

**THE SOLDIER AND THE SCIENTIST:
A COMPARATIVE READING OF SHAKESPEARE'S
CORIOLANUS
AND IBSEN'S *AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE***

ADRIANA RĂDUCANU

Yeditepe University, Istanbul

Abstract: In this comparative study, I shall discuss William Shakespeare's "Coriolanus" and Henrik Ibsen's "An Enemy of the People". The focus will be placed on the rift between the individual and the community, or between the 'right' of the one vs the 'might' of the many. Notwithstanding the different contexts, this is a conflict that in both plays generates a strong sense of social satire, followed by the unavoidable tragedy of the alienated individual.

Keywords: democracy, individual, multitude, satire, tragedy

1. Introduction

In 1936, A.E. Zucker connected Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* and Ibsen's *Brand*, describing the two protagonists as "spiritually so closely akin" (qtd. in Koht 1945: 85), in view of their shared despisal of the "multitude", albeit for different reasons. Coriolanus emphasizes the birth privilege that comes with the noble background, while Brand is a relentless promoter of the "leadership of advanced and clear-sighted individuals" (Koht 1945: 85). Koht (ibid.) refuted the Brand-Coriolanus similarities, but elaborated on Zucker's alternative theory, which situates Coriolanus and Dr Stockmann on the same axis. Harold Clarke Goddard (1960: 235) briefly noticed that, in *An Enemy of the People*, Ibsen may have been inspired by *Coriolanus* and pointed out that centuries cannot "alter" the substance of "the eternal petty politician". The similarity between some aspects of the two plays was later noticed by Van Laan (1986: 302-303), who pointed out that Dr Stockmann's confrontation with his townspeople in Act IV faithfully mirrors Act III of Shakespeare's play, when, in a bid to become consul, Coriolanus is compelled to ask for the people's and the tribunes' votes in the marketplace. Stockmann's remarks on how his foes should be extinguished closely resemble Coriolanus' intention to erase Rome. Similarly, Knutsson's (1993: 169) close-reading of Dr Stockmann's tirade about "the humanity before him", reduced to the "status of mixed breed barnyard fowl and mongrelized dogs", culminating in the shouted beliefs that "a society based on lies – lies by his definition - should be utterly destroyed" also calls to mind Coriolanus' destructive outbursts. Dr Stockmann's various self-serving visitors in the final act who try to convince him to change his mind about the baths is similar to the emissaries who attempt to

change Coriolanus' mind about sacking Rome. Finally, but not least importantly, Stockmann's vague plans about emigrating to America recall Coriolanus' verbal correction of his banishment in the famous phrase: "There is a world elsewhere" (III.3.137).

Undeniably, in *Coriolanus*, the Roman tribunes together with some of the most hostile plebeians anticipate the plethora of politicians, landowners, and media representatives of the small provincial town in Ibsen's play. Between them, they thwart the individual, who is prevented from fulfilling his professional destiny and either tragically loses his life or reaches a stage of spiritual empowerment which compels him to stand alone and attempt to resist the hostile societal maelstrom. The present study will focus on this rift between the individual and the community, or between 'right' and 'might', drawing attention to the hazards of democracy, which may sometimes annihilate the individual and install the tyranny of the majority. Notwithstanding the different contexts, in both plays the conflict between the 'professional' (soldier or scientist) and the 'laymen' generates a strong sense of social satire, followed by the (more or less) unavoidable tragedy/fall of the alienated individual. As an introductory theoretical framework, the first part of this study will offer a brief survey of the problematic aspects of democracy as rendered in (primarily) Plato's *Republic*, Polybius, J.S. Mill and Oscar Wilde; the focus will be on displaying the faults of a system which may come into conflict with the individual and his abilities.

In the following sections, I will argue that Coriolanus and Dr Stockmann evade and transgress a contemporary 'politically correct' character assessment. Their passionate self-esteem mark them as social pariahs if valued by the standards of our (more or less) egalitarian era, but render them fine literary conceptualizations of virtues considered pivotal either at an earlier date (Sophoclean/Homeric in the case of *Coriolanus*), or incomprehensible to the laymen (the nineteenth century growing reputation of science/scientists in the case of *An Enemy of the People*). In rejecting the mainstream critical verdict on Shakespeare and Ibsen's protagonists, I do not simply advocate a nostalgic return to 'hero-worship'; instead, my confessed aim is to avoid what Whitman (1982: 47-8) aptly labeled:

a low brand of dramatic criticism...which offers solutions such as: If Oedipus had only controlled his temper better, he would not have come to grief; or, Othello could have saved himself a great deal of trouble if he had been less naïve. These tasteless vulgarisms...destroy the play rather than elucidate it.

2. From Plato to Wilde: or the conflict between the individual and the masses

This section will pinpoint some of the most problematic (within the scope of this study) aspects of different forms of government. Classical antiquity places Plato as the first thinker to touch upon such issues. As the mouthpiece for the his master's political philosophy, arguably because of his emotional investment (the (in)famous execution of Socrates under Democracy), Plato is most critical of Democracy; thus, he perceives it as plagued by a stringent disparity between ideals and their actualization and as setting the stage for the tyranny either of one or the many. Therefore, he shows how the instauration of Democracy brought on by the revolt of the masses against the wealthy minority results in "excessive freedom"

(Plato 2000: 564a) which morphs into a generalized lack of duties and responsibilities: “Where there is liberty, then obviously each person can arrange his own life within the city in whatever way pleases him” (idem: 557b). Democracy also fosters an absolute lack of compulsion, for example, those competent to rule will not be called to do so, nor will the warriors be compelled to fight when the city is at war (idem: 557e). The force of whim comes to regulate behaviour: “[...] even if there’s a law stopping you holding office or being a member of a jury, there’s nothing to stop you holding office and being a member of jury anyway if that’s how the mood takes you” (ibid.). Most significantly, Plato emphasizes democracy as a system which supports the erasure of any hierarchical distinctions: “A father, for example, gets used to being like a child and being afraid of his sons”; “teachers are afraid of their pupils and curry favour with them”; “the young are the image of their elders and challenge them in everything they say and do” (idem: 563a); it is impossible to tell the ruler from the ruled, “whether in public or in private” (idem: 562e). Most significantly, Plato argues that the excesses of freedom enjoyed by man in democracy lead to the rise of tyranny:

What is the beginning of the change from a leader into a tyrant? Or is it clear that when the leader begins to do the same thing as in the myth which is spoken about the temple of the Lykaian Zeus in Arcadia ... how the man tasting human organs cut up with organs of other sacrificial animals necessarily becomes a wolf. (idem: 565e)

This particularly gory mythological example, used to signify the end of democracy, is to be read in the context of the establishment of radical equality (conceived as complete lack of hierarchical distinctions) and a climate in which animals and humans are treated in the same way. In this manner, people, convinced that they are not bound to respect gods, that they do not need gods, end up by committing degenerate acts of irreverent and distasteful anthropophagy. Furthermore, as Saxonhouse (1998: 281) points out, tyranny appropriates democratic principles and reveals the obscurity to which a government that disregards *eidê* (form) leads, once the vehemence of unleashed appetites, passions, and desires takes over. Interestingly, this resonates with Shakespeare’s own portrayal of the problematic aspects of democracy (and its potential to turn into tyranny) in *Troilus and Cressida*: “Then everything includes itself in power, / Power into will, will into appetite, / And appetite, as universal wolf, / So doubly seconded with will and power, / Must make perforce an universal prey/And eat up himself” (I.3.119-124).

Building on Plato’s views of democracy as a flawed form of government, Polybius (online) coined the term ‘ochlocracy’ (mob-rule), in the second century. He saw it as a degeneration of democracy, brought about by excess and disregard of the laws by the masses. Centuries later, John Stuart Mill’s 1859 *On Liberty* was also critical of the tyranny of the majority, with its accompanying “tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling” which he claimed “was more harmful and more difficult to be protected from than the individual tyrant’s rule” (Mill 1859: 7). In his notorious *The Soul of Man under Socialism*, Oscar Wilde also displays his highly critical views on democracy, which he considers the worst possible form of government, in fact assimilating it with tyranny:

There are three kinds of despots. There is the despot who tyrannizes over the body. There is the despot who tyrannizes over the soul. There is the despot who tyrannizes

over the soul and body alike. The first is called the Prince. The second is called the Pope. The third is called the People. (Wilde1994: 1193)

As this succinct survey of the shortcomings of democracy has briefly emphasized, Plato, Polybius, Mill, and Wilde are thinkers who, albeit belonging to different chronologies and geographies, share remarkably similar views: they all see democracy's potential to degenerate into the tyranny of one or the many. In the following sections, I will reveal how Shakespeare's and Ibsen's protagonists – admittedly heroes that frequently test the limits of sympathy/empathy - are sacrificed to appease the clamouring voices of the multitude who ask for their demise.

3. Protagonists

3.1. Shakespeare's soldier

Shakespeare's tragedy features the Roman general Caius Martius, whose soldierly merits gain him the cognomen Coriolanus after crushing the Volscians' army. The Senate nominates him for consulship, but he fails to win the people's vote (for the second time), so he is banished from Rome. Without a homeland and without allies, he finds unexpected refuge with his sworn enemy, Tullius Aufidius, general of the Volscian army. They become allies and plan to attack Rome. However, persuaded by his mother Volumnia, and by his wife Virgilia, Coriolanus abandons his revenge plans, spares Rome, but is killed by the Volscians, manipulated by his new-found ally in retaliation for his betrayal.

Coriolanus is the Shakespearean play which has most generated an unenthusiastic critical reception. Derek Traversi (qtd. in Wainstein 1993: 16) notices that "*Coriolanus* never satisfied the critics. Most of them have felt that it stands in some way apart from the main body of Shakespeare's work". Brecht's adaptation and criticism is seen by Scofield (1990: 324) as an attempt to "tidy-up" Shakespeare's play; furthermore, Brecht blames the "cult of the hero in 'bourgeois' drama", "particularly in Shakespeare" as the main responsible for "what was wrong with current drama both socially and aesthetically" (idem: 322). Even Harold Bloom, the contemporary critic best-known for his love of Shakespeare, acknowledges that: "That Coriolanus is not totally unsympathetic (whatever one's politics), [...] is a Shakespearean triumph" (qtd. in Hiltzik 2017). At this juncture, I would argue that all the above critical evaluations make distinctive demands on the readers: firstly, they require familiarity with Plutarch's considerably more obnoxious Coriolanus and with it a certain effacement of Shakespeare's 'adaptation'. Secondly, they imply that the conflict between the individual and the masses can only be solved on an egalitarian basis, with both parties willing to submit to a compromise-glorifying political game. I contend that this hypothetical agreement would not only displace the play as a tragedy, but it would unravel the protagonist's sense of identity and moral essence, which do not draw their substance from 'bowing' to the demands of the changing times and people.

Most obvious to readers familiarized with Greek epic poems and tragedies, Coriolanus belongs to the Homeric/Sophoclean family, which counts Achilles, Antigone, and Ajax among its members. In such literary masterpieces, the main conflict is that between the hero and the non-heroic community which, after preventing him/her from fulfilling his/her potential, turns against him/her in an act

of collective violence and kills him/her. Similarly to these other archetypal heroes, trapped in an unredeemable tragic situation, Coriolanus is also a victim of the clash between private integrity and communal duty. As Wainstein (1993: 21) points out, the most significant characteristic of the Sophoclean tragic hero is *arête*, a concept which goes beyond the limits of integrity, “perhaps best expressed as a comprehensive heroic distinction”, “an inherent condition and an absolute [...] an immutable state of being, a constant in dynamic and developing dramatic situation”, which enables the authentic hero not to surrender to circumstances “without significant, critical compromise and consequent loss of tragic stature”. In Coriolanus’ words: ‘Let them pull about mine ears, present me/Death on the wheel or at wild horses’ heels; [...] yet will I still/Be thus to them’ (III.2.1-6). As the fundamental virtue, born from the dark currents of a nonrational demand for absolutes, *arête* establishes an interesting rapport with the other features of the tragic hero. It preserves the Aristotelian *megalopsychia* (magnanimity), since Coriolanus is acknowledged by friends and foes alike as a generous war hero, constant in his refusal to reclaim for himself any of the battle spoils. On the other hand, *arête* problematizes *hamartia*, the other significant characteristic of the tragic hero. The fall, seen as the actualization of the personal *hamartia*, does not occur, since what is perceived as intolerable pride by all the others (his own mother included) to Coriolanus is, basically, constancy of character and refusal to embrace the temporary opportunity for political advancement at the cost of moral integrity. The Roman plebeians, on the other hand, justify their hatred of Coriolanus in view of his pride which, in their eyes, validates whatever punishment they decide to inflict on him.

As Cantor (1976: 34) argues, the patrician anger/pride opposes the plebeian appetite/eros and thus sets the tragic hero apart from the rest of Rome. Coriolanus, labelling the plebeians’ non-heroic demands as ‘A sick man’s appetite, who desires most that/Which would increase his evil’ (I.1.176-79), upholds an irreconcilable rift between health and pestilence. In this context, his attempt to recast the masses’ appetites as pride and employ it on the battlefield, in the service of the city, proves futile and the challenge dies unheeded: ‘Nay, let them follow. / The Volsces have much corn: take these rats thither, / To gnaw their garners. Worshipful mutiners, / Your valour puts well forth: pray follow.’ (I.1.249-250).

The powerful contrast between Coriolanus’ austerity, viewed as “spiritedness” (Cantor 1976: 37), and his fellows citizens’ conviviality, as “eros” (ibid.) reaches its peak after his banishment. Sicinius, one of the two tribunes/artisans of Coriolanus’s expulsion, remarks on the warrior’s wrong “remedies” in the time of “the present peace” and “quietness of the people”; without his austere presence, the tradesmen give themselves to “singing in their shops and going about their functions friendly” (IV.6.1-9). Interestingly, this idyllic depiction of daily life in a Rome without Coriolanus anticipates Tocqueville’s (2000: 661-665) remarks about people being actively engaged in the “pursuit of wealth and material comfort” and in the re-fashioning of courage as self-interest; this dominant feature of democratic societies, while generating peaceful virtues which enable the pursuit of wealth, devalue “intellectual and artistic excellence”, drawing most men “to commercial and industrial careers”. In this context, Coriolanus’ ‘excellence’ as a warrior is therefore disqualified by the emphasis on the economic factor. In Cantor’s words (1976: 34): “Coriolanus evidently is bad for trade in Rome since his proud austerity interferes with the “friendly functioning” of the city. If his pride is to be viewed as *the* Roman trait, Sicinius thinks that Rome would do well to

dispense with Romanness.” As a play, *Coriolanus* explores the collapse of the differentiation of the public and private interests. In times of war, “private interests must be sacrificed for the sake of common good [...]”; ironically, Sicinius’ account of the city omits at least one function, that of the warrior” (Cantor 1976: 33-35). Thus, *Coriolanus*, the trained professional, will be tragically prevented from fulfilling his function as the permanent defender of Rome by the “fickle mob”, sentenced him to death on page two of the play, in an episode which anachronistically recalls the later Stalinist show (non)trials.

Ironically, the sense of peace and friendliness shared by the Romans who feel free to indulge their appetites in the absence of the uncompromising soldier is but a temporary respite; Rome will find itself under threat of an invasion by its former defender (turned expelled warrior), and his Volscian ally. As Wainstein (1993: 269) argues, *Coriolanus*’ much-criticized resolve to go against Rome, and fight “against [his] cank’red country” (IV.5.88-92), is not an egotistical, malevolent act, but the Sophoclean hero’s typical response to blatant humiliation or injustice. Moreover, “the received Greek maxim”, to “benefit thy friends, and hurt thy foes” (Jebb qtd. in Wainstein 1993: 269) can no longer prevent *Coriolanus*’ Achillean, all-destructive wrath because he has no friends left; his final decision to spare the city at the cost of his own life is a response to a mother’s virulently political plea and a wife’s eloquent silence.

3.2. Ibsen’s scientist

As Meyer (1971: 500) explains, the plot of Ibsen’s *An Enemy of the People* had its origin in two actual incidents. Alfred Meisner, a young German poet whom Ibsen had known in Munich, told him how, when his father was a medical officer at the spa of Teplitz in the eighteen-thirties, there was an outbreak of cholera, which the doctor felt it was his duty to make known publicly. As a result, the season was ruined, the citizens stoned the doctor’s house, and forced him to flee the town.

Ibsen’s play, an example of environmentally inflected literature, features Dr Stockmann, a scientist who, after discovering that the water of the baths in his town are teeming with dangerous bacteria, decides to inform the people about it, to protect the public health. As the baths are an important source of revenue for the town, their closing until necessary improvements are made will be very costly and require the raising of taxes. At first, several of the town’s leading men, like Hovstad, the town paper’s editor, and Aslaksen, the head of the Householders’ Association, support the Doctor and his discovery. Nevertheless, the Doctor’s own brother, the Town Mayor, manages to swiftly turn the entire town against him; thus, Dr Stockmann is left to face the reactions of a public, whom he reprimands in an impassionate sermon, for the corruption and the ignorance plaguing the complacent majority. Alone, jobless, and homeless, carrying the burdens of a *pater familias*, the Doctor is paradoxically reinvigorated by this ‘banishment’ and decides to start a school in which to educate the poor.

Neither a comedy nor a tragedy, Ibsen’s drama inspired various critical readings; “a realistic social problem comedy” (Van Laan 1986: 99), “a genuine comedy of uncommon merit” (Knutson 1993:174), an intricate network of classical allusions, as revealed by “Athenian details beneath the imagery of modernism” (Johnston 1979: 109). Although not without merit, the critical view of the play as

comedy should not exclude a different perspective. As Vaan Laan (1986: 101) notices, Ibsen's plays demonstrate "a non-explicit, deep-structural allusion suggesting contemporary middle-class action is as legitimate for tragedy as the more heroic action of the famous tragic drama it implicitly echoes".

Zwart (2004: 349) also supports this darker reading of the play, when he notices that the protagonist is moulded on the archetype of the whistle blower, a scientist who "quickly finds himself transformed from a public benefactor into a political outcast by those in power"; the drama is thus a canvas on which the ethical and epistemological are cleverly interwoven, stressing the difficulties of communicating scientific (microbiological) data to the general public. In his sanitized adaptation of Ibsen's play, Arthur Miller (1977: 9) similarly emphasized the rift between the trained professional and the laymen, drawing attention to the story "of a scientist who discovers an evil and, innocently believing that he has done a service to humanity, expects that he will at least be thanked". In the absence of the recognition of the hero's abilities, which is replaced by mass-ostracization, the fragile foundations of democracy are exposed, generating the poignant question: "what does one do in a democracy when the majority is wrong - totally, incontrovertibly, unquestionably wrong?" (Lambert 1965: 628). Ibsen's play does not provide a practical solution to this dilemma, but it bears testimony to its existence, thus avoiding – similarly to Shakespeare – the ideological trap of lionising vulgar populism.

As previously mentioned, Ibsen's protagonist is initially willing to share his scientific discovery with his townsmen in the hope that he will convince them of the necessity of closing the baths down. This rather naïve (although laudable) enthusiasm is justifiable in the context of the play's publication date. As Zwart (2004: 353) pertinently argues, by the nineteenth century "the typical literary profile of the physician had recently changed", leaving behind Molière's so-called men of science, actually "buffoons", obsessed with "grand, obsolete theories and academic disputes", and redundant translations of the obvious diagnosis into scholarly Latin. The nineteenth century novel, with some notable exceptions such as Charles Bovary, had redressed this caricatural aspect of the physician who "had come to play a much more serious role", that of a specialized individual, able and entitled by his training to detect and perceive truths and minutiae that escaped the unqualified eye.

Although written in the climate of growing trust in the trained professionals' expertise, Ibsen nevertheless opts for capitalising on the resilient reticence of the laymen to accept the verdict of the scientist. Thus, before long, Dr Stockmann learns that his professional/ethical convictions are planting discord within the community and that his findings (plain, clear and scientifically neutral) are either manipulated by or manage to antagonize the whole political spectrum. His brother, the town Mayor, wishes for a "good summer" when, he hopes, the increasing number of visitors taking the baths will make him quite a profit. Hovstad, the radical journalist, sees the scientific discovery as a "favourable opportunity of emancipating the humble, down-trodden Masses!" Thus, water pollution stops being a "scientific observation" and becomes "political metaphor" instead (Zwart 2004: 356). The left-wingers see science as a means to advocate for the cleaning of society's 'polluted swamp', whereas the right-wingers, interested in maintaining the *status-quo* (and the money that goes with it) perceive Stockmann as "an educated hooligan who misuses his data and scientific prestige to satisfy his desire for anarchy and turmoil" (ibid.).

Stockmann himself demonstrates a curious incapacity/unwillingness to compromise. This is perhaps excusable in the context of his profession: convinced of the correctitude of his (verified) reports, he fails to see how facts can be bent into interpretation and turned into a game of dishonest political hermeneutics. Hence, he follows into the footsteps of Coriolanus, his Shakespearean predecessor and, equally exasperated with the political machinations that he refuses to become a part of, manages to alienate many readers and critics with the “elitist strain of his speeches” (Lindholdt 2001: 55). Although there is no way of knowing how much of Shakespeare’s own views are articulated by his Coriolanus (Keats’ ‘negative capability’ comes to mind), in Ibsen’s case the rapport between author and character is better documented. The Norwegian playwright confessed his half-hearted allegiance to his character’s views: “Dr Stockmann and I get along so splendidly with one another; we are so much in agreement on so many things; but the Doctor is more muddle-headed than I am [. . .]” (qtd. in Van Laan 1986: 102).

Undeniably, Dr Stockmann is one angry scientist whose irate speeches idealize Social Darwinism and go as far as suggesting eugenics:

The common people are nothing more than the raw material of which a People is made. (Groans, laughter and uproar.) Well, isn’t that the case? Isn’t there an enormous difference between a well-bred and an ill-bred strain of animals? Take, for instance, a common barn-door hen. What sort of eating do you get from a shrivelled up old scrag of a fowl like that? Not much, do you! And what sort of eggs does it lay? A fairly good crow or a raven can lay pretty nearly as good an egg. But take a well-bred Spanish or Japanese hen, or a good pheasant or a turkey—then you will see the difference. Or take the case of dogs, with whom we humans are on such intimate terms. Think first of an ordinary common cur—I mean one of the horrible, coarse-haired, low-bred curs that do nothing but run about the streets and befoul the walls of the houses. Compare one of these curs with a poodle whose sires for many generations have been bred in a gentleman’s house, where they have had the best of food and had the opportunity of hearing soft voices and music. Do you not think that the poodle’s brain is developed to quite a different degree from that of the cur? Of course it is. It is puppies of well-bred poodles like that, that showmen train to do incredibly clever tricks—things that a common cur could never learn to do even if it stood on its head. (Uproar and mocking cries.) (Ibsen, act IV)

True to the point, such deeply discriminatory and disparaging remarks occur when Dr Stockmann is repeatedly prevented from delivering his speech and inform the citizens about his scientific discovery. The scientist’s cynical contemplation of his fellow citizens’ understanding of existence as ‘un-examined life’ (in Aristotelian terms) reduced to the satisfaction of necessities, his hurt disillusionment with the community at large, which repeatedly proves unable and unwilling to accept the latest scientific discoveries and digest the unpleasant truths that they frequently reveal, irrupt in potent expressions of crusading individualism turned into all-destructive ire. The consequences are disastrous: the Stockmann family are turned out of the house, the Doctor, labelled as ‘enemy of the people’, is dismissed from the spa, his daughter, Petra, loses her teaching position, and his other two children, after being manipulated to start a fight at school are sent home. Moreover, his loyal friend Horster, ‘guilty’ of having hosted the meeting turned sour, also loses his captainship.

Somehow inconsistent in view of his tirades against the townspeople, Stockmann's method of coping with ostracization by opening a school is Aristotelian in nature:

In *Politics* VII-VIII Aristotle recommends that public education should be available to all people. The type of education that he envisions achieves more than the ability to read and write; accordingly, it extends to teaching the way to recognize beauty in the world coupled with gaining some grasp of how the universe works. The fruits of such type of schooling will be revealed in the willingness of young people to make apt decisions, to be able to judge and categorize wisely which will enable them to participate as decision-makers in the citizen assembly and judicial system, ultimately as holders of public office. (Horniak, 2019)

4. Conclusion

Coming to us from different literary worlds, set apart by time and space, Coriolanus and Dr Stockmann share a significantly similar destiny: both are compelled to face the verdict of the majority who declared them *personae non-gratae* and dictated their physical annihilation or their social ostracization. As twenty-first century citizens, we are fully convinced of the benefits of democracies, which largely outweigh their drawbacks: however, Shakespeare and Ibsen, through their obnoxious and outspoken protagonists, at odds with the contemporary dictate of 'political correctness', remind us of a different truth: that the majority is not always right, and that even the individual who theoretically is the farthest removed from the destructive rage of the masses, either by his privileged high-birth or by his objective knowledge of scientific facts, is sometimes in dire need of public protection.

References

- Cantor, Paul. 1976. *Shakespeare's Rome: Republic and Empire*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.
- Goddard, Harold Clarke. 1960. *The Meaning of Shakespeare*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, Vol. 2.
- Hiltzik, Michael. 2017. "No Mercy in Him: Reading Shakespeare's 'Coriolanus' in the Age of Trump" in *The Baltimore Sun*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.baltimoresun.com/la-fi-hiltzik-coriolanus-20170821-story.html> [Accessed 2021, October 1].
- Horniak, Marcia. 2019. "Moral Character" in Edward N. Zalta (ed.). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. [Online]. Available: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2019/entries/moral-character/> [Accessed 2021, October 1].
- Ibsen, Henrik. *An Enemy of the People*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/2446/2446-h/2446-h.htm> [Accessed 2021, August 28].
- Knutsson, Harold C. 1993. "An Enemy of the People: Ibsen's Reluctant Comedy" in *Comparative Drama* 27, pp. 159-175.
- Koht, Halvdan. 1945. "Shakespeare and Ibsen" in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 44 (1), pp. 79-86.
- Johnston, Brian. 1979. "The Poetry of An Enemy of the People" in *Scandinavica: An International Journal of Scandinavian Studies* 18, pp. 109-122.
- Lindholdt, Paul. 2001. "Greening the Dramatic Canon: Henrik Ibsen's 'An Enemy of the People'" in *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies* 3(1), pp. 53-65.
- Meyer, Michael. 1971. *Ibsen: A Biography*. New York: Doubleday.

- Mill, John Stuart. 1860. *On Liberty*, 2nd ed. London: John W. Parker & Son.
- Miller, Arthur. 1977. *Arthur Miller's Adaptation of "An Enemy of the People"*. New York: Penguin.
- Plato. 2000. *The Republic*. Ferrari, Giovanni R. F. (ed.), Trans. Tom Griffith. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambert, Robert G. 1965. "An Enemy of the People: A Friend of the Teacher" in *The English Journal* 54, pp. 626-628.
- Polybius. *Histories, Book 6, The Rotation of Politics*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text.jsp?doc=Plb.+6.4&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.02340> [Accessed 2021, September 25].
- Saxonhouse, Arlene W. 1998. "Democracy, Equality, and Eidê: A Radical View from Book 8 of Plato's Republic" in *The American Political Science Review* 92(2), pp. 273-283. [Online]. Available: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2585663> [Accessed: 2020, February 29].
- Scofield, Martin. 1990. "Drama, Politics, and the Hero: Coriolanus, Brecht, and Grass" in *Comparative Drama* 24 (4). [Online]. Available: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41153481> [Accessed: 2021, October 1].
- Shakespeare, William. 1980a. (1951). *Troilus and Cressida* in Alexander, Peter (ed.). *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. London and Glasgow: Collins, pp. 787-827.
- Shakespeare, William. 1980b. (1951). *Coriolanus* in Alexander, Peter (ed.). *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. London and Glasgow: Collins, pp. 827-870.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de. 2000. *Democracy in America*. Trans. Harvey Mansfield, Delba Winthrop. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Laan, Thomas F. 1986. "Generic Complexity in Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People*" in *Comparative Drama* 20(2), pp. 95-114.
- Wainstein, Marienne. 1993. PhD Thesis. *Shakespeare's Coriolanus: a Tragic Hero in the Sophoclean Mould*. London: University College London. [Online]. Available: <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10100086/> [Accessed: 2021, December 13].
- Whitman, Cedric H. 1982. *The Heroic Paradox: Essays on Homer, Sophocles, and Aristophanes*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Wilde, Oscar. 1994. "The Soul of Man under Socialism" in *Complete Works*. Glasgow: Harper Collins, pp. 1174-1197.
- Zwart, Hub. 2004. "Environmental Pollution and Professional Responsibility: Ibsen's 'A Public Enemy' as a Seminar on Science Communication and Ethics" in *Environmental Value* 13 (3). [Online]. Available: www.jstor.org/stable/30301998 [Accessed: 2021, October 1].