a form of state power that subjugates its citizens and makes them subjects.

As a citizen, Cato also shows his opposition towards the policies of the Metellus, urged by Caesar when Metellus claims, "We will have the army/ Of Pompey entr'd" Italy (p. 348). It becomes clear that Caesar "concerned much more with his own welfare than the welfare of the state" (Crawley, 1974, p. 152). Cato reacts aggressively to Metellu's statement, saying,

> We? Which 'we' intend you?
> Have you already bought the peopl's voices?
> Or bear our Consuls or our Senate here
> So small love to their country, that their wills
> Beyond their country's right are so perverse
> To give a tyrant here entire command? (p. 348)

Cato fearlessly challenges military decisions taken by not the approval of people nor the sincere members of the Consuls or Senate. Cato points out the selfishness of the politicians who care about their interests rather than their countries. The objectives of such politicians are to seek "the maintenance of privileges, the accumulation of profits, the bringing into operation of statutary authority, the exercise of a function or of a trade" (Foucault, 1982, p. 792). Reflecting the same concern about Pompey, Cato notes that "consequently he/Is in all means enthron'd in th'empery" (p. 348). Although Chapman could not see Cromwell's rule of the Empire since he died in 1634, these lines shows that his prophecy was going to become true when Cromwell took over the government after the execution of Charles I.

As Cato continues to argue that their love of country comes after their pride and ambition, he equates Caesar and Pompey in terms of tyranny and the harm they cause. He says "My hopes / Of [Pompey's] sincere love to his country build / On sandier grounds than

Caesar's; since he can / As good cards show for it as Caesar did" (p. 350). Their love is identified with "sandier grounds" which are shaky, weak, and vanish easily. It means that their arguments about love of the country do not rely on strong basis. Chapman accuses Charles I and Cromwell of being hypocrites whose words and actions contradict. They articulate their love, yet do the opposite by drawing the country into hatred, war, and violence.

Cato maintains his mediator position even after the defeat of Caesar's army against Pompey's. Despite Cato's advice for reconciliation, the armies of Caesar and Pompey encounter which is result in Caesar's defeat. In order to save time and collect reinforcement, Caesar charges Vibius—a Roman noble to,

> … haste to Pompey,
> Entreating him from me that we may meet,
> And for that reason, which I know this day
> Was given by Cato for his pursuit's stay,
> (Which was prevention of our Roman blood)
> Propose my offer of our hearty peace;
> That being reconcil'd, and mutual faith
> Given on our either part. (p. 361)

It is worth to note that Caesar's peace offer seems disingenuous since he does not hesitate to go to war as seen in Senate scene, yet considers the "prevention of Roman blood" after the defeat. The exercise of power is "elaborated, transformed, organized; it endows itself with processes which are more or less adjusted to the situation" (Foucault, 1982, p. 792). Transforming the operation of power, Caesar maneuvers in the hope of changing the course of action, while Cato is still consistent about peace as he articulates in Pompey's camp,

> I so advis'd, and yet repent it not,
> But much rejoice in so much saved blood
> As had been pour'd out in the stroke of battle,
> Whose fury thus prevented, comprehends
> Your country's good and Empire's. (p. 364)

Cato interprets Caesar's defeat as an opportunity for peace. Expecting a constructive and positive move from Caesar, Cato predicts oncoming peace offer by repeating his reconciliation advice to Pompey,

> That will his conquest sell at infinite rate,
> If that must end your difference; but I doubt
> There will come humble offer on his part
> Of honour'd peace to you, for whose sweet name
> So cried out to you in our late-met Senate,
> Los[e] no fit offer of that wished treaty.
> Take pity on your country's blood as much
> As possible may stand without the danger
> Of hindering her justice on her foes. (p. 364)

Chapman refers to the negotiations between the King and the Parliament before the Civil War broke out. Caesar's approach for peace can be interpreted as the two attempts of negotiations between Charles I and the Parliament. First, like Caesar, who needs military reinforcement and extra time to amend his situation, Charles called for the third Parliament in 1640 in order to finance war against Scots. Second, the negotiations between the King and the Parliament in 1642 "appealed for the support of the nation and maneuvered to gain control of the armed forces" after which, the Civil War broke out (Plant, 2013, pr. 2). The Senate scene in the first act where Caesar and Pompey take the decision of war corresponds to the meeting between Charles I and the Parliament. When Vibius takes Caesar's offer to Pompey, he claims, "Cato prophesied then", pointing out Chapman's prophecy about negotiation efforts in the politics of England articulated by Cato (p. 371).

On the other hand, Pompey's approach to the peace offer brought by Vibius reveals his hidden jealousy for Caesar and a strong desire for his position. This indicates that Pompey is more concerned about his reputation than the good of the nation. If Pompey were sincere about his love for the country, why would he not consider the offer before rejecting it? He articulates with rage, "Devices of a new forge to entrap me! / I rest in Caesar's shades, walk his strow'd paths, / Sleep in his quiet waves?" (p. 371). Pompey is sure that "This offer'd peace of his is sure a snare / To make our war the bloodier" (p. 371). If he "rather wish[ed] to err with Cato / Than with the truth go of the world besides," why would not he accept Cato's advice about the peace offer? (p. 371).

The inconsistency in Pompey's character and decisions costs him "six thousand" lives and a defeat in the battle of Pharsalia against Caesar who "gives his army wings" to Utica, "not for the town's sake, but to save [Cato]" (p. 382). Expressing his discontent about Caesar's victory, Cato says,

> Where Caesar now is conquer'd in his conquest,
> In the ambition he till now denied,
> Taking upon him to give life, when death
> Is tenfold due to his most tyrannous self;
> No right, no power given him to raise an army
> Which in despite of Rome he leads about,
> Slaughtering her loyal subjects like an outlaw;
> Nor is he better. (p. 383)

Cato asserts that Caesar chooses war because of his ambition rather than a good intention. The manifestation of power through a military action and political hegemony indicates that Caesar exercises power in many and different ways. Explaning how power is excercised, Foucault (1982) states,

> *[P]ower is exercised by the threat of arms, by the effects of the word, by means of economic disparities, by more or less complex means of control, by systems of surveillance, with or without archives, according to rules which are or are not explicit, fixed or modifiable, with or without the technological means to put all these things into action.* (p. 792)

Without obtaining the consent of the citizens, Caesar takes the decision on his own like Charles I, who dissolved the Parliament and declared his own rule. Foucault (1972)

claims, "Power makes men mad, and those who govern are blind" (p. 51). Power makes Caesar blind, and Cato refuses to live under the rule of Caesar uttering, "All just men / Not only may enlarge their lives, but must, / From all rule tyrannous, or live unjust" (p. 384). Rees (1954) claims, "In Chapman's tragedies the man of policy is the mortal enemy of the just or virtuous man" (23). As he divorces himself from Caesar's politics in his reason and emotions, Cato now desires physical separation, which will transcend justice beyond time and space.

Cato contemplates suicide, uses it to protest against conditions, and reaches absolute peace with it. He finds consolation for the ills of life in death. However, disangagement from public life is not giving the control to the enemy. Cato's death "has asserted a justice [Caesar] cannot pervert, a freedom he cannot tyrannize" (Bement, 1974, p. 256). Through Cato's suicide, Chapman suggests tyranny and justice cannot coexist and justice should immediately be restored. Otherwise, as long as we live under tyrants, as Cato indicates,

> Our whole contents and freedoms, to dispose
> All in the joys and ways of arrant rogues
> Stay but their wild errors to sustain us!
> No forges but their throats to vent our breaths,
> To form our lives in, and repose our deaths. (p. 394)

Cato is referring to the hardships of living under the conditions imposed by tyrants. According to Chapman, "In order to maintain his honesty, a man must withdraw from a corrupt society" (Goldstein, 1963, p. 41). Instead of being a part of corruption, Cato, a Stoic wise man, utters, "I'll pursue my reason, / And hold that as my light and fiery pillar" because "Th' eternal law of heaven and earth no firmer" for him (p. 395). His sucide "represents both a victory for his principles and a denial of victory to the tyrant" (Bemet, 1974, p. 236). He feels the need to "Perform the fitting justice of a man / In kingdoms' common good" because, as stated at the beginning of the play, "Only a just man is a free man" (p. 384, p. 343). Cato's life is subordinate to him, and since the soul has the rule over body, the soul can "dispose It, / and the life in it, at her just pleasure?" (p. 384). He justifies suicide to perform justice. Kistler (1979) writes, "In the long run, Cato's very purity, the source of his strength, makes it impossible for him to assess the world around him accurately, or function in it effectively. His only solution to human evil is to run away from it: to 'fly the World' in self-inflicted death" (pp. 345-346). Cato associates virtue with being away from political corruption. What we conclude from Chapman's strategy of creating Cato is that "a great man is isolated from his society" (Presson, 1969, p. 46). As a strategy to maintain virtue, Cato advices his son to avoid public life, "be counsell'd / By your experienc'd father not to touch / At any action of the public weal, / Nor any rule bear near her politic stern" (p. 397). Withdrawal from the world opens a space for Cato to resist political cynicism and Caesar's thirst for personal authority.

The death and dramatic manifestation of virtuous men like Clermont, Byron, and Cato could be interpreted as Chapman's retirement from public life, stage, court, and politics to concentrate on his personal life. Chapman himself experiences the pradox between maintaining his aesthetic integrity and desire for recognition and submitting to authority. He moved from London to Hitchin in 1619 and put a distance between himself and theatrical writing. Later in his career, Chapman's "allegiance to system, to social dogma, and to

transcendentally sanctioned ethical codes begins to abate" (Braunmuller, 1992, p. 27). Chapman pessimistic view about society reflects his distrust and opposition to the court of Henry III, monarchical power, court culture, kings, powerful courtiers, and patrons. Portraying virtue in conflict with society and the death of virtuous men destroyed by political cynicism reflects Chapman's anti-court ideas versus republicanism ideals. Describing republicanism of the the 1650s, Peltonen (1995) states,

> *It conceived of men as citizens rather than subjects; they were characterised not so much by obedience to the king as by active participation in the political life of their community through counselling and the law-making process. The citizens' participatory role was chiefly based on their virtuous characters, which enabled them to promote the public good. The term 'classical republicanism' thus embraces a cluster of themes concerning citizenship, public virtue and true nobility.* (p. 2)

The themes Peltonen's mentions can be seen in many of Chapman's plays. The virtue Chapman portrays through various characters in his plays is in conflict with court world. Chapman's political philosophy and moral position is clear: standing against corrupted political power. His opposition is to the politial authority whose system of reward is based on favouritism rather than meritocracy. The virtious hero is discontent and bitter that the virtue is undevalued. He poses a social criticism to aristocratic heroism and values and world of rank and power. For Chapman, the concept of virtue "stands for those individual qualities and accomplishments by which men and women make themselves, achieve competency, merit their place, and it is defined not by its opposition to vice but to all the unearned privileges of wealth and blood. It is the key to a world of merit rather than inheritance" (Huntington, 2001, p. 2). Like Chapman, Cato does not want to lose his integrity with an alliance to a corrupted authority. The virtue of the character cannot function within the society, thus the character seeks refugee under the solitariness of death.

Cato's suicide is not a withdrawal; rather, it is a discourse of standing as the embodiment of resistance. For Foucault (1972), power is hierachical and inegalitarian, and it provokes resistance whic is called "counter-power" (p. 219). It is important to point out that "resistance is not simply an "antimatter" or a negation of power. It can also be productive, affirmative, and even use the techniques of power" (Pickett, 1996, p. 459). Engaging in a revolutionary action, Cato expresses his resistance at the level of his body. Discussing resistance in Faucoult's writings, Pickett (1996) states, "The practice of resistance is directly linked to the practice of self-creation" (p. 464). Cato uses his autonomy and releases his subjectivity from being simply a slave of the dominant power. The idea that Cato is admired and showed as a virtuous role model even after his death articulated by Anthenodorus, "Your life and death made precedents for men." (p. 396). Approving Anthenodorus, Cato advises, "Ye hear, my masters, what a life this is, / And use much reason to respect it so. / But mine shall serve ye." (p. 396). Suggesting that his life will be an example for the rest, Cato symbolizes the ideal, virtuous, and selfless role model against tyranny and ambition.

CONCLUSION

Through *Caesar and Pompey*, Chapman portrays potential political and military scenarios for England, as a warning for officials, the leaders, and public about the approaching Civil War. Crafted as a Roman allegory of the conflict between Charles I and Parliamentarians leading the three kingdoms into war in 1642, the play reflects Chapman's republicanism ideals and his distrust to monarchy, a political regime which allows one person to exercise ultimate power over the citizens and institutions. New historicism, particulary Foucault's concept of "power" provides the theoretical framework to examine the play in terms of its relations to other cultural productions and history along with the power relations in England. In the play, Chapman reflects the repressive nature of power through Caesar an attribution to English monachs while Cato, a philosophical virtuous character, becomes the voice of Chapman and the epitome of negotiation.

Although Cato—the voice of reason, Chapman and the public becomes the victim of Caesar and unjust policies, his suicide does not symbolize a defeat; rather, it represents a triumph againt tyranny. In order to emphasize that the victor is himself, Cato states how the souls are immortal. He indicates that villainy and evil is mortal and will be defeated by reason and will of public, which can be interpreted as Charles I's execution and death of Cromwell. Chapman summarizes the core moral message of the play in Cato's words that point out the dichodomy of freedom/enslavement. Caesar and Pompey becomes the slave of their ambition and own welfare like Charles I and Oliver Cromwell, while Cato fees himself from depraved politics. Due to the imposibility of retaining integrity under the unjust government and egotism of military thirts of the leaders, Chapman's moral characters such as Clermont in *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*, Chabot in *The Tragedy of Chabot,* and Cato in *Caesar and Pompey* choose a noble death rather than compromising with the corrupt political setting. Their death can be interpreted as a resistance and "counter-power" in Foucauldian terminology, which contributes to self-creation within a new discourse. By portraying the problematic mechanisms and structures of power relations in early modern world and English politics embedded in *Caesar and Pompey*, Chapman conveys his multidimentional political and moral messages that transcend time and space.

Article Information

Ethics Committee Approval:	Exempt from the Ethics Committee Decision.
Informed Consent:	No participant
Financial Support:	No financial support from any institution or Project.
Conflict of Interest:	No conflict of interest.
Copyrights:	No material subject to copyright is included.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bement, P. (1974). *George Chapman: Action and contemplation in his tragedies.* Salzburg: University of Salzburg Press.

Berghahn, K. L. (1992). New historicism: Editorial introduction. *Monatshefte*, 84(2), 141-147

Brannigan, J. (1998). *New historicism and cultural materialism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Braunmuller, A. R. (1992). *Natural fictions: George Chapman's major tragedies*. Toronto: University of Delaware Press.

Brown, J. R. (1954). Chapman's Caesar and Pompey: An unperformed play? *The Modern Language Review*, 49(4), 466-469.

Cadman, D. & Duxfield A. (2016). Rome and home: The cultural uses of Rome in early modern English literature. *Early Modern Litrary Studies,* 1-15.

Cantor, P. A. (1976). *Shakespeare's Rome: Republic and empire.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Chapman, G. (1910). *Caesar and Pompey: A Roman tragedy*. In T. M. Parrott (Ed.), *The plays of George Chapman: The tragedies*. (pp. 339-400). London: Routledge. (Original work published 1631)

Crawley, D. (1967). Decision and character in Chapman's the tragedy of Caesar and Pompey. *Studies in English Literature*, 1500-1900, 7(2), 277-297.

Crawley, D. (1974). *Character in relation to action in the tragedies of George Chapman.* Salzburg: University of Salzburg Press.

Dutton, R. (2000). *Licensing, censorship and authorship in early modern England: Buggeswords.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (1972). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. (Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, and Kate Soper, Trans.) New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.

Goldstein, L. (1963). George Chapman and the decadence in early seventeenth-century drama. *Science & Society*, 27(1), 23-48.

Greenblatt, S. (1980). *Renaissance self-fashioning: From more to Shakespeare.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hadfield, A. (2005). *Shakespeare and republicanism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Higgins, M. (1945). Chapman's senecal man: A study in Jacobean psychology. *RES,* 21, 183-191.

Howard, J. E. (1986). The new historicism in renaissance studies. *English Literary Renaissance,* 16(1), 13-43.

Huntington, J. (2002). *Ambition, rank, and poetry in 1590s England*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Ide, R. S. (1985). Chapman's Caesar and Pompey and the uses of history. *Modern Philology*, 82(3), 255-268.

Jensen, F. C. (2012). *Reading the Roman Republic in early modern England*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.

Kistler, S. F. (1979). The significance of the missing hero in Chapman's Caesar and Pompey. Modern Language Quarterly, 40, 339-57.

MacLure, M. (1966). *George Chapman: A critical study*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

O'Callaghan, J. F. (1976). Chapman's Caesar. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 16(2), 319-331.

Peltonen, M. (1995). *Classical humanism and republicanism in English political thought, 1570-1640.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pickett, B. L. (1996). Foucault and the politics of resistance. *Polity*, 28(4), 445-466.

Plant, D. (2012). The first civil war: Political overview. Retrieved from http://bcwproject.org/church-and-state/first-civil-war/index

Presson, R. K. (1969). Wrestling with this world: A view of George Chapman. *PMLA,* 84(1), 44-50.

Rees, E. (1954). *The tragedies of George Chapman: Renaissance ethics in action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Scheick, W. J. (1993). The ethos of new historicism. *An Interdisciplinary Journal,* 76(4), 571-589.

Schwartz, E. (1961). A neglected play by Chapman. *Studies in Philology*, 58(2), 140-159.

Soellner, R. (1985). Chapman's *Caesar and Pompey* and the fortunes of prince Henry. *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England*, 2, 135-151.

Swinburne, C. A. (1875). *George Chapman: A critical essay.* London: Chatto and Windus.

Taunton, N. (2001). *1590s drama and militarism: Portrayals of war in Marlowe, Chapman and Shakeaspeare's Henry V.* New York: Routledge.

Veeser, A. H. (1989). The new historicism. New York: Routledge.