

# The Myth of the Multitude: “The displeased commons of the cite”

TONY VOSS

Heiner Müller observed that in *Hamlet* “The break-in of time into the play constitutes mythos” – by which I understand him to have meant that “myth” was one possible response to the social, political and psychological demands of Shakespeare’s context.<sup>1</sup> In 1600 the times would press on the text and performance of the play at many points: politically, the succession crisis which faces Denmark haunted Elizabeth’s reign for decades; personally, the death of the playwright’s son Hamnet (aged only 11) in 1596 may have felt like a prefiguration of the end of the Danish Prince. *Hamlet*’s transformation of both social history and individual experience into myth is of its nature tragic: James I and VI (the philosopher king?) and Fortinbras (the soldier) succeed, but Hamnet, like Hamlet, dies, although he, too, “was likely, had he been put on,/ To have proved most royal”. (5.2.404-405) This is a reminder that “the category of myth [even in the perhaps special sense suggested here] reflects the interests of those who employ it.”<sup>2</sup> Myths are imagined rather than revealed. In the light of these and further observations, this paper sets out to examine whether or not the image and action of the crowd in a sequence of Shakespeare’s works can be said to achieve anything like the dimensions of myth. This project has been inspired and given traction by Peter Titlestad’s “Hamlet the Populist Politician” and Kai Wiegandt’s *Crowd and Rumour in Shakespeare*.<sup>3</sup>

\*

Titlestad is concerned with the play on the stage. He offers an interpretation of Hamlet’s character at variance with the “Hamlet of Goethe and Coleridge”, and argues that the Hamlet of film, for whom “it is all in the mind”, is “impossible”.<sup>4</sup> With “fiercest inwardness” (Harold Bloom’s phrase) this Hamlet combines “outward fierceness”.<sup>5</sup> Impulsive but cautious, the Prince is well aware of the power and range of his antagonist Claudius. This Hamlet is realistic about

---

1. Heiner Müller, “Shakespeare a Difference” (speech given at the Weimar Shakespeare Festival, 23<sup>rd</sup> April 1988), 2. Online: <http://theater.augent.be/file/14>. My thanks to Anetq Manciewicz for this reference. Perhaps one should distinguish between breaking into the play and breaking into the performance. In a 1970s production of *Macbeth* for the University of Natal (Pietermaritzburg) Dramatic Society, the part of Old Siward was played by a black colleague. At a performance for an all-black audience in Edendale, his line “Towards which advance the war” (5.4.21), accompanied by a drum-roll, evoked a roar of “Amandla!” from the audience, most of whom were high-school students with their texts of the play open before them, even those sitting on the floor. For a mythic (in the sense suggested here) reading of *Hamlet* in the particular circumstances of South Africa in the transition from apartheid to African National Congress rule, see Tony Voss, “Viva *Hamlet!* Viva!” in *Crux* 20.2 (1994): 1-14.

2. From “Myth (addendum)” in *The Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, ed. Paul Edwards (New York: MacMillan/Free Press), vol. 6, 467.

3. My argument owes a great deal to Wiegandt’s book, which I was privileged to review in *Shakespeare in Southern Africa* 25 (2013). See Peter Titlestad, “Hamlet the Populist Politician” in *Shakespeare in Southern Africa* 25 (2013): 43-50.

4. Titlestad, “Hamlet the Populist Politician”, 45-46.

5. *Ibid.*, 47.

his scope for action. Suggestions for performance, which concern particularly soliloquies and asides in which Hamlet addresses himself directly to the audience (especially, in the Elizabethan theatre, to the groundlings) as if present at Elsinore and “woos them from the stage” in order to win sympathy for his cause, offer a number of detailed instances of delivery and gesture which could “tilt the whole performance, sending ripples through the whole play”, including planting a claque in the audience.<sup>6</sup>

This argument has two important further implications for the performance of *Hamlet*. The first concerns mode: one line of the action of the play becomes a debate between Claudius and the Prince, so that the action has a rhetorical sequence of direct appeals to the audience, a war of words which Hamlet wins – at the cost of his own life and inheritance. Claudius enters the exchange first with his address to the court in Act 1 Scene 2. Hamlet only answers this directly in the soliloquy at the end of the scene, but he has already drawn the theatre audience into the court audience with his first line: “A little more than kin and less than kind.” (1.2.65) As the action progresses, Hamlet’s rhetorical initiative rises and falls with the advancement and delay of his tragic purpose. The histrionic subject matter of the soliloquy at the end of Act 2 Scene 2 invites a direct appeal to the audience, as does the fact that the audience shares Hamlet’s knowledge of the Ghost. Perhaps continuity is maintained by the echo of Hamlet’s opening line in “kindless villain” (2.2.583). The political status of the audience may be at issue in “To be or not to be” (3.1.56-89) but, equally significantly, Hamlet shares only with the audience what is both his most private and his most universal consideration. The advice to the players (3.2.1-46), if delivered with a special consciousness of the audience, suggests a “popular” rather than a “populist” politician, although Titlestad does at one point call Hamlet “both orator and educator in his relationship with his audience”.<sup>7</sup> If Claudius’ prayer in Act 3 Scene 4 enters the debate, it is his last chance, for his soliloquy at 4.3.61-71 commits him to villainy, and is answered by the hero’s appeal at 4.4.32-66. From this point on the rhetorical sequence matches the tragic. Claudius’s political rhetoric yields to the philosophical and heuristic rhetoric of Hamlet, which in turn gives way to the militaristic rhetoric of Fortinbras. In *Hamlet*, tragedy trumps rhetoric – whereas, Wiegandt argues, in *Julius Caesar* (recalled at moments in *Hamlet*), Shakespeare had seemed both to unite the Elizabethan audience and the Roman crowd and to rhetoricise the tragedy.<sup>8</sup>

The second implication of Titlestad’s argument concerns genre. If a performance is calling for the active, or at least audible, participation of the audience, there is no “fourth wall” and the element of ritual in the performance may be modified. The delivery of the play tends toward melodrama, not for Gothic spectacle and exaggerated sentiment, but for the nature of the audience’s involvement with the performance, for that energy which encourages spectators to cheer, boo and sigh, for an emotional commitment to the moment at least equal to suspension of disbelief. Melodrama in the conventional sense filled the popular theatre from the early nineteenth century when, it has been argued, the relationship between audience and stage approached once again what it had been in Shakespeare’s lifetime.<sup>9</sup> In 1883, Hall Caine proposed that “Shakespeare is not properly described as a tragedian, or comedian, or writer of farce, or writer of historical plays, or as all of these, but as what we now call a melodramatist – as almost the first and quite the greatest, of English melodramatists.”<sup>10</sup> Caine argues further that the distinction of melodrama was “to unite the principles of comedy and tragedy”.<sup>11</sup> Victor Hugo

6. *Ibid.*, 43.

7. *Ibid.*, 47. See also Chapter 1 of Annabel Patterson’s *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice*, “Caviar or the General: Hamlet and the Popular Theater” (Cambridge/Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), 13-31.

8. See Wiegandt, *Crowd and Rumour in Shakespeare* (Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate, 2012), 53-70.

9. See Patterson, *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice*, 17-18.

10. T. Hall Caine, “Two Aspects of Shakespeare’s Art” in *Contemporary Review* 43 (Jan-June 1883): 892.

11. *Ibid.*: 895.

had distinguished “*drame*” from both “*tragédie*” and “*comédie*”. Yet melodrama as an *occasion* involves not only a confusion of traditional genres but also an overlap of stage and theatre audience. The melodramatic option for *Hamlet* may thus make it difficult to avoid casting an actor “whose own presence overwhelms the mere character he inhabits”.<sup>12</sup>

These modal and generic implications suggest that it is wrong to accept, as Titlestad seems to do, Claudius’ judgment of the “multitude” as “distracted” (4.3.4), “muddied,/ Thick and unwholesome” (4.5.81-82), or to refer to them as Hamlet’s “mob”. Hamlet does not appear to subscribe to this political myth. Even Claudius, when the political chips are down, seems to acknowledge the capacity of choice in “the general gender” (4.7.18). As Victor Hugo said, and Yeats was fond of quoting, “In the theatre, the crowd becomes a people” (*Au théâtre la foule devient un peuple*). In writing of Hugo, Olivier Bara distinguishes between “un théâtre du peuple” and “un théâtre peuple”.<sup>13</sup> The distinction is difficult to reproduce in English, but may be reflected in the distinction between “the common people” on the one hand, and “the people” as in *vox populi* or *senatus populusque Romanus* on the other. Evidence of this emerges throughout Shakespeare’s oeuvre. Kai Wiegandt distinguishes between “mass ... a great number of people” and “crowd ... a group of people united by the bond of particular psychological mechanisms”.<sup>14</sup>

London and Rome together form the crucible of Shakespeare’s imagination of the multitude. The setting of *Hamlet* is the perhaps medieval fastness of Elsinore, rather than a city: the contrasting locales reflect contrasting energies of the crowd, imagined as a mob. The outside scenes are militaristic (battlements, Fortinbras’ road to Norway) and liminal (the graveyard). Some members of Shakespeare’s audience would recognise and be familiar with the intimate and courtly spaces of the castle, whereas the groundlings would be spying and eavesdropping on such scenes. If the crowd is always a function of space, in the city the threatening crowd spreads: from inside Elsinore the crowd threatens to intrude. So *Hamlet*, in this argument, even though it has no crowd scenes, is one in a sequence of plays in which the playwright’s sympathy for the common people is at issue: *2 Henry VI* (1590-1591), *Julius Caesar* (1599), *Hamlet* (c.1600), *Sir Thomas More* (1603-1604) and *Coriolanus* (1608).<sup>15</sup> In *Hamlet* the sympathy is embodied in a poetic (and musical) motif of folklore, popular belief, ballad measure and other strains.<sup>16</sup>

\*

The image of the crowd as monstrously “many-headed”, which derives from figures like Cerberus, Chimaera, Hydra or Briareus, is an essentially political, ‘post-mythic’ (on the analogy of ‘post-colonial’) figuration, a mythic construct in historical times. In Shakespeare’s plays it occurs only seldom. In *Coriolanus* its use is associated with the aristocratic hero and other patricians. The First Citizen reports that Martius “stuck not to call us the many-headed multitude” (2.3.17) and Martius tells his mother that “The beast/With many heads butts me away.” (4.1.1-2) Rumour in *2 Henry VI* sets to work on “the blunt monster with uncounted heads” (Induction 17). In that play, the contemptuous aristocratic view of the crowd is released by Cade’s rebellion. Eleanor suffers “the giddy multitude ... a rabble ... the envious multitude” (2.4.21-35). For Warwick they are “the rude multitude” (3.2.135). The Messenger reports Cade’s army as “a ragged multitude/Of hinds and peasants, rude and

12. Ira Hauptman, “Defending Melodrama” in *Melodrama (Themes in Drama 14)*, ed. James Redmond (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 286.

13. Olivier Bara, “National, Populaire, Universel: Tensions et contradictions d’un théâtre peuple chez Victor Hugo”, *Group Hugo*. Online: [www.groupugo.div.jussieu.fr](http://www.groupugo.div.jussieu.fr)

14. *Crowd and Rumour in Shakespeare*, 3.

15. The conjectural dates are those proposed by *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. Michael Dobson and Stanley Wells (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

16. See Voss, “Viva *Hamlet!* Viva!”.

merciless” (4.4.30-31).<sup>17</sup> There is a mythic political narrative, indeed a political myth, behind the aristocrats’ disdain – human beings are not created equal, and it is providentially ordained that the few control the many: “A political myth is always the myth of a particular group. It has as its hero or protagonist, not an individual, but a tribe, a nation, a race, a class or even a chance collection of exiles and immigrants.”<sup>18</sup>

When the many-headed monster loses contact with its leader, it has no head. In the words of Eleanor: “The commons, like an angry hive of bees,/ That want their leader, scatter up and down/And care not who they sting.” (2 *Henry VI* 3.2.125-127) This pre-logical thinking issues in such monarchical propaganda as the Tudor myth and the divine right of kings, as Canterbury argues for “The act of order in a peopled kingdom” in *Henry V* (1.2.184-189). Naturally, this positive image of the leader/crowd relationship recurs in the plays. Bassanio evokes the image as he tries to marshal his emotions in response to Portia’s gift of the ring (*Merchant of Venice* 3.2.177-183). Angelo, stricken by his desire for Isabella and feeling his blood rush to his heart, thinks of “The general subject to a well-wish’d king” (*Measure for Measure* 2.4.20-30). Even a devoted populace needs crowd control. The Archbishop in 2 *Henry VI* claims that he and his fellows have been contorted into the mutant of rebellion: “The time misorder’d doth, in common sense,/ Crowd us and crush us to this monstrous form/To hold our safety up.” (4.2.33-35) The “Hydra son of war” (38) is born of the (usurper) monarch’s “scorn” (37) for the rebels’ grievances. Surrender of individuality to the crowd may, then, be experienced as voluntary or involuntary. In either case the state or the ruling class seeks to control and engage the multitude, which is the mass in action.<sup>19</sup> Shakespeare sets these responses in a context of particular historical moments, turning points at which continuing social instability finds violent manifestation, so that the interpretation of events in the terms of political mythology remains with the individual characters and interest groups rather than being justified by or energising the action of any play as a whole.

In a number of plays, Shakespeare sets the image of the multitude from the political myth of the ruling class against the appearance and action on stage of the multitude themselves, in what are usually called “crowd scenes”. Following Wiegandt, I wish to suggest, first, that 2 *Henry VI*, *Julius Caesar*, *Hamlet*, *Sir Thomas More* and *Coriolanus* are realistic in their presentation of mass action:

Shakespeare portrays violent crowd behaviour in order to balance the impression of a deliberate, self-aware and orchestrated class action that would have made identification of the popular audience with the rebels too easy. The remarkable plastic illustration of crowd behaviour and the horror and cruelty connected with it are pitted against the justified cause of rebellion.<sup>20</sup>

Second, I would argue that they form a sequence of intensifying popular sympathy but end in political disillusionment. The crowd, as the multitude in action, is a function of space, as Shakespeare’s use of “crowd” as a verb indicates, and the space is usually urban. The crowd scenes of these plays are set in London or Rome but register “the incursion of the times into the play[s]”, mythically or not.

2 *Henry VI* is a drama of betrayal. The circle of aspirants to the crown of the gentle and pious king plot and counter-plot in a bewildering sequence. Random violence is not the

17. These examples perhaps help to distinguish between “the multitude” (the commoners generally) and “a multitude” (a particular crowd).

18. Henry Tudor, *Political Myth* (London: Pall Mall, 1972): 139.

19. These implications of “crowd” (French *foule*) animate *refoulement* (“pressing back, driving back, forcing back”), as in the 1951 Refugee Convention which forbids “*refoulement*” of asylum seekers to face the danger of prosecution. See World Socialist Web Site (WSWS): <http://www.wsws.org/>.

20. *Crowd and Rumour in Shakespeare*, 44.

prerogative solely of Cade's army.<sup>21</sup> Cade has been suborned by York to exploit the unhappy commons already distressed by the death of their Protector Gloucester, and baying for the blood of his murderer Suffolk. The nobles' image of the multitude as monstrous precedes, perhaps even as a cause, Cade's rebellion. To judge from what is today left of his record, Shakespeare's Cade is a real achievement: historically placed, a recognisable politically opportunistic type, sketched both so as to achieve character and retain mystery. His immediate lieutenants both see through his pretensions and prompt him to his most violent intentions and actions (4.2.1-79). In defeat he accepts wryly the fickleness of his followers, as they rally to Clifford's call to be "pressed" into fighting in France for the son of Henry V: "Was ever feather so lightly blown to and fro as this multitude?" (4.7.54) And yet, dying at the hands of Iden, Cade claims to have been killed by "famine" (4.10.59 and 74), which at least reminds us of an understandable motive for rebellion and commotion.

In *Julius Caesar* the crowd is more clearly brought on to the stage in dialogue, as it were, with those in authority. It is not certain that Flavius the tribune's judgment of the commoners in the opening scene is just: "See where their basest mettle be not moved./ They vanish tongue-tied in their guiltiness." (1.1.62-63) In the next scene we hear the commoners off-stage: their desire "to see Caesar and rejoice in his triumph" (1.1.32) is fulfilled and the tribunes are "put to silence" (1.2.285). Casca's images of the people recall those of the tribunes, and in a sense already compromise the conspiracy. After the murder the crowd's sympathies shift from the rationalising, even prosaic rhetoric of Brutus to Antony's call to arms and anarchy, sweetened by the terms of Caesar's will. The dramatic role of the crowd of plebeians ends with their dragging Cinna the poet to his death. (3.3.38) The scene is ironically followed by the Triumvirate "pricking down" their enemies. As riot shades into civil war, the people can once again expect to be pressed into military service on one side or the other. Wiegandt argues that *Julius Caesar's* self-conscious awareness of acting and theatre, in imagery and characterisation, goes together with a kind of daring that incorporates the theatre audience into the stage crowd. There is an overlap here between rhetoric and theatre. From the point of view of Sidney in *An Apologie for Poetrie*, for example, rhetoric was encroaching on poetry. Shakespeare and other dramatists were able to incorporate rhetoric (and its arts) into their plays. Where rhetoric dominates the public action of *Julius Caesar*, poetry seems to retreat into the more intimate moments like those between Brutus and Portia or Lucius.

Scholarly opinion seems to be that fewer than 200 lines of *Sir Thomas More* are by Shakespeare.<sup>22</sup> Nonetheless, Brooke is right that this is a "fine play".<sup>23</sup> Its crowd scenes are significant to and harmonised with the tragic trajectory of More, and its image of "the people" gives the sense of a sequence of plays which can be read as consciously developing and perhaps sophisticating Shakespeare's political imaginary. As the play opens, strangers bully and exploit the native Londoners, invoking the authority of the Ambassador as holding sway over that of the Mayor. Lincoln has "drawne a (bill) of our wrongs and the straungers insolencies" (1.1.114), to be read from the pulpit at the Spittle sermons, preached on Easter Monday and Tuesday.<sup>24</sup> George Bettes suggests something pagan and more sinister: "on May day next in the morning wee le goe foorth a Maying, but make it the wurst May day for the straungers that ever they saw". (1.1.164-16) Once the bill has been published, the nobles' apprehensions of danger are fulfilled by news of "uproar" (1.3.75) and "rebellious route" (85). Palmer has criticised the "Men of ... place and greatnesse" (65) for not informing the King, who would have been sympathetic

21. See Margaret Owens, "The Many-Headed Monster in *Henry VI*, Part 2" in *Criticism* 38.3 (Summer 1996): 367-82.

22. See Michael Dobson and Stanley Wells, *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*, 433 and C. F. Tucker Brooke, *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* (1908) (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), xlix.

23. Brooke, *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*, xlvii.

24. All quotations from *Sir Thomas More* are in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*.

to the citizens and redressed their wrongs (64-70). To calm the people Surrey suggests calling on More, whose trick to save the life of Lifter the cutpurse has already (1.2) suggested his “especiall favour with the people” (1.3.88). The May Day “commotion” intensifies from cudgels to swords and even Lincoln, the drafter of the bill, calls on his fellows to “fier the houses” (2.2.80). The rebels have released prisoners from the Counters and Newgate when More, who realises that it is time for “force or parley” (2.3.17) receives the King’s request to intervene. The rebels, led by Lincoln, are at their most defiant as More arrives: “we accept of the kings mercy, but we will shoue no mercy upon the straungers.” (2.4.30-32)<sup>25</sup> More has already given an account of the “mutinie” which parallels the plot up to this point (2.3.43-50) and underlines his sympathy for the commoners; he will be the “one, to calme our private foes/With breath of gravitie, not dangerous blowes!” (51-52)

Lincoln, whose story parallels the hero’s, leads the calls for silence to enable More to address the crowd. More opens his dialogue with a characteristically witty equivocation, “what you do offend you cry upon,/That is the peace” (80-81): without peace they would not be human. The crowd, in an appeal that must have reached out to the theatre audience and vividly evokes the refugees of any era, is asked to imagine “the removing of the straungers” (90). The citizens, in the persons of Lincoln and Doll, acknowledge that to harass the others makes them liable to the predations of “other ruffians” (104). More, asking them to consider that the “ynnovation” (115)<sup>26</sup> defies both authority and God himself, calls for submission and repentance, and asks the commoners to imagine themselves banished, in “the straungers case” (161). Yielding on the perhaps slim assurance that “mercy maie be found/Yf you so seek”(171-2), the rebels are despatched to prison as Shrewsbury exits to report to the King, prevent further unrest and pick up any remaining mutineers.

In the event the Council’s decision, the Sheriff’s “too forward” (3.1.140) initiative, and bureaucratic delay mean death for Lincoln. Doll is saved from the gallows by Surrey’s message of royal pardon, but her colleague’s death has already betrayed the people’s trust in the assurance of mercy given by More, who is not present at the execution. There is a break in the action as the plot focuses on the hero from this point, forgetting the May Day insurrection, but More goes to his beheading as “the best freend that the poore ere had” (5.1.43). Both More and the people are betrayed by the monarchy.

*Coriolanus* is also a tragedy of treachery and betrayal. The “mutinous citizens” (1.1.1) are scorned by the patricians and by their own tribunes; the mutiny, prompted by famine and usury, and ready to resist military impressment, is both systemic and contingent. If the theatre audience, which this play seems to move towards incorporating into the action, like the on-stage commoners at moments, is in a transitional state, “no longer a mass, not yet an active crowd”, then this distinctive energy seems to be even more powerfully exploited here than in *Julius Caesar* – we can understand why *Coriolanus* has been so amenable to modern-dress adaptation: “the tragedy consists in the autonomous citizens’ degeneration into a destructive mob”.<sup>27</sup> Martius and the citizens bring out the worst in each other, while the play, as Wiegandt argues, also raises an anarchistic “vision of the sovereignty of the masses that does not rely on representation”.<sup>28</sup> There is pathos in the denouement of *Coriolanus*, but there is evidence too of thoroughgoing political disillusion, recalling *2 Henry VI*, so that in this sequence of plays, disillusion overtakes sympathy for the people.

25. Lines 1-172 of this scene (Act 2 Scene 4) “have been attributed with the greatest confidence to Shakespeare” (*Ibid.*, 436).

26. That is, revolution(cf. *1HenryIV* 5.1.78). More, invoking “thapostle” (2.4.116), may be thinking of Romans 13:1.

27. *Crowd and Rumour in Shakespeare*, 4 and 97.

28. *Ibid.*, 38.

Shakespeare's crowd scenes are realistically, one might say naturalistically, developed. They present popular protest, riot or commotion in history in a way that is lifelike and yet in a way in which we could not see them in nature itself.<sup>29</sup> In my view Shakespeare does not subscribe to any "anti-popular myth" or "anti-democratic mythology".<sup>30</sup> Neither Brents Stirling's diagnosis of Shakespeare's attitude toward the mob – "massed humanity is simian" – nor Brooke's – "half good-natured laughter, half scorn and distrust" – seems to me to be borne out by these plays.<sup>31</sup> (A crowd is not always a mob.) The myth of the multitude rests always with individual characters, and Shakespeare's crowds, acting differently in different circumstances, are themselves animated by myth on occasion.<sup>32</sup> Shakespeare's image of the people is much more like that of the artist Parrhasius, whose

picture of the people of Athens [*demos Atheniense*] ... shows ingenuity in treating the subject, since he displayed them as fickle, choleric, unjust and variable, but also placable and merciful and compassionate, boastful ... lofty and humble, fierce and timid – and all these at the same time.<sup>33</sup>

In *2 Henry IV*, Feeble, the women's tailor, is pressed into the anonymity of Falstaff's army, a fate that hovers over many of the common people who make up the crowds in the sequence of plays I have discussed. Feeble is saved from battle, but his great *moriturus* is nonetheless betrayed by the politicians, including Falstaff (2.3.157-8, 233-237 and 239). Ultimately, the sympathies of the playwright are with Feeble.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Christopher. "Fields of Vision". *Review (The Weekend Australian)*, 16-17 March 2013: 12-13.
- Bara, Olivier. "National, Populaire, Universel: Tensions et contradictions d'un théâtre peuple chez Victor Hugo". *Group Hugo*. Online: [www.groupugo.div.jussieu.fr](http://www.groupugo.div.jussieu.fr).
- Brooke, C. F. Tucker, ed. *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* (1908). Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.
- Caine, T. Hall. "Two Aspects of Shakespeare's Art". *Contemporary Review* 43 (Jan-June 1883): 883-900.
- Dobson, Michael and Wells, Stanley. *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Edwards, Paul, ed. *The Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: MacMillan/Free Press, 2005.
- Gabrieli, Vittorio, and Melchiori, Giorgio, eds. *Sir Thomas More*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990.
- Hauptman, Ira. "Defending Melodrama". *Melodrama (Themes in Drama 14)*, ed. James Redmond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, 281-92.
- Hinks, Roger. *Myth and Allegory in Ancient Art*. London: The Warburg Institute, 1939.
- MacPhail, Clark. *The Myth of the Madding Crowd*. New York: de Gruyter, 1991.
- Müller, Heiner. "Shakespeare a Difference". Speech given at the Weimar Shakespeare Festival, 23<sup>rd</sup> April 1988. Online: <http://theater.augent.be/file/14>.
- Owens, Margaret E. "The Many-Headed Monster in *Henry VI*, Part 2". *Criticism* 38.3 (Summer 1996): 367-82.
- Patterson, Annabel. *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice*. Cambridge/Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.

---

29. See Christopher Allen, "Fields of Vision" in *Review (The Weekend Australian)*, 16-17 March 2013: 13.

30. Annabel Patterson, *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice* (Cambridge/Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), 1 and 9.

31. Stirling in Patterson, *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice*, 9 and Brooke, *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*, lii.

32. See Georges Sorel on violence and myth in *The Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* vol. 9, 133-34.

33. Pliny, *Natural History*, trans. H. Rackham (London and Cambridge: Heinemann / Harvard

- Pliny. *Natural History*, trans. H. Rackham. London and Cambridge: Heinemann / Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works*, ed. Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson and David Scott Kastan. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2001.
- Titlestad, Peter. "Hamlet the Populist Politician". *Shakespeare in Southern Africa* 25 (2013), 43-50.
- Tudor, Henry. *Political Myth*. London: Pall Mall, 1972.
- Voss, Tony. "The Tongued Monster" (Review of *Crowd and Rumour in Shakespeare*). *Shakespeare in Southern Africa* 25 (2013): 107-10.
- . "Viva Hamlet! Viva!". *Crux* 20.2 (1994): 1-14.
- Wiegandt, Kai. *Crowd and Rumour in Shakespeare*. Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate, 2012.