

Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences

ISSN: 2663-239X



INTER-TEXTUAL

Numéro juin 2021

www.inter-textual.univ-ao.edu.ci

ISSN : 2663-239X

REVUE INTER-TEXTUAL

**Revue semestrielle en ligne des Lettres et Sciences Humaines du Département
d'Anglais adossée au Groupe de recherches en Littérature et Linguistique anglaise
(GRELLA)**

Université Alassane Ouattara

République de Côte d'Ivoire

Directeur de Publication: M. Pierre KRAMOKO, Maitre de Conférences

Adresse postale: 01 BP V 18 Bouaké 01

Téléphone: (225) 01782284/(225) 01018143

Courriel: pkramokoub.edu@gmail.com

Numéro ISSN:

Lien de la Revue: <http://inter-textual.univ-ao.edu.ci>

ADMINISTRATION DE LA REVUE

DIRECTEUR DE PUBLICATION

M. Pierre KRAMOKO, Maître de Conférences

COMITÉ DE RÉDACTION

- Professeur Guézé Habraham Aimé DAHIGO, Professeur Titulaire
- Dr Vamara KONÉ, Maître de Conférences
- Dr Kouamé ADOU, Maître de Conférences
- Dr Kouamé SAYNI, Maître de Conférences
- Dr Koffi Eugène N'GUESSAN, Maître de Conférences
- Dr Gossouhon SÉKONGO, Maître de Conférences
- Dr Philippe Zorobi TOH, Maître de Conférences
- Dr Jérôme Koffi KRA, Maître de Conférences

COMITÉ SCIENTIFIQUE

- Prof. Azoumana Ouattara, Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire
- Prof. Coulibaly Daouda, PhD, Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire
- Prof. Djako Arsène, Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire
- Prof. Francis Akindès, Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire
- Prof. Lawrence P. Jackson, Johns Hopkins University, USA
- Prof. Léa N'Goran-Poamé, Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire
- Prof. Mamadou Kandji, Université Ckeick Anta Diop, Sénégal
- Prof. Margaret Wright-Cleveland, Florida State University, USA
- Prof. Kenneth Cohen, St Mary's College of Maryland, USA
- Prof. Nubukpo Komlan Messan, Université de Lomé, Togo
- Prof. Séry Bailly, Université Félix Houphouët Boigny, Abidjan
- Prof. Zigui Koléa Paulin, Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire

TABLE DES MATIERES

LITTERATURE

1. AESTHETIC DISTANCE AND EMPATHY IN DRAMA AS A PERFORMING ART: IN SEARCH OF EMOTIONAL BALANCE BETWEEN ACTORS AND THE AUDIENCE
Hodabalou ANATE1 – 14
2. LE SILENCE, L'ECRITURE ET L'AFRICAIN-AMERICAIN: UNE LECTURE INTERTEXTUELLE DE A LESSON BEFORE DYING D'ERNEST GAINES ET THE COLOR PURPLE D'ALICE WALKER
Johnson ADEBOYE15 – 31
3. DEL EPÓNIMO TOPONÍMICO A LA PROYECCIÓN DE LA CONCIENCIA PRESERVADORA EN *FUENTE OVEJUNA* DE LOPE DE VEGA
Amon Paul N'DRI32 – 50
4. STORYTELLING AS A HEALING PROCESS IN LESLIE MARMON SILKO'S FICTION
Kpatcha Essobozou AWESSO.....51 – 62
5. KINGSHIP IN WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S *JULIUS CAESAR* AND *TITUS ANDRONICUS*: A POLITICAL ANALYSIS IN THE AFRICAN CONTEXT
Casimir Comlan SOEDE.....63 – 75
6. LA POETIQUE DE L'ENTRE-DEUX ET DE L'ESTHETIQUE DANS *HOW THE GARCIA GIRLS LOST THEIR ACCENTS* DE JULIA ALVAREZ
Drissa BENIN.....76 – 94
7. UNWRITING WESTERN CANONS WITH AFRICAN ORAL IMPLEMENTS: A STUDY ON SUBVERSION OF GENRES IN ISHMAEL REED'S *MUMBO JUMBO*
Ahmadou Siendou KONATE.....95 – 111
8. MATERNAL SOLICITUDE IN A TALE OF *THE MABINOGION*: "PEREDUR THE SON OF EVRAWC"
El Hadji DABO.....112 – 119
9. LA FONCTION ENGAGEE DE LA LITTERATURE ORALE AFRICAINE ET L'EPOPEE
Magdalene MENSAH.....120 – 136

CIVILISATION

10. *E PLURIBUS UNUM*: AN UNCOMPLETED SOCIAL METAPHOR AND COMMUNITY IDEAL
Moïse KONATE.....137 – 147
11. AUTOUR DU BOVIDE : LEXIQUE COMPARE DES PRATIQUES PASTORALES CHEZ LES ELEVEURS DE L'ÉCOSSE ET LES PEUL DE LA SENEGAMBIE
Mamadou KANDJI.....148 – 163

12. THOREAU'S ETHICS OF REBELLION AND THE BUILDING OF CIVIL SOCIETY	
Pierre KRAMOKO	164 – 176
13. HOPE AND DISAPPOINTMENT IN MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.'S POLITICAL THEOLOGY: ECLIPSE OF THE LIBERAL SPIRIT	
Floyd W. HAYES, III	177 – 201

KINGSHIP IN WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S *JULIUS CAESAR* AND *TITUS ANDRONICUS*: A POLITICAL ANALYSIS IN THE AFRICAN CONTEXT

Casimir Comlan SOEDE

Littérature et Civilisation Britanniques
Centre Béninois de Langues Etrangères (CEBELAE)
Université d'Abomey Calavi (UAC) -BENIN

Abstract

Human beings' self-satisfaction, pride, and notoriety in its various forms, are the causes of many social conflicts. This troublesome atmosphere becomes sourer when it reaches political areas in which a dominant minority group envisages to hold and maintain leadership in the community and ensure the succession to power. In this respect, as the present study explores the concept of kingship in Shakespeare's plays, it sheds light on politics in Africa, specifically political parties, governments or leading groups during the shifting period of the throne/power. Grounded in New historical approach the study helps to uncover new perspectives in William Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* and *Titus Andronicus*. Because the main interest of the two plays is the focus on conspiracy, massacres and bloodshed in the course of the race to power, the essay also poses the hypothesis that power manoeuvring and abuse for self-interest generates trouble and conflicts in any societies.

Key words: usurpation, non-dialogue, self-interest, conflicts, dictatorship.

Résumé

L'autosatisfaction, l'orgueil et la notoriété de l'homme sous toutes ses formes se trouvent à l'origine des foyers de conflits observés dans le monde. Cette atmosphère déjà troublante devient plus délétère dans le domaine politique lors des alternances au pouvoir où l'un des membres du parti au pouvoir ou non prétend à la magistrature suprême. Dans cette perspective, la présente étude lève un coin de voile sur la gouvernance politique ou la chefferie dans le processus de l'alternance au pouvoir par les tiers ou toute autre personne. La théorie de la nouvelle histoire a été d'un grand intérêt pour décoder les messages véhiculés par les comportements des personnages des pièces de théâtre *Julius Caesar* et *Titus Andronicus* de William Shakespeare à l'étude. Cette recherche nous a ainsi révélé l'existence des massacres tout comme les effusions de sang le long des pièces. Elle a également parvenir à la conclusion selon laquelle la confiscation du pouvoir par une seule personne compromet le vivre ensemble dans la communauté.

Mots clés: usurpation, non-dialogue, intérêt personnel, conflit, dictature.

INTRODUCTION

The Throne or power, regarded as a position occupied by a sovereign, bishop, or other exalted people in a kingdom, community, country or any social and political group, appears as a subject of many envies within members of the same social group according to English culture and tradition. The access to that particular position can possibly generate social conflicts regarding the rules and the flowchart to grumble before reaching it. Indeed, in England only married people aged 21 could pretend being candidate for the throne (N. Clegg 1).

The same situation is observable in political parties when the pervasive intention is to maneuver in such a way that the candidate for the throne is the one who comes from the kingship or the family ties. Misunderstandings within the group and, subsequently, the dislocation of the party rise, when the leader or the leader to be has to leave his/her position and shift it with someone else. Rivalries among people, clans, and social groups seem to wretch communities and deplete the harmony that prevailed in the given kingdom or nation.

In that regards the current research work aims at revisiting the ways the political power is hampered by a group of persons who does not think of it shifting with another one. This work also prompts the shifting and the sharing of the power as the asset for a community without bloodshed. Thanks to New historical approach, the study helps to uncover new perspectives in William Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* and *Titus Andronicus*, the plays understudy. The study therefore in the first point sets the concept of Kingship in English Culture and tradition with the focus on characters' behaviours in the two plays. Secondly, this research work gives insights into the perception of kingship and throne as a symbol of unification for peace in a community.

1. Cultural and Traditional Perception on Kingship and Throne

Power is a precious tool that cannot be handed down to a successor. Then, it is someone with royal abilities who can inherit his or her parents' power. Thus, the throne comes to be a matter of class or social group that the applicant or candidate for power has to belong to. But, due to self-notoriety, self-satisfaction and someone's pride chasing, conflicts occur between partners or groups. In other words, people from the social group have to privilege, defend and support their counterparts yearning for such a position for the notoriety and goodness of the whole association. They have to keep, run and save it as long as possible against any outcomes. That way of maintaining the throne is also sometimes source of misunderstandings in a kingdom, nation and community while the population under-authority seems frustrated and does not take real advantages from the running and sharing of public affairs.

The disputes inside and outside of the reigning groups that this situation leads to are often grounded in the fact that some people do not share the ideology of the ruling class. This antagonistic relationship in power chasing areas is viewed in the two plays, the corpus of this research work. In *Titus Andronicus*, the dispute between the two brothers involves Saturninus and Bassianus, after the death of the Roman Emperor, their father. The two men's conversation exemplifies the strong disagreement between the two men:

Saturninus: Noble patricians, patrons of my right,
Defend the justice of my cause with arms.
And countrymen, my loving followers,
Plead my successive title with your sword:
I am his first born son that was the last
That wore the imperial diadem of Rome;
Then let my father's honors live in me,
Nor wrong mine age with this indignity.
Bassianus: Romans, friends, followers, favourers of my right,
If ever Bassianus, Caesar's son,
Were gracious in the eyes of royal Rome,
Keep then this passage to the capitol
And suffer not dishonour to approach
The imperial seat, to virtue consecrate,
To justice, continence and nobility;
But let desert in pure election shine,
And, Romans fight for freedom in your choice. (*Titus Andronicus*
445).

The two brothers challenge each other because of personal interests. In search of their own satisfaction, and instead of protecting their traditional and cultural rules, they prefer to fight for their own profit and notoriety which stands power. In similar ways, many people from noble and royal families or within political parties or even a social organisations adopt such attitudes when it comes to power. Their sole actions amount to exercising power and keeping that political position at any costs, as the objective is to enjoy precious privileges and materialistic comforts associated with power. For instance, in *Julius Caesar*, Cassius and his mate Brutus as well project themselves to succeed to the late Caesar so as to well-benefit from the advantages of the power left by their dead father. Cassius says in that respect that:

When there is in it but one only man, O, you and I have heard our father say, There was a Brutus once that would have brook'd. The eternal devil to keep his state in Rome. As easily as a king (*Julius Caesar* 521).

Rivalry is hereby declared between the late Caesar's relatives and his close collaborators Cassius and Brutus plan to use power for their self-notoriety and self-satisfaction. Cassius dislikes the prestige given to Caesar. He does not want him to ascend to the throne, because he is praised by Romans as being so wonderful in his way of leading. For his fight against the

enemies in favour of Romans, people wish him to stay as long as possible on the imperial throne. However, Cassius and his accomplice Brutus who do not want him to remain in power, conspire against him until death. The conspiracy reaches a far more complex stage when the play shows that Brutus happens to be a close friend to Caesar they plan to assassinate. It therefore appears that Caesar is totally ignorant of the conspiracy orchestrated by his friend. Even though, Brutus's intent is not to exercise the power, he takes part in the plot for one specific reason: by inheriting the throne, he and Cassius wish to have control over everything, and make use of the political power as they want.

This race to power justified by people's sole view of the political power is observable in Shakespeare's tragedies that actually describe the political arena in real life not only in the past in Western countries, but also in today's world, specifically in African countries which gained their independence. On the African continent, one can note similar cases of races to power coupled with plans to stay in power. The current form of this bulimia concerning power occurs when some African presidents revise the country's fundamental and constitutional law in order to remain in power after their regular terms. This attitude paves the way to serious socio-political conflicts between those who govern, and their opponent groups.

The desire of power that is often embedded in self-satisfaction or pride raises the question of leadership. In other words, what are the type and meanings of leadership in the political circle? Apparently, in most cases a political authority in power is not necessarily a leader, at least, if one defines the concept of 'Leadership' as abilities to run an organization or a country for the interests of the group or the people. The current cases of change in Constitution in many African countries testify to the fact that these Presidents cannot be qualified as true leaders. The state of trouble due to the President's lack of leadership generates the dislocation of the whole community. Self-interest in leadership hampers the growth of the community. United Kingdom exits from European Union to safeguard their economic position in the union.

The characters in Shakespeare's plays act in such a way of self-interest satisfaction Emperor Saturninus in *Titus Andronicus* avenges his brother Bassianus' death by killing Martius and Quintus. He considers his act as an honor killing because he is a member of the nobility. This sense of nobility that implies self-satisfaction plays out when Tamora protects his sons against Titus' family which is not of the royal breed. In the same way, defending and shedding light on the notoriety and satisfaction of one's group or a person, Cassius, the late Caesar's General declared: "[...] Men are sometimes the master of their fates. [...]. What should be in that 'Caesar'? Why should that name be sounded more than yours? Write them together,

yours is as fair a name [...]. Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed, That he is grown so great?" (*Julius Caesar* 521).

For his self-interest and satisfaction, Cassius does not want anymore to hear people talk of Caesar. Yet, Caesar has lived and fought for the interests of his countrymen, he enjoys love from them. His fame derives from the virtues he incarnates. That is the reason why Cassius wonders 'What should be in that 'Caesar'?' In people's imagination, the name of the late Caesar, so well-known, loved and respected by Romans is associated with many virtues. Thus, Caesar's name "is grown so great" (521). Cassius is so excited that he wants to be and acts like his late king when he accesses the Throne. He wants Romans to trust him the same way they did to the king during his lifetime. He tries to persuade his late king's friend Brutus and beyond that character, all Romans. He knows that Brutus can have some influence on Romans who must make a choice for the succession to the throne.

Regarding the attitude of some characters, Titus in *Titus Andronicus* and Brutus in *Julius Caesar*, the concept of Kingship has to go beyond his dictatorship state to a circle of togetherness sharing. In fact, when someone from a social class or family arrives to reach a higher social or political position, be it local or nationwide, s/he is looked at and taken as the saviour of the other members of his/her group. So, he becomes the one who has to find solutions to them (financial or not) for everything. He has to protect and take care of them no matter what and how. The togetherness sharing has to be the principles in kingship. Boris Johnson's assumption as a prime minister in UK to replace Theresa May exemplifies the case of the group's interest conservation or protection. Thus, he accepts to resume with the work of his predecessor, his group's member, and succeeds where she failed. He promises to overcome the challenge in which his group's member did not succeed.

Romans know that Titus in *Titus Andronicus* is their saviour like Caesar in *Julius Caesar*. They have won several battles abroad and brought back captives. Both Titus and Caesar in their respective play defended their community against enemies. For that reason, they can be their representative or deputy. Romans give them all their support as "nobler man, a braver warrior" (445). For instance, Titus is viewed as a hero and addresses his patricians as a hero. Yet, he refuses that noble position because he is not ready for that job, and he does not want any more to usurp a position, acting in this sense as an honest citizen.

The Romans's sentiments of pain and cries after the death of Caesar testify to the significant role played by the emperor during the battles against enemies. Antony, Caesar's son, mentions it to Romans when his father died: "If you have tears, prepare, to shed them. Now, You all do know this mantle: I remember. The first time ever Caesar put it on; [...]" (*Julius*

Caesar 533). According to English tradition and culture, people hardly mourn the death of an emperor. Romans mourn their dead king or queen when s/he has displayed self-sacrifice for them. The plays emphasize the importance of the individual's acts of bravery, commitment, and virtues in his/her lifetime. For the interest of the kingship, Saturninus gets married the Goth's Empress Tamora and safeguard the notoriety of his brother Bassianus against Titus' children. Bassianus and Saturninus are the sons of the late Emperor of Rome. Regarding the virtue of togetherness in kingship as a brotherhood, Saturninus thinks that his responsibility is to protect the image of royal family.

Caesar's relatives mainly Antony was in the same logic of saving his kingship's notoriety. So, he has to succeed to his dead father's throne. He cannot offer this opportunity to anyone else. Caesar's relatives are proud and attached to the kingship. While talking to his brother Antony, Octavius invites him not to allow Brutus to interfere in what is for the kingship. So, Octavius reminds Antony of what their dead parent Caesar said: "When there is in it but one only man, O, you and I have heard our father say, There was a Brutus once that would have brook'd. The eternal devil to keep his state in Rome. As easily as a king." (*Julius Caesar* 521). During his lifetime, the dead father Caesar knows that the only one who envied his throne is Cassius. But for the whole Roman nation and for Marcus Caesar, orchestrating a conspiracy with his accomplice Brutus against Cassius is viewed as treason. That is why, prior to his death, he urges his sons to get awareness of the situation about the nation. Brutus is an 'eternal devil' who wants to 'keep his state in Rome'.

Cassius, one of Caesar's conspirators wants Brutus to accept the responsibility of Caesar's murder since both of them target the same position. An unfair competition is likely to come out between conspirators. Brutus's self-satisfaction, self-notoriety and pride are eloquently expressed through the following statement:

[...]. My ancestors did from the streets of Rome. The tarquin drive, when he was call'd a king. 'Speak, strike, redress!' am I entreated To speak and strike? O Rome, I make thee promise; If the redress will follow, thou receives. Thy full petition at the hand of Brutus. (*Julius Caesar* 523).

Brutus's self-celebration reaches its climax. As a result, he wants to be the king after the death of Caesar, his friend. He invokes the ancestors of Rome to bless his plan, and he asks the Romans sign a petition for his support. All these actions suggest that Brutus has taken part in the conspiracy against Caesar. He is so proud that he says: 'O Rome, I make thee promise; if the redress will follow, thou receives thy full petition at the hand of Brutus'. While he does not belong to royal and noble family, and while the legal provisions of the kingdom do not authorize

him to be the king, he attributes himself the right to be critical of King Caesar who is accused of mismanagement. He believes that he is the right person who can redress that flaw in the management and governance of Rome for the interests of the Romans. He wants to achieve his self-satisfaction and pride through the accomplishment and the establishment of his notoriety as king of Rome.

Similarly in *Titus Andronicus*, Tamora the Goths' Empress tries to achieve self-satisfaction, notoriety and pride from the Emperor Saturninus who has succeeded his late father on the throne. Saturninus and Tamora come from noble and royal family/kinship, and their marriage offers the possibility to share experiences, tradition and cultures. Tamora has some knowledge in ruling the kingdom, because she was an Empress unlike Prince Saturninus who is newly appointed for the first time as Emperor. Then, his desire is to have an experienced woman like Tamora. The couple empire's leading is based on the kingship's image saving but with many bloodsheds. By focusing on one's group's image saving, Titus and his family are always praised and respected by Romans and the late Emperor. At the death of the Emperor, the elderly Titus has been chosen by his countrymen to take over the crown.

The old man's refusal of the offer is justified by the fact that he is aware of not being a member of the royal family. He is honest enough to recognize that grabbing the Romans' throne is unfair. He defines himself as a person respectful of the law and the principle which stipulate: "to Caesar what for Caesar and to God what for God". In other words, he claims not being concerned with ruling the empire. He excludes himself from any privilege, pride and satisfaction regarding kingship ascribed to the descents of royal lineage. On the surface, therefore, the old man Titus is not a leader, just because he does not hold any leadership position in the kingdom. He refuses the possibility of becoming Emperor, while he has been offered the power by the people. However, a close analysis shows that he displays great qualities of leadership that consist in being respectful of the constitutional law. The law in the kingdom takes the form of a traditional principle according to which only people of royal breed are attributed the running of the Roman Empire.

Titus's attitude teaches outstanding lessons: Being at the leadership position equates with ensuring peace and security, provided the law is respected by all individuals. Contrastively, being a leader does not mean considering oneself as a person with supernatural power or abilities in the community. In the play, such a perception of the throne leads to all types of misbehaviours. In other words, anybody appointed as a king, queen, president should not define their leadership in the sense of a mythic superman or superwoman. The play also pictures Saturninus, the Roman Emperor, who misbehaves toward Titus's family despite all the

consideration Titus gives him. The Emperor is a type of the leader who over-uses his power and authority against his countrymen. He expresses his ungratefulness by asking Titus to bring to him the hand of a member of his subject's family. He accuses Titus's family of the assassination of Bassianus, the Emperor Brother. To provide evidence of the innocence of his sons, Titus cut off his own hand and sends it to Saturnius.

This abuse of power and authority is also noted with Tamora whose reign is equally characterized by self-satisfaction to the detriment of the people. She orchestrates a plot in order to humiliate the old Titus and his family accused of having dishonoured Tamora on the battlefields. Tamora was Titus's captive after the war that opposed Goths and Romans. Now that she is the Empress of the Goth, she decides to take revenge by humiliating Titus. To this end, she asks Titus's own sons, Chiron and Demetrius to rape and mutilate Lavinia, Titus' unique daughter. In Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, Cassius and Metellus also conspire against King Julius Caesar. Cicero is among those who oppose the conspirators; for him nobody other than King Julius Caesar's sons Octavius or Antonius must come to the throne. But the conspirators disagree on the respect of that principle governing the Empire; they decide to pay for his opposition. They express their intention of killing Cicero, as eloquently shown by the following conversation: "Cassius: But what of Cicero? Shall we sound him? I think he will stand every strong with us. [...] Metellus: it shall be said his judgement ruled our hands: Our youths and wildness shall no whit appear, But all be buried in his gravity" (*Julius Caesar*, 525).

Their words exemplify their intentions towards their relatives. They are very enchanted to decide upon the Senator Cicero's survival during the attack in order to attend or to come to an end with their project. They want to murder the king. Their ambitions are more gravely bad since they know that if they do not well equip themselves they will be killed. Moreover, Cassius knows that the noble general Brutus will not accept him to wear the crown in the detriment to one of Caesar's sons. For that reason he urged to finish with him during the upcoming battle. But unfortunately he was the one who passed away. "The end of this day's business ere it come! But it sufficeth that day will end, and then the end is known. Come, ho! Away!"(539).

Cassius' self-satisfaction, notoriety and pride to the throne is prominent in the play. He wants to have access to everything in the kingdom. Having possession of the lands, wealth of people in the community or kingdom, is the main and noble desire of the general Cassius. How to deprive them from their properties, wives and wealth seems what conspirators targeted in their way to the power. But they do not account with the end of their business. Brutus is 'sufficeth' with the conspirations of Cassius from the death of Caesar and others. So he wants to 'away' him too for soul sake of King Caesar. This way of perceiving throne by ending lives

of opponents has to be rethought by equipping the kingship and throne assertion with more moral values that have always to be cultivated, promoted and transmitted from generations to generations. This will, for sure, helps to have new leaders with clear notions about leading for the goodness of their communities.

2. The Symbols of Kingship, Throne and Peace

Kingship and Throne are perceived as being linked to each other; and anyone who belongs to the group, clan, and kingship has a favour to access to the throne. So, as a group member they have to defend the honour, ideology, dignity of their clan in order to save the group's value and interests. Thus, they have to mind the group's notoriety, satisfaction, pride and "face-saving"¹⁴. That was the showcase in the play *Titus Andronicus* whereby Saturninus asked Titus' family member left hand as mark of their innocence in the murder of his brother Bassianus. Aaron was sent to Titus' home as the messenger. He said to Titus: "Titus Andronicus, my lord the emperor. Sends thee this word, - that, if thou love they sons, Let Marcus, Lucius, or thyself, old Titus, Or any of you, chop off your hand. And send it to the king: he for the same, Will send thee hither both thy sons alive; And that shall be the ransom for they fault". (*Titus Andronicus* 456). From these words, the Emperor in order to defend his clans' men and their dignity, has to act as an elder and take the front of any action since he is the first leader of the whole clan.

Shakespeare makes use of "the ransom for they fault" to elucidate that in royal family, no one can go against royal assault without punishment. That is the reason why Titus cut and sent his left hand to innocence his sons about the act they did not commit; and also to convince Saturninus about the fact that he is wronging the way about the real murderers of Bassianus. However, to preserve his family's honour, Titus tried to answer the Emperor's request. He said: "[...] With all my heart, I'll send the Emperor my hand/Good Aaron, wilt thou help to chop it off?" (456). Brutus in *Julius Caesar* did the same to safeguard the relationship that gathers and ties him and the dead king Caesar's family. Brutus' words are expressive in the showcase before the battle in Philippi. In their discussion of adieu, Brutus said to Cassius regarding notoriety, satisfaction and pride of Romans in general and Caesar soul sake in particular: "No, Cassius, no: think not, thou noble Roman, That ever Brutus will go bound to Rome; He bears too great a mind. But this same day. Must end that work the ideas of March begun; And whether we shall meet again I know not [...]" (*Julius Caesar* 539).

¹⁴Casimir Soédé. *Dignity and Vengeance in a Selection of Shakespeare's Plays: A Contemporary African Perspective*, Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing (LAP), 2016, p. 38

Undoubtedly, Brutus is more fearless than the other conspirators. His commitment to save his community's interests overpasses his own personae. He has to 'go bound to Rome'. So, he wants to mark and stop the ideas of March's month in Rome by slaying if necessary his blood for the safety, notoriety, satisfaction and pride of his countrymen. Because for him, 'this same day must end that work the ides of March begun'. He is sure to win the battle of Philippi in order to end that disputes between the two countries in which king Caesar trespassed. Brutus arms and reinforces himself with great courage in such a way that he wonders if Cassius and he will meet again. He seems to know this last battle is the fatal one between Philippians and Romans' armies since King Caesar's will was to win this battle or war and grabbed Philippi's territory. Through those acts and portrayals of Titus and Brutus, Shakespeare is showing to his readers that the leader, governor, authority, emperor, president order incarnates respect and has to be pushed in execution even if it hurts. That is why, as a leader your decisions have to be well minded to avoid hurting.

In addition the clan face-saving, notoriety, satisfaction and pride are also observable in Tamora and Aaron's behaviors in *Titus Andronicus* and in the ones of Brutus, Antony and Octavius in *Julius Caesar* as well. In fact, Tamora is the deported Queen of Goths and the Romans' Empress after getting married to Saturninus. She has the duty to protect her sons and her position before Romans and even Goths. Throne gives opportunities to people to have a kind of authority and respect among the group or the country they are living in. Opposed to Tamora, Titus and his family do not have such an authority; so they have to obey to the emperor, who will make the old Titus to cut easily his left hand as a proof of his relatives' innocence. Tamora exercised her authority as Empress. She allowed her sons to do anything they want with Lavinia, the old Titus's daughter. Aaron as her secret boyfriend is her accomplice. Aaron cannot spread his lover's secret. As a reward for the secret keeping, he got a child from their hidden union or relation.

Personal interest, group's face saving or notoriety and pride are at work in the plays understudy. Cassius, Cato the conspirators against Caesar and his throne are also killed by Roman army. The Roman soldiers have to save the notoriety and honour of their King Caesar. Pindarus declared: "[...] Caesar, thou art revenged, Even with the sword that kill'd thee [...]" Durst I have done my will, O Cassius, Far from this country Pindarus shall run, Where never Roman shall take note of him" (*Julius Caesar* 540). Through all these vengeful acts within the plays, the playwright sheds light on how the power and a political position as well can be used to destroy a whole family, clan, ethnics, community, and nation. This is a call toward

countrymen to revisit their behaviours by promoting welfare attitudes in their social group as showed by Lucius' words at the end of the play *Titus Andronicus*.

Vengeful acts were widespread during King James and Queen Elizabeth's reigns. In *Titus Andronicus* for instance, two great and noble families challenge each other through bloodiest battles. Thanks to his political position one destroyed and ended lives of almost the members of the second family. Saturninus made kill Titus' sons. Demetrius and Chiron Tamora's sons raped and mutilated Titus' daughter Lavinia. Even though, Titus will take revenge on him and destroy in return the royal family by organizing a trapped and murdering banquet, these atrocities did not bring peace into the empire. Shakespeare seems to be an artist who paints atrocities to correct wrongdoings in his community. Country's wealth and leading have to be well shared and well done for counterparts' safety. Titus was on a way to reach a higher position of his community but he refused due to the fact that he does not belong to royal family. The author rings the bell about political immorality that leads to political violence. Each one has his role to play in a community whatever is their position. Everyone cannot be a leader in a group but they have a role to play in for its prosperity.

People nowadays are joining politics not because of conviction, but for exercising power on their under-controlled people and for even cheating on them. A good politics implies good governance and therefore, draws to many advantages for the whole community. Whereas bad politics has all on its way of negative aspects such as selfishness rooted on exclusion, discrimination, frustration, and oppression. In that prospect, the leaders lead in dictatorship because of their self-interests. This attitude very often is subjected to protestation and conflicts. Leadership is a heavy responsibility and should be minded seriously. A leader has several duties toward his countrymen and they have to be aware of that. Osundare argues that: "Leaders are, in the language of psychologists, role models. People look up to them and copy their actions, behaviors and even mannerism. Therefore if a leader lacks discipline the effect is apt to spread automatically down to his followers" (N. Osundare 66). This is to say that leaders have great impact on their people and vice versa. This is evidenced through the misbehavior of Saturninus in the play.

Shakespeare's mission seems to instruct and educate his audience about the danger of bad political leadership. Politicians have to be rational and reasonable while combating unfair phenomena or things as injustice and corruption. Antony in *Julius Caesar* claimed how far his late father incarnates honesty, kindness toward Romans. He emphasised:

This was the noblest Roman of them all: All the conspirators save only he, Did that they did in envy of great Caesar; He only, in general honest thought. And common

good to all, made one of them. His life was gentle, and the elements. So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up, And say to all the world 'This was a man! (*Julius Caesar* 541).

It is thus noticeable that Caesar was a man of all Romans. He was so gentle and shared kindness within his people. He was the noblest and honest general of Rome in his thoughts and in actions as well since his collaborators' wills were to embody such characters in themselves. Politicians are far more considered due to their position than to their actions by their countrymen. So, they have to be real patriots and embody patriotic spirits at any level of management. The counterparts' interests are viewed as a priority, to the extent that they are at the service of their countrymen. Soédé insists on this issue when he quotes Achebe:

A person who loves his country is not a person who *says* he loves his country. He is not even a person who shouts or swears or recites or sings his love of his country. He is one who *cares* deeply about the happiness and well-being of his country and all his people. Patriotism is an emotion of love directed by a critical intelligence. A true patriot will always demand the highest standard of his country and accept nothing but the best for and from his people (C. Soédé 174).

According to Achebe, the leaders, as good patriots have not to show off themselves. They have to let the co-patriots appreciate them in good harmony. In other words, unity and love without any distinction of race, tribal and sex are the good guide of human life and they have to be promoted. Achebe is suggesting that politicians should not break human peaceful life because of their personal interests namely notoriety, satisfaction and pride. People should understand now that making justice themselves, has nothing good if it is not violence and bloodshed. But with tolerance and forgiveness things can be remediated in general. So, people have to mind their acts and have not to charge or blame others for the non-achievements of their goal. In short violence always call violence, but only reciprocal tolerance and forgiveness are the best ways to resolve problem in communities. That is why one is right while saying that "competition is a reality in politics, but competition is not synonymous with one's fellow's annihilation" (174).

CONCLUSION

To sum up, this research work shows how misunderstandings of the concept of kingship regarding social group's notoriety, satisfaction and pride draws way to social conflicts in its various forms in a kingdom, group, clan, ethnic, nation or country and community. The work has also pinpointed how it is difficult for an outsider to access the position of leader in politics. Kingship which has to be regarded as a high position in the political area makes people to exercise power on their counterparts through various manners. And throne or power draws way to bloodshed while it comes for its reaching by people from the same social group or not. The

current study is urging Shakespeareans and people worldwide to the re-visitation of the kingship crew or ties on one hand and on the other hand, it is driving countrymen's attention on how to implement it into people's daily behaviours so as to have from them tolerance, acceptance and forgiveness. This work appeals leaders in planet to review their governance since there is no doubt that blood calls blood. Leaders therefore have to avoid using dictatorship and arbitrariness against their countrymen for a good living atmosphere in their communities.

Bibliographical References

1. ACHEBE, Chinua. 1984. *The Trouble with Nigeria*. 1st ed. England and Wales: Heinmann Educational Books
2. SHAKESPEARE, William. 2010. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* "Titus Andronicus" (1592, p. 443-468). Mumbai: Wilco Publishing House.
- 3..... 2010. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* "Julius Caesar" (1599, p. 443-468). Mumbai: Wilco Publishing House.
4. CLEGG, Nick. "Succession to the British throne." 2019 In *Wikipedia*. www.google.com/Succession+in+to+British+throne.+Wikipedia.com. Retrieved on September 11, 2020.
5. OSUNDARE, Niyi. 2009. "Freedom and the Creative Space", pp.63-68. In *Multiculturalism and Hybridity in African Literature* by Hal Wylie and Bernth Lindfors eds. Trenton NJ: Africa World Press.
6. SOEDE, Casimir. 2016. *Dignity and Vengeance in a Selection of Shakespeare's Plays: A Contemporary African Perspective*, Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing (LAP).