



A Critical Analysis of The Funeral Speeches in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar Using Principles of Rhetoric

Adesanya M. Alabi

School of Foreign Languages, Ostim Technical University, Ankara

adesco101@yahoo.com

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v6i4.1944>

APA Citation: Alabi, A. M. (2024). A Critical Analysis of The Funeral Speeches in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar Using Principles of Rhetoric. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*. 6(4).345-363. <http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v6i4.1944>

Received:

21/10/2024

Accepted:

20/11/2024

Keywords:

Funeral Rite,
Speech and
Rhetorical
Art, Julius
Caesar,
Betrayal,
Death, Power,
Roman
Audience. .

Abstract

Julius Caesar is among William Shakespeare's most engrossing dramatic tragedies. Power, death, and life in its widest sense are all critically analysed in the play. Although tragedy is a highly sentimental literary genre, tragic plays typically evoke intense emotions in readers or viewers. Also, the art of rhetoric is a significant tool of persuasion that gives depth to the text. Drawing on Aristotle's rhetorical concept, this study examines the rhetorical devices Shakespeare's characters in Julius Caesar employ to accomplish their objectives. However, the emphasis is on the distinctive characteristics of Mark Antony and Brutus, respectively, and how they effectively applied language to grab the attention of the Roman audience. It is evident by examining the rhetorical devices used by the two powerful orators, Brutus and Mark Antony, that they apply different strategies and tactics to express their ideas and emotions to their audience. Their speeches particularly benefit from their proficiency in rhetoric. As the study progresses, it becomes more evident how each character presents their point of view and persuades others.

1. INTRODUCTION

An essential component of classical Greece and Rome was rhetorical art. It was a ubiquitous tool of political discourse, the judiciary, government, and intellectual debate. Multimedia communication was not possible back then, unlike it is now. We use social media platforms like Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, TV, podcasts, billboards, and campaign posters among others these days to facilitate mass communication. Even though there were no modern forms of communication throughout those times, people nevertheless used their ideas through language and rhetoric to convey meanings to the general audience. They debated on different subjects and defended their theorems—be it the political, social, or philosophical issues. Thus, "the historical tradition of classical rhetoric has been the focus of intense study in a number of academic disciplines, including the field of rhetoric and composition" (Lipson and Binkley, 2004, p.2). Shakespeare was influenced by the popularity of rhetorical art throughout his childhood and studied it as a young boy. As a result, rhetorical art was extensively studied by students in his day. He might have been acquainted to a lot of classical writers and historical characters at this point. Rhetoric was undergoing a huge renaissance at the time Shakespeare was born, and several English-language publications featuring the canonical works have been released (Ballard, 2016, p.6). The works in this category use rhetorical figures, and they were written with some language employed to facilitate persuasion.

All these books formed the figures of speech or figurative expressions that heighten the hue meanings of rhetoric. In all his dramatic texts, one can actually see how skilfully Shakespeare applies rhetorical devices to convey his idea. He has not only made use of linguistic craft and mechanisms in the creation of his characters and their dialogues, but the characters also express interesting speeches and ideas that reflect rhetorical quality. In *Julius Caesar*, rhetorical devices are significantly applied to make the play absorbing. In fact, *Julius Caesar* is a play that really reflects the art of rhetoric in its real magnitude. "Shakespeare's play *Julius Caesar* emphasises the connection between rhetoric and politics. Some scholars, like Gayle Greene and Kim Ballard, point out that rhetoric in *Julius Caesar* is extremely important for the central political problems and character analysis" (Dumitrašković,2023,p.102). However, rhetorical art was an important tool in governance, law, public hearings, and philosophical argument in ancient Greece and Rome. Therefore, this paper explores how Shakespeare applies rhetoric to *Julius Caesar* and how he specifically uses the characters of Mark Antony and Brutus at Caesar's funeral.

2. The Art of Rhetoric

People have used rhetoric in different forms to achieve personal, national, collective, and general interests. Different definitions have been given to rhetoric. Thus, "Rhetoric... is the capacity to persuade others; or a practical realisation of this ability; or, at least, an attempt at persuasion, successful or not" (Wardy, 2005, p.1). In order to broaden the definition and efficacy of rhetoric, Wardy explains that "it is the capacity to get others to do what its possessor wants, regardless of what they want, except to the extent that their desires limit what rhetoric might achieve; this, of course, is the rhetoric of ideological manipulation and political seduction" (2005, p.1). As we all know, rhetoric has been an imperative part of society for centuries. It has been given different definitions and functions. Clack (2003) maintains that "to the Greeks and Romans, rhetoric meant the theory of oratory. As a pedagogical mechanism, it endeavoured to teach students to persuade an audience. The content of rhetoric included all that the ancients had learnt to be of value in persuasive public speech" (Clack, 2003,p.3).

Furthermore, one crucial factor to understand about rhetorical art is: how do we use it? For what purpose? In whom interest? Is it for a good or sinister goal? Why does it play an effective role both in a positive and negative way? Rhetoric is intended to achieve one thing: to convince the hearers and gain their support, whether for a positive or cynical motive. In fact, we need to bear in mind that "in the nineteenth century, text books of rhetoric came to include descriptions of a kind little considered by classical rhetoricians and narratives of an aim and scope, which they excluded. Thus, the modern treatise on rhetoric deals not only with what the Greeks would recognise as rhetoric" (Clack, 2003, p.7). Nevertheless, "the classical Greek orators developed a rhetorical art that took as central the plurality of classes within the regime and usually within their audience. We, in our new and unprecedented rhetorical situation, need to develop a rhetorical art that is suited for the new public." (Kochin,2002, p.9). Rhetoric is explained to be an important device of persuasive communication, but "to the Greeks and Romans, rhetoric was defined by its function of discovering means to persuasion and was taught in the schools as something that every free-born man could and should learn" (Clack, 2003, p.1).As the classical progenitor of rhetoric, Aristotle established a concept for most of the subsequent ententes of Rome. These entries were scribbled for the directive of all members of the audience of all categories. It was not just meant for politicians and legal luminaries. It was meant for a

sublime explication of legal analysis and representation of common jurisdiction assertions (McCormack, 2014, p.132). The writers of these entities include Cicero and Quintilian, who used Aristotle's rhetorical concept to establish and distinguish persuasive disquisitions and legal assertions into three specific segments:

1. Logical argument (logos)
2. Emotional argument (pathos)
3. Ethical appeal (ethos)

These popular segments have always been considered Aristotelian three patterns of evidence. Hence, the concept that surrounds the legal assertion has gone through a process of change over time. The analysis of Greek and Roman theorists establishes their opinions based on the study they made about the human condition and on the crucial personal experience they had about the apologia of cases. However, Oyegoke posits that "the need for persuasion is often informed by a dire or grave situation that one needs to wriggle out of. Persuasion may also be necessitated by a person's disposition to a subject, development, or topic in view" (Oyegoke, 2017, p.1). Therefore, "the art of persuasion through speech is what scholars, ancient and modern, call rhetoric or oratory" (p.1). Aristotle establishes some principles in his *Art of Rhetoric*, translated by W. Rhys Roberts; he explicates some dichotomies and relationships between different types of rhetorical art and how they are applied in different contexts. Rhetoric was first developed by Aristotle, a Greek philosopher; in his book *Rhetoric*, he recognises different types of rhetorical appeals such as logos, pathos, and ethos, as earlier stated. Since the era of Aristotle, people have discovered other rhetorical devices, and two of them are reflected in *Julius Caesar*, known as parallelism and repetition. Thus, "Aristotle argues what successful rhetoric entails, for what purposes rhetoric should be used, and what effective rhetoricians do. Aristotle's *Rhetoric* speaks to the power of words and has remained relevant since its publication" (Floyd-Lapp, 2014, p.1).

Nonetheless, Aristotle postulates that rhetoric is the coequal of dialectic, and both of them deal with the same topics within general human knowledge. Hence, all men apply both accordingly depending on the given circumstance, so it is obvious that men make discussion and try to defend themselves and their theorem through the means of rhetorical persuasion (Aristotle inside parenthesis of Roberts, 2008, p.4). Persuasion therefore depends on how the speaker equips himself to convince his or her listeners through persuasive devices. Hence, "[p]ersuasion is fundamental to public policy debates. This is because a policy debate engages both the supporters and opponents of a proposed policy, in which the two sides deploy any means available to persuade the audience to support and identify with the opinion of interest" (Hsiu-chingKo, 2015, p.114). In this sense, the speaker must understand the content and context of his speech; without this, the communication becomes ineffective when it lacks rhetorical devices.

Rhetorical devices are used to convince the hearers and win their support. However, looking at this subject from the classical context, "Rhetoric was an important part of Greco-Roman education. It enabled politicians and others who spoke in public to persuade their audiences in an efficient and effective manner" (Erickson, 2004, p.1). As rhetoric has a positive side, it is

important to also note that it has a negative side, too. As it can be used for positive intentions, it can also be used for negative motives. Erickson explicates that "there was (and still is) a danger associated with this art because, like any powerful tool, it can be misused. Just as a virtuous person can employ it to accomplish good, so can an evil one use it to do the opposite" (2004, p.1). Furthermore, Aristotle explains the three components in his *Art of rhetoric*: ethos (credibility or ethical approach), which simply means the listeners are convinced by the personality of the person who speaks. People tend to be convinced by the people they have so much respect for. If a speaker has a good image that commands great respect, the credibility of his image tends to convince the people who hear him. The second, which is logo, means you make your argument based on the application of reason; every point can be logical when the use of reason takes the centre point of the argument. In Greek, logo means the intramural constancy of the argument, the intelligibility of the communiqué, the argumentation of its reason, and the potency of its supporting proof (Aristotle inside parenthesis of Roberts, 2004,p.236). Therefore, the effectiveness of ethos is sometimes referred to as the idea's logical appeal. The last one, which is pathos (emotional appeal), simply means the communication appeals to the emotions of the hearers. The choice of word is an essential device for getting the emotional response of the hearers. Language or words appropriately and logically used have a way of arresting the emotions of the hearers, and they are used to make the argument more effective. It can also be described as a way of gaining the hearers' sympathy and penetrating their imagination. Thus, "Rhetoric flourished in the law courts and political assemblies of infant democracy; it was central to the curricula of schools throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance" (Breneman, 1991, p.1).

Notwithstanding, Aristotle maintains that rhetoric does not belong to a specific field of study because it is applied in all disciplines. Oratory has been part and parcel of human society even from the inception of the human race; in political oratory, Aristotle opines that the discussion about nonessentials has no inducement, and political oratory is not in particular given disreputable functions than forensic because it attends to broader subjects (Aristotle inside parenthesis of Roberts, 2004, p.4). In political debate, the person who engages in it does so to prove and defend one thing—his or her personal and crucial desire. In fact, "Rhetoric is useful (1) because there are things that are true and things that just have a natural tendency to prevail over their opposites, so that if the decisions of judges are not what they ought to be, the defeat must be due to the speakers themselves" (2004, p.7).

It is therefore obvious that rhetorical art deals with the method of persuasion. Persuasion can be described as a kind of indication since most men are persuaded when they consider something to have been indicated (2004, p.5). The orator's indication is considered enthymeme, and this is commonly known as the most productive method of persuasion. Enthymeme is the substance of rhetorical persuasion, which is concerned principally with non-essentials (2004, p.5). The definition of rhetoric in the critical sense, by Aristotle, is to see what can be persuasive in a given circumstance, but this doesn't mean that the speakers will have the ability to persuade and gain the support of the hearers in all circumstances. In this sense, the speaker is congruous with a physician who has to provide healing measures for his patient; if he has everything it takes, this depends on how he can apply them appropriately. This is the same in the case of a rhetorician; he has all it takes to convince his hearers if only he can make use of them effectively. However, Downing maintains that "rhetoric is a particularly appealing

subject because it addresses simultaneously the didactic need of knowledge and skill in a very neat and integrated manner; it can be used as a very solid frame and tool of analysis, for instance in literary texts and various language materials." (Downing, 2006, p.154). In fact, "the possibility that rhetoric could facilitate the rule of philosophy raises the question of whether rhetoric could also be used to undermine the governance of philosophy" (Al-Maini, 2005, p.283). During the Elizabethan period, rhetorical art was a pervasive part of society. Peter Mack (2004) explains that Elizabethan rhetoric re-establishes erudition, prowess, and methods that an Elizabethan would have learnt at the high school and institutions of higher learning so as to be part of the religious and political rhetorical competition of the time: technique to the audience, explication and replica of textual compositions, structure of ideas, and mechanism of disputation (Mack, 2004, p.2). In Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, the most absorbing and prestigious scene of the play is Act III, Scene 2, in which Brutus presents his apologia and why he has to assassinate his friend, giving his assertion that his action is in the interest of Rome and its people. However, Antony is able to persuade the Roman audience and turn the people against Brutus in an emotional eulogy to his friend. The speeches of two of them are good examples of rhetoric, as the speakers tend to make use of their speeches to gain the support of the audience with their viewpoints.

3. The Pedigree and the Power of Rhetoric in Caesar's Funeral

Looking critically into the event of rhetorical art by the two powerful orators, Brutus and Mark Antony, at Caesar's funeral rite, it is clearly observed that the two individuals make use of different rhetorical approaches and techniques in communicating their feelings to their audience. In their speeches, the art of rhetoric plays a very significant role in the way they deliver their vagaries. "Act 1 Scene 3 of William Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* contains a striking range of esoteric verbal-visual imagery offering an opportunity to analyse its compositional design and to assess its effects" (Myklebost, 2018, p.3). As it is known, the fountainhead of rhetoric could be traced to ancient Greece and Rome. It is a powerful tool that they used in persuading people to accept their ideas, especially in government. In particular, during the period of Cicero, a great politician, he was a very good orator whose speech can make the most sceptical person believe what he says. Hence, it is this rhetorical art that Shakespeare's characters use, especially Brutus and Antony, during Caesar's funeral. Ballard (2016) argues that "throughout his plays, we can see how Shakespeare was steeped in rhetoric—not just through the linguistic 'tricks' and techniques he uses to compose his characters' speeches, but through the comments the characters themselves make about the art of communication" (Ballard, 2016, para 1). Therefore, to look into the manner in which Brutus and Antony deliver their oratory, it is obvious that there are significant linguistic devices that Shakespeare makes them use. He makes them apply languages that provoke thoughts and emotions. Brutus uses logical languages that make people reason. At the same time, language is used by Antony to get people's sympathy and emotion. This is exemplified when Brutus tells the Roman audience that killing Caesar doesn't mean he loves Caesar less, but he loves Rome more. He puts Rome first and Caesar second. Here it can be understood that Roman rulers are ephemeral; they will always come and go, but Rome remains the same. Antony also uses language when he argues that he has come to bury Caesar, not to praise him, and that "the evil that men do lives after them." His choice of words arouses emotion and sympathy from the audience. Thus, "Antony does not have it in an easy way. He is as a man questioned by the

A Critical Analysis of The Funeral Speeches in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar Using Principles of Rhetoric

conspirators for his kinship with Caesar. Brutus gives him a chance to speak at Caesar's funeral, but only after Brutus- an extraordinary speaker in his own particular right- has spoken first to show their reason behind Caesar's assassination”(Aziz,2022,p.99).Furthermore, Ballard (2016) explains that "early on, Shakespeare established rhetoric as the possession of the powerful and as a means of controlling and influencing the behaviour of the commoners. It is also the vehicle by which he explores issues relating to the good of the Roman people and the democratic values of the state." As Senator Brutus begins his speech, trying to justify and elucidate his participation in the killing of his friend Caesar, he makes use of effective rhetorical devices such as antithesis parallelism to defend his crime. Antithesis is the contiguity of contradicting perspectives; it is a wonderful rhetorical device in which two different things, such as friendship and enmity or love and hatred, are disputed. Parallelism is the application of elements in a communication that have the same grammatical features; they are related in structure, meaning, or sound. Instances of parallelism are more common in literary studies and in mundane communications. Brutus reflects this component thus: "Had you rather Caesar [was] living and dies all slaves than that Caesar were dead, to live all free men?" The audience's senses are stimulated by Brutus's well-articulated motive for rising against Caesar, which is why they never challenge him and instead applaud and exalt him. Hence, "Brutus convinces the public about the fact that Caesar was ambitious by using again the arguments of the confirmation... and some rhetorical questions... He has just exposed his arguments, making clear that he killed Caesar because he was a tyrant" (Sara, 2015, p.99). Hence, he goes further and states that:

Brutus: As Caesar loved me, I weep for him;as he
was fortunate, I rejoice at it; as he was valiant,
I honour him: but, as he was ambitious,
I slew him. There is tears
for his love; joy for his fortune; honour for
his valour; and death for his ambition. Who
is here so base that would be a bondman?
If any, speak; for him have I offended. Who
is here so rude that would not be a Roman?
If any, speak; for him have I offended. Who
is here so vile that will not love his country?
If any, speak; for him have I offended
(Act 3, scene 2, p.76).

Although Brutus extenuates his crime against his good friend, Caesar, his act of amicide is not rationally justifiable. In fact, he does not conceal his participation in the killing of his friend,

and he uses the opportunity to convince the Romans why Caesar deserves to die. In this regard, it's essential to note that "Shakespeare's interest not only in the visuality of language but also in the interplay between different forms of mimesis" (Meek, 2017, p. 21). Listening critically to what Mark Antony utters at Caesar's funeral, it becomes clear that Brutus' act of perfidy is basically a product of conspiratorial persuasion from Cassius, who has succeeded in inveigling other quislings to join him in the assassination of their ruler. In fact, it is not the death of Caesar that now matters but the speeches—the rhetoric that is made by Brutus and Mark Antony accentuates the pick of the whole play and is the basis of the rest of the events of the play. Hence, Brutus is a great betrayer of a great friend. Although, according to Aristotle's concept of tragedy, a tragic hero in one way or another personally contributes to his own doom. His Achilles' heel is always the main point of his woe. This happens because of his excessive arrogance and inability to listen to warnings and correct his errors.

Therefore, Caesar has a weak point, which is hubris. *Hubris* is an excessive pride innate in a tragic hero, which makes him feel like a superhuman who cannot be subdued by any force. This is exemplified in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. The three witches behind *Macbeth* assure him that he can never be conquered by any man born of a woman. This contributes vehemently to his overconfidence, which leads to doom. Thus, Caesar is warned by the soothsayer at the marketplace to beware of the "Ides of March," but he ignores the warning. In Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, he postulates the circumstances of certain engagements, explaining that if those circumstances are not carefully controlled, it will always lead to doom. Hence, in Aristotle's opinion, there have been people of great wealth who were destroyed by their own wealth, and the brave were devoured by their bravery (1996, p. 6). In this scenario, when one is not meticulous about what he has most, be it bravery, wealth, power, fame, influence, or whatever, it is possible for destruction to be imminent through those possessions. This is the muddle Caesar has. He is never aware of his excessive private or public pride, which is the main architect of his doom. If Caesar had listened to the warning, he would have escaped doom. However, looking at this event from another perspective, it can be reasoned that because he is a hero who has been fated to perish without any reversal of doom, what is meant to happen would have happened.

In juxtaposition to what happens to King Oedipus in Sophocles' *The Oedipus Rex*, King Oedipus is also vehemently warned against finding out the truth about who is responsible for the plague in the land, but he insists on searching for the truth until the last point. At the end, his discovery of the truth indicts and incriminates him of being the main culprit—it is a discovery of bitter candour that leads to his desertion of his noble throne, gushing out of his two eyes, identifying that his children are also his siblings, and his self-banishment. In this context, knowing the truth will end somewhere that is not favourable, especially when it concerns a tragic hero. To some extent, Caesar is becoming more powerful, magnificent, and indispensable than Rome itself—critically speaking, he needs to die for Rome and its dignity to survive, as Brutus claims. This is more crystallised in his being deified when people say "Hail Caesar." But Caesar could have been guiltier if his death had not come from his close friends. Really, it is very pathetic. He is a great man with a godlike character, but his inability and insouciance to be wary of his frailty and get rid of it devour him. In fact, "the tragic hero will be proven to have undergone a path of individualisation, shifting from a mere tool to

convey the overall philosophy of the tragedy to becoming the heart and soul of the tragedy" (Ayman, 2016, p.6).

4. Rhetoric as an Instrument of Power

In ancient Rome, skill in rhetoric was a pervasive attribute of their leaders. This is obvious in the opening scene when the legionary officers (the tribune) Marrullus and Flavus meet with the common people and Marullus objurgates them because they rejoice and commemorate Caesar's victory over the sons of Pompey, the previous Roman leader. He asks them a series of questions and points an accusing finger at them:

Marrullus

Where is thy leather apron and thy rule?

What dost thou with thy best apparel on?

You, sir, what trade are you?

Second Commoner

Truly, sir, to wear out their shoes, to get myself

Into more work. But, indeed, sir, we make holidays,

To see Caesar and to rejoice in his triumph.

Marullus

Wherefore rejoice? What conquest brings he home?

What tributaries follow him to Rome,

To grace in captive bonds his chariot wheels?

You blocks, you stones, you worse than senseless things!

O you hard hearts, you cruel men of Rome,

Knew you not Pompey?

Many a time and oft

Have you climb'd up to walls and battlements,

To towers and windows, yea, to chimney-tops,

Your infants in your arms, and there have sat

The livelong day, with patient expectation,

To see great Pompey pass the streets of Rome:

And when you saw his chariot but appear,

Have you not made an universal shout,

That Tiber trembled underneath her banks,
To hear the replication of your sounds
Made in her concave shores?
And do you now put on your best attire?
And do you now cull out a holiday?
And do you now strew flowers in his way
That comes in triumph over Pompey's blood?
Be gone! Run to your houses; fall upon your knees,
Pray to the gods to intermit the plague
That needs must light on this ingratitude.

(Scene 1p.4-5).

His intention is to disgrace them into running home to make a supplication to the gods to suspend the plagues. There is also an obvious disparity between the potent rhetoric of Marullus and the trivial expression of the plebeian conbler, who plays with the legionary officer, applying double entendre, which gives it ambiguous connotations. Shakespeare creates rhetoric as a property of the powerful and as a weapon of hegemony over the common people. Rhetoric is also used to crystallise the subject that relates to the benefit of the Romans and the political virtue of the polity. In the subsequent scenes, rhetoric becomes an instrument of political conspiracy against Caesar; it fulfils a sinister rather than a public duty.

5. Rhetoric and connivance

Rhetorical function is reflected in conspirators who plot the death of Caesar. Cassius is the principal conspirator who proposes a plot to kill Caesar, and his main tool to do that is his rhetorical prowess to train the conspirators. He starts by persuading Senator Brutus that it is imperative to do something about Caesar's ambitious propensity for power. He feels that by conniving with Brutus, the connivance will be more potent. Brutus quickly becomes suspicious that Cassius is plotting something that will contradict his idea:

BRUTUS

Into what dangers would you lead me, Cassius,
That you would have me seek
Into myself For that which is not in me?

CASSIUS

Therefore, good Brutus, be prepared to hear:
And since you know you cannot see yourself
So well as by reflection, I, your glass, Will modestly

Discover to yourself That of yourself which you yet
Know not of. And be not jealous on me, gentle Brutus:
Were I a common laugh, or did use
To stale with ordinary oaths my love To every new
Protester; if you know That I do fawn on men and
Hug them hard And after scandal them, or if you know
That I profess myself in banqueting To all the rout, then
Hold me dangerous. (Act 1, scene 1, p. 12).

Quote I, as Aeneas, our great ancestor,
Did from the flames of Troy upon his shoulder
The old Anchises bear, so from the waves of
Tiber Did I the tired Caesar. And this man
Is now become a god, and Cassius is
A wretched creature and must bend his body,
If Caesar carelessly but nod on him (scene 2, act 1, p. 13).

He also tries to use trickery on Brutus; he claims that the names "Brutus" and "Caesar" have the same meaning; and he agonises that Rome rests only on the shoulder of one man. That is, the whole destiny of Rome is controlled by one man. The rhetorical devices used by Cassius become so overwhelming that Brutus has to stop him and give him time to think. Rhetoric has the power to convince even the most rigid men in the world. Cassius subsequently claims that he has already persuaded some of the most important figures of Rome while talking to Caesar to support the subterfuge. Hence, achieving the act of homicide is done through the power of rhetorical persuasion. As the day of assassination approaches, the traitor Decius sanguinely persuades Caesar to leave his home, while Brutus eventually promises to convince Caius Ligarius to be part of the conspiracy.

Brutus, the Rhetorician

Rhetorical acumen is used to lure Brutus into the temptation of killing Caesar even when Brutus knows that Caesar has committed no crime to deserve such a brutal conspiratorial deal. He knows that he sternly refuses a kingly crown given to him. Brutus then concludes that the propensity to become dangerous is enough reason to kill him.

BRUTUS

And then, I grant, we put a sting in him,
Those at his will he may do danger with.
The abuse of greatness is, when it disjoins

Remorse from power: and, to speak truth of Caesar,
I have not known when his affections sway'd
More than his reason. But 'tis a common proof,
That lowliness is young ambition's ladder,
Whereto the climber-upward turns his face;
But when he once attains the upmost round.
He then unto the ladder turns his back,
Looks in the clouds, scorning the base degrees
By which he did ascend. So Caesar may.
Then, lest he may, prevent.
And, since the quarrel Will bear no colour for the thing he is,
Fashion it thus; that what he is, augmented,
Would run to these and these extremities:
And therefore think him as a serpent's egg
Which, hatch'd, would, as his kind, grow mischievous,
And kill him in the shell(Act 2,scene 1,p.32).

While soliloquising, Brutus searches for metaphorical expressions such as "the serpent's egg"; he uses this to make Caesar's death legitimately needful because Caesar is now dangerous. Brutus is not just a rhetorician; he uses rhetorical art to convince himself to do the unnatural. His wife, Portia, becomes wary of the situation and advises him through the use of rhetoric. Brutus does not respect his wife for being exceptional alone, but for her ability to have a great command of rhetorical eloquence.

6. Caesar's Funeral Speech

As the conspirators prepare to assassinate Caesar, Brutus disagrees with Cassius' opinion that they should also assassinate Mark Antony, Caesar's close friend. Brutus applies rhetorical devices to dissuade him from such an act. He points out that they should be "sacrificers but not butchers" or "purgers, not murderers".

CASSIUS

Decius, well urged: I think it is not meet,
Mark Antony, so well beloved of Caesar,
Should outlive Caesar: we shall find of him

A shrewd contriver; and, you know, his means,

If he improve them, may well stretch so far

As to annoy us all: which to prevent,

Let Antony and Caesar fall together.(Act2scene1pg39).

BRUTUS

Our course will seem too bloody,

Caius Cassius, To cut the head off

And then hack the limbs,

Like wrath in death and envy afterwards;

For Antony is but a limb of Caesar:

Let us be sacrificers, but not butchers, Caius.

We all stand up against the spirit of Caesar;

And in the spirit of men there is no blood:

O, that we then could come by Caesar's spirit,

And not dismember Caesar! But, alas,

Caesar must bleed for it! And, gentle friends,

Let's kill him boldly, but not wrathfully;

Let's carve him as a dish fit for the gods,

Not hew him as a carcass fit for hounds:

And let our hearts, as subtle masters do,

Stir up their servants to an act of rage,

And after seem to chide 'em.

This shall make Our purpose necessary and not envious:

Which so appearing to the common eyes,

We shall be call'dpurgers, not murderers.

And for Mark Antony, think not of him;

For he can do no more than Caesar's arm

When Caesar's head is off(act2,scene1,pg40).

After permitting Antony to live, he makes a request to Brutus to be allowed to speak at Caesar's funeral. Carcius seriously warns Brutus against it that the people may be moved by what Antony will say. Brutus eventually allows Antony to speak. "Antony stages an impassioned paean to Caesar that is Ulyssean in its cunning, and upon the concluding portion or peroratio of his oration he feigns humility about his rhetorical prowess, paraleptically denying it even as he practices it and saying that he only speaks what the people already know and shows them, with ostensibly equal hermeneutic immediacy" (Tambar,2020, p.41). At the funeral, rhetorical art takes on its full function. In fact, the central subject of the play is no longer about the death of Caesar but about the art of rhetoric that takes centre stage at his funeral. This becomes the principal discourse. Brutus is the first speaker; he speaks with great calmness and eloquence. He applies rhetorical devices in an effective manner. He speaks in prose, and his speech is absorbing, mind-blowing, and magically penetrating. He judiciously uses antithesis and parallelism that exemplify his rhetorical style:

BRUTUS:

If there be any in this assembly,
any dear friend of Caesar's, to whom I say,
that Brutus' love for Caesar was no less than his.
If then that friend demand why Brutus rose against Caesar,
this is my answer: --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 free men?
As Caesar loved me, I weep for him; as he was fortunate,
I rejoice at it; as he was valiant, I honour him: but,
as he was ambitious, I slew him. There is tears for his love;
joy for his fortune; honour for his valour; and death for
his ambition.(act3 scene 1pg73).

Antony's speech is obviously presented in verse, not in prose. It is appropriately delivered on the injured, bloody, and lifeless body of Caesar. His speech is more brilliant and appealing than Brutus's. He uses rhetorical repetitions and pauses when he reminds Brutus that "he is an honourable man". He wisely convinces the Roman audience that Brutus's claim for killing Caesar is not justifiable. In accordance with Aristotle's concept of rhetoric, Antony's speech does not only appeal to people's emotions but also their reasons. As Antony gives his emotional iconoclastic view about Brutus's reason for killing their friend, within a few minutes, the audience has a change of mind about Brutus's claim and reason for killing Caesar. The crowd immediately finds out that Brutus and his cohorts are betrayers.

7. The Comparative Delineation of Brutus and Antony's Funeral Rhetoric

In speeches made by the two speakers at Caesar's funeral—comparing rhetorical speeches made by Brutus and Antony—one will realise that they apply different rhetorical styles to hold the attention of the Roman audience. In the art of public speaking, there are different appeals that can be applied in order to arrest, gain, and retain the attention of the audience. Looking critically into the approach used by Brutus, one finds that he applies logical appeal, as said earlier—he is able to prove his rationale with logic by drawing the attention of the Roman audience to the dignity of Rome. Rome is more cardinal than anyone, irrespective of his achievement and dignity, including Caesar. He justifies killing Caesar for the good of Rome and the Romans. To him, Rome comes first, and no one can be elevated above her. Even the ruler of Rome is not as indispensable as Rome. Hence, if anyone or the ruler is over-rising or raising himself above the dignity of Rome, he poses a great threat to the entire city and her descendants. Therefore, Caesar must die for Rome to live. Here is what Brutus postulates in his apologia for killing his best friend under the auspices of a conspiracy:

Romans, countrymen, and lovers!
hear me for my cause, and be silent,
that you may hear: believe me for mine
honour, and have respect to mine honour,
that you may believe: censure me in your
wisdom, and awake your senses, that you
may be the better judge (Act 3scene 2judge p.76).

At the beginning of his speech, he tries to instruct the audience to maintain absolute decorum so that he will be able to penetrate the psyche of the people with his words, points, and logic. Notwithstanding, the logical approach and points he uses make the audience see reasons for Caesar's tragedy of necessity and why it is logical for him to die. The people of Rome hail him for killing their leader, who has brought more cachet to Rome than Brutus could have brought to them. In this sense, sophistry is appropriately applied in his speeches. In ancient Greece, the Sophists usually applied sophistry to convince their audience, but most times, sophistry was always a potent mobility to deception. They manipulated people through their fair and logical speeches.

Critically, some speeches may be very logical but not true. Ryan (2014) points out that Brutus's appeal to "any dear friend of Caesar's" and his rhetoric of love, friendship, and civic loyalties outline the familiar discourse of friendship so prevalent in late-sixteenth and early seventeenth-century England" (p.10) This is exactly what Brutus applies; he uses logical words that are not necessarily true. He tells them to awaken their senses, but Brutus is the one who tries to manipulate their senses through fair speeches that are not really fair. Thus, he explicates and reveals his hypocrisy to rationalise his crime—he tries to make the people of Rome accept the fact that he is right for killing Caesar and killing him is for the good of Rome and its people. He accuses Caesar of being ambitious; here, ambition, as it is accentuated by Brutus, has a negative connotation.

Looking at this event from Brutus' point of view, he has done the right thing by killing his own friend. But looking at it from the verisimilitude point of view, Brutus himself may have a personal and private ambition that makes him assassinate his best friend. That is, to eliminate him so that he will be deposed from the godlike level that Caesar has already attained. There is a great seed of envy planted within the line of his heart that prompts the tragic connivance against Caesar. He really does not want Caesar to attain the level he presumes he might attain and which he feels could be more egregious to the entire Rome—Rome must be first, not Caesar; that is his perception. Unfortunately, he claims he is doing everything for Rome's sake and in the interest of Romans. Here he points out at the end of his speech when Antony comes in with Caesar's body:

'With this I depart,--that, as I slew
my best lover for the good of Rome,
I have the same dagger for myself, when
it shall please my Country to need my death (Act 3, Scene 2, p. 76).

Brutus identifies the fact that he is dearly loved by Caesar, but he betrays him. Nonetheless, as he claims that he has the dagger for himself, when it shall please Rome to need his death? The question is: is he really true about his statement, or does he say that to gain people's trust? He actually gives his speech rhetorically, even as he is ending his speech at the entrance of Antony and Caesar's bodies. He maintains that:

Who is here so base that would be a bondman?
If any, speak; for Him have I offended. Who is
here so rude that would not be a Roman? If any,
speak; for him have I offended. Who is here so
vile that will not love his country? If any, speak;
for him have I Offended. I pause for a reply (Act 3, scene 2, p. 76).

Here, the logical approach that Brutus applies to his audience is appealing to them, and they hail him without questioning. But as he rounds off his speech, Mark Antony dispels his claim and gets into people's emotions. On an occasion like this, we must know that Caesar's untimely passage into the great beyond is too tragic. Assassinating the ruler of Rome is tantamount to crumbling the whole of Rome itself—when the captain of a troupe is defeated, the troupe is conquered. Symbolically and sincerely, Caesar is not just a leader but a warlord who has fought and brought conquests to Rome in his adventure of war. The Caesar of Rome is an embodiment

and symbol of Rome, her power, and her dignity. So, if the Caesar of Rome is conquered, it shows Rome has gone down.

The people of Rome have never reasoned to this extent before they hailed Brutus for his speech of crime. But Antony's elocution is more emotional because he becomes emotive when he renders his speech. He opens the people's eyes and senses and draws the attention of the citizens of Rome to all the good works of Caesar for Rome and her people. He tells them how he has fought most terrible wars in which, through that, he brings an honour to Rome and her people—it is, therefore, tragically uncalled for to pay him back with death—tragic death. He makes them realise that even if Brutus has justified his crime, they should know that his crime is not just against Caesar but against Rome in particular. If Brutus truly loves Rome more than he claims, he will not kill the man who stands as the symbol of the whole of Rome. Hence, the rectitude Brutus avows to have for Rome is never a true one but a forged and barny one. One cannot claim to love Rome and destroy her head. In his attempt to persuade the Romans, Antony uses an act of persuasion in an emotive manner, and he is able to resuscitate the minds of the people towards the evil that Brutus and his fellow conspirators have done. In a few parts of his first lines, he maintains:

Friends, Romans, and countrymen, lend me your ears;

I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him. The evil
that men do lives after them; The good is oft interred
with their bones; So let it be with Caesar. The noble

Brutus Hath told you Caesar was ambitious: If it were so,
it was a grievous fault, And grievously hath Caesar answer'd it.

Here, under leave of Brutus and the rest-- For Brutus is an
honourable man; So are they all, all honourable men—Come
I to speak in Caesar's funeral. He was my friend, faithful and
just to me: But Brutus says he was ambitious; And Brutus is an
honourable man. (Act 3,scene 1,p.79).

In the speech stated above, Antony also makes use of irony and sarcasm, in which he taunts Brutus as an "honourable man," as Brutus himself claims. And all his partners in crime are also honourable men because they all conspire to commit "an honourable ime." In this sense, Antony uses pathos and makes the people of Rome have an emotional identification with him. This makes them mourn the fallen Caesar when they realise that he really does not deserve the evil committed against him by his best friends. Hence, Antony keeps on explicating all that Caesar has done, which should accord him honour even in death. He points out and proves to the audience that Caesar is not ambitious—he has even three times presented him with the opportunity of becoming the leader of Rome, which he has rejected three times. If he is truly ambitious, as Brutus has accused him, he would have accepted the kingly offer when he was

given. He opines that "I thrice presented him a kingly crown, which he did thrice refuse: Was this ambition? Yet Brutus says he was ambitious" (Act 3, scene 2, p. 79). Talking about Ethos as reflected in Mark Antony's speech, he tries to justify his good relationship with Caesar. This manifests the tragic feeling, and the speech is used to persuade and convince the listeners about the credible level of their friendship. The last but not least, logos, is palpably manifested in Mark Antony's speech: this is a situation where there is an appeal to logic and reason, and this is how he is able to persuade the Roman audience to get outraged at the atrocity committed by Brutus and his partners in crime. Antony points this out when he tries to persuade his audience to believe in the good works of Caesar. From the debut till the end of his speech, Antony gives many instances of the good deeds and a great humane attribute of Caesar to prove that he is unjustly murdered by his "friendly enemies." This culminates in the will Caesar wrote, which he reads to the audience, and it is discovered that Caesar gives every citizen of Rome 75 drachmas and half of his orchards. Antony makes use of those proofs to let the Roman citizens realise that Caesar is never as cruel a dictator as Brutus and others make them believe. Therefore, Antony uses the rhetorical devices judiciously to the extent that he is able to evoke tragic feelings and sympathy from the audience, and this makes him win their support in the end.

8. CONCLUSION

To sum up, Antony is very intelligent, and he points out the good works of Caesar, through which he is able to arouse the emotion of the people against Brutus and his cohorts. Thus, the significant difference between the two speakers is that Brutus appeals to the logical mind of the Roman audience, while Antony cleverly appeals to the emotions of the people, and a very good result is achieved. Brutus is honourable, while Antony is emotionally persuasive. "However, Mark Antony's speech is not as clearly divided as Brutus' is, as this one is longer and includes several pauses and interactions with the public, which is in some way indicating that it will be a more pathetic and less rational speech" (Sara, 2015, p.99). Hence, pathos is effectively felt in Antony's speech. When he establishes an emotional nexus and identification with the crowd, he makes them view the injuries of the stabs executed by Brutus on Caesar, his friend. He postulates that "this was the unkindest cut of them all (Act 3, scene 2, p. 83). This really creates an emotional and calligraphic identification between the audience and the speech. More so, catharsis is greatly accentuated—there is a great sense of pity and fear. With his rhetoric and gestures, Antony is able to establish a great sense of sympathy, trauma, and loss of trust in the citizens of Rome. However, "as much as listening to his words, Antony wants to encourage the plebeians of Rome to look once more upon the piteous sight of the slain Caesar's corpse. The assumption that underpins Antony's observation is that the blood of Caesar can "speak" more to the citizens than any words the orators might use" (Geddes, 2010, p.45). Thus, Shakespeare's characters have always been unique to the extent that even the most absurd character of his drama makes a very sensible dialogue. The characters analysed in this study and the peculiarities of their speeches have shown what the power of rhetorical art can achieve. Using persuasive speeches to gain the support of the listeners has played a significant role in *Julius Caesar*, especially in the funeral scene, and this really gives the play the indispensable credibility and prestige it has gained so far. This analysis has revealed, not just logically but chronologically, the use and power of effective rhetoric in an attempt to persuade others and gain their acquiescence. However, there are critical questions about the nature of Caesar's

A Critical Analysis of The Funeral Speeches in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar Using Principles of Rhetoric

death: why has Mark Antony kept the secret away from Caesar? If he truly loves Caesar, as he claims, does that mean he is not aware of the conspiracy that led to the death of his friend? Why has Caesar not listened to the warning from both the soothsayer and his wife about the pending danger? If Caesar's case should be related to fate, do we think even if Caesar had listened to the warnings, he wouldn't have died in his sleep? These questions are very relevant for further research.

REFERENCE

- Al-Maini , Doug.(2005). Technique and teleology in plato's rhetoric.Jurnal, Legacy Toward New Paradigms. Volume 10, [Issue 4: Special Issue: The End of Myth: Philosophy vs. Rhetoric](#) Guest Editor: Jeff Mitscherling.
- Ayman,Bassant.(2016).The Tragic Hero between Aristotle and Miller.10.13140/RG.2.2.27492.83849.Retrieved on 28/3/2019.
- Aziz, F. (2022). Mark Antony's Funeral Speech in Terms of Aristotle's Rhetorical Devices & Persuasive Modes in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar: A Stylistic Study. *Journal of Education College Wasit University*, 1(46), 597-620.
- Ballard, Kim.(2016).Rhetoric, power and persuasion in Julius .British Literary History. Discovering Literature: Shakespeare & Renaissance.Caesar.<http://web.ntpu.edu.tw/~shueng/Christine-Shakespeare-Caesar>.Retrieved on 23/4/2018.
- Breneman, Bret.(1991).Socrates'/Plato's Use of Rhetoric ABahá'í Perspective. Journal of Bahá'í Studies Vol. 4, number 1.
- Clark, Donald Lemen.(1922). *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance: A Study of Rhetorical Terms in English Renaissance Literary Criticism*.Proofreaders, www.gutenberg.net.Retrieved on 28/3/2019.
- Downing, Raquel Hidalgo.(2006).The Art Of Persuasion: The Relevance Of Rhetoric Today .EstudiosIngleses de la Universidad Complutense ISSN: 1133-0392 2006, vol. 14 153-166.
- Dumitrašković, T. (2023). RHETORIC AND POLITICS–THE POWER OF WORDS IN SHAKESPEARE'S JULIUS CAESAR. *Филолог–часопис за језик, књижевност и културу*, 14(27), 102-116.
- Erickson, Daniel N. (2004) Gorgias, Polus, and Socrates on Rhetoric in Plato's Gorgias. LCMND e-Journal. Volume 1.
- Floyd-Lapp,Claire (2014).Aristotle's Rhetoric: The Power of Words and the Continued Relevance of Persuasion.Young Historians Conference.Paper 12.<http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/younghistorians/2014/oralpres/12>.Retrieved on [2/4/2019](#).

- Geddes, Louise.(2010).Sacred Blood and the Body's Rich Legacy in Julius Caesar.This Rough Magic. A Peer-Reviewed, Academic, Online Journal Dedicated to the Teaching of Medieval & Renaissance Literature.*Magic*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 45-74.
- Griffith, Tom.(1996).*Aristotle The NicomacheanEthics*.Wordsorth.Editions Limited.8B East Street,Ware,Hertsfordshire SG12 9HJ.
- Khan, Victoria.(1994).*Machiavellian Rhetoric :From the Counter-Reformation to Milton*. Princeton University Press,Princeton,New York.
- Ko, H. C. (2015). Political persuasion: Adopting Aristotelian rhetoric in public policy debate strategies. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 5(10), 114-123.
- McCormack, K. C. (2014). Ethos, pathos, and logos: The benefits of Aristotelian rhetoric in the courtroom. *Wash. U. Jurisprudence Rev.*, 7, 131.
- Lipson, Carol. S and Binkley, Roberta. A. (2004). *Rhetoric before and beyond the Greeks*. State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Mack ,Peter(2004)*Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* .[Cambridge University Press](https://www.cambridge.org/9780521876223).UK.
- Mansilla, Sara Parra .(2015). Officiaoratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar.*Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research Volume 3 Issue 2*.
- Meek, R. (2017). *Narrating the visual in Shakespeare*. Routledge.
- Myklebost, S. A. (2018). Early Modern visual-verbal esoteric imagery and the theatre: Julius Caesar 1.3. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 17(1), 3-25.
- Goke, A. A., & Bosede, A. A. (2017). THE THREE FACES OF GREEK AND ARISTOTELIAN RHETORIC. *European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, (4), 15-24.
- Roberts, W. Rhys.(2004).*Rhetoric Aristotle*. Dover Publications, Inc.Mineola, New York.
- Ryan, Elise Lonich. (2014). To Love Caesar While Striking Him: Political Betrayal and Friendship with the Dead in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar. SAA Julius Caesar Seminar Paper.
- Shakespeare, William.(2018). *Julius Caesar*. Global Grey.
- Tambar, J. S. (2020). The Rhetoric of Wounds in Coriolanus; or, a Tragedy of Renaissance Rhetoric. *Comparative Drama*, 54(1/2), 27-50.
- Wardy, Robert. (2005).*The Birth of Rhetoric: Gorgias, Plato and Their Successors*.Routledge 11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE.
- Kochin, M. S. (2002). *Gender and rhetoric in Plato's political thought*. Cambridge University Press.