APPENDIX

INTERLOCKING EPISODES OF ACTION: SHAKESPEARE'S USE OF MORE'S "RUSTY ARMOR" SCENE (3.5.1–109)

Contemporary scholars like to repeat the cliché that Shakespeare takes More's irony and transfers it to Richard. Whether such a transfer is possible may be a moot point, but the attribution justifies a brief survey of the little play Richard stages for the Mayor in 3.5.1–109, as it developed from a short and wittily ironic episode in More's *History*. More is, without doubt, at his most amusing as he satirizes Richard's attempts to justify the sudden execution of Lord Hastings:

> Now flew the fame of this lord's death swiftly through the city, and so forth farther about, like a wind in every man's ear. But the protector immediately after dinner, intending to set some color upon the matter, sent in all the haste for many substantial men out of the city into the Tower. And at their coming, himself, with the duke of Buckingham, stood harnessed in old ill-faring briganders, such [dilapidated armor] as no man should ween that they would vouchsafe to have put upon their backs except that some sudden necessity had constrained them. And the protector showed them that the lord chamberlain and other of his conspiracy had contrived to have suddenly destroyed him and the duke there, the same day, in the council. And what they intended further was as yet not well known. Of which their treason he never had knowledge before ten of the clock the same forenoon: which sudden fear drave them to put on their defense such harness as came next to hand. And so had God holpen them, that the mischief turned upon them that would have done it. And this he required them to report. (*History*, 61–62)

Having wryly followed up his account of Richard's role-playing by noting that "every man answered him fair, as though no man mistrusted the

matter—which, of truth, no man believed," More goes on to describe
how Richard sent a herald abroad to read out a proclamation, declaring
throughout all of London the details of Hastings' treasonous plot "to have
slain the lord protector and the duke of Buckingham sitting in the coun-
cil" (62). Next he considers at some length Jane Shore's role in the alleged
conspiracy and the cruel punishment Richard inflicted on her, and then
devotes a few lines to Richard's device to have the Queen's kinsmen,
Rivers, Grey, and Vaughan, beheaded at Pomfret "on the self day in
which the lord chamberlain was beheaded in the Tower of London, and
about the selfsame hour . . . in the presence and by the order of Sir
Richard Ratcliffe." In the *History* and in the play, the narrative material
serves to effect a transition between two major events—(1) Richard's dra-
matic assault on the innocent Lord Hastings and (2) his subsequent and
reprehensible plot to brand as illegitimate his own brother and his two
nephews. Having neatly rounded off the tale of Lord Hastings' demise,
More turns back to Richard's attempt to wean the populace away from
their loyalty to King Edward's heir by mounting a campaign to prove that
he, Richard, is in fact the legal successor to his father the Duke of York.

How does Shakespeare handle the problem of staging the transition
between these two episodes in Richard's bid for the crown? When the
narrative is presented from Richard's point of view, the witness, in this
case His Honor the Mayor rather than an assorted group of "substantial
men out of the city," experiences the ambush as real. The scene's impor-
tance to our study lies in the extraordinary agility with which Shakespeare
constructs and artistically interlocks its dramatic units, some looking back
to Hastings' execution and some looking ahead to the Mayor's role in 3.7.
Analysis of the rusty armor scene brings to light a method of interlock-
ing that appears for the first time in *Richard III,* a technique for making
transitions between one primary scene and another by adroitly disguising
the boundaries between adjoining scenes.

Elements of Interlocking between Scenic Units

While writing *Richard III*, Shakespeare was apparently aware that the
structurally self-contained dramatic units he was creating each emerged,
though in miniature, as complete and independent wholes. Richard's
instigation of Clarence's murder in his prison chamber (1.4.1–283),
Richard's disruption of the holy peace established by King Edward
(2.1.1–141), Richard's attack on Hastings at the Tower council meeting
(3.4.1–107)—each one of these de casibus sequences represents not only a
complete action but also a major action in the intensification of the build-
ing plot. Though this organic unity of each of the dramatic sequences,

with its own beginning, middle, and end, was a highly desirable quality, it could result in the total play's presenting a series of relatively disconnected episodes, each well crafted but not sufficiently integrated with the adjacent episodes to merge into a continuously flowing action. The presence in *Richard III* of several subordinate units whose primary function is to link the fully developed dramatic sequences together to create an overarching action that transcends any individual episode testifies to Shakespeare's awareness of this emerging dramaturgical problem. The rusty armor sequence that Shakespeare developed for his climactic third act to link the Hastings scene directly to the Baynard's Castle scene demonstrates how well such interlocking units have been crafted.

In Logan's edition of More's *History*, there are approximately thirty pages separating the execution of Lord Hastings from the beginning of Richard's masquerade as a man who would not be king in the Baynard's Castle scene. Shakespeare's extraordinary handling of this intervening material tells us much about his growing awareness of the differences between narrative and drama. In his treatment of the material, he exhibits, on the one hand, a new degree of dramatic economy, and, on the other hand, a sense of wanting to integrate the segments of the developing action into a smoothly flowing whole. What he achieves in reimagining More's account of the mock defense of the Tower of London from Richard's point of view is remarkable.

There is much to appreciate in the intriguing structure of the play's "rusty armor" scene. Shakespeare seizes upon this typically perspicacious mockery of Richard's methods in More's narrative, not only to broaden and embellish his presentation of Richard's flair for histrionics but also to create a sequence that will tie together two key actions and disguise the seams between them. As usual, Richard's point of view of the incident supersedes More's. Richard, picking up the challenge and substituting the Lord Mayor for the array of gentry whom More's Richard summoned to witness the mock attack, will show how expeditiously the combination of pyrotechnics and flattery worked to win the Mayor's confidence.

The rusty armor scene in More's telling is little more than a paragraph in length. Shakespeare develops it into a complex scenic unit. Notice, first, that the scene should be recognized as a satellite unit. Not intended to develop into a full-fledged scene on its own, it has a distinctly subordinate status meant to carry on the story line from one major episode (3.4) to another (3.7). Though Shakespeare has endowed the rusty armor scene with an action that flows through the scene's four segments, welding them together into one unit of action, the central throughline disguises a two-part structure. The scene's action not only reaches back to conclude the Hastings episode but also moves forward to initiate the Baynard's

Castle action. With the utmost economy, this one scene simultaneously effects a conclusion and opens up new directions.

That commentators fail to discern the structure and function of the rusty armor sequence can be seen from the commonly accepted notion that the "rotten armour" scene in 3.5 can best be understood—nay, can *only* be understood—from the perspective offered in the historical sources from which Shakespeare was working. Some contend that it is impossible to solve the puzzling question of how to play the three characters from the evidence available in the play itself. Only people familiar, as Shakespeare's original audience was, with Edward Hall's *Chronicle* and Thomas Legge's *Richardus Tertius* can adequately grasp the shift from 3.5 to 3.7 that occurs in Shakespeare's play. Such an approach not only invokes the popular myth that Shakespeare's Richard is More's Richard (a ludicrous schemer *whose every scheme is patently obvious*) but adds to it the notion that Shakespeare's Mayor is More's Mayor (a *distinctly* corrupt politician).

This process of conflation is hardly necessary; moreover, it obscures the imaginative transformations that Shakespeare has rendered in his narrative sources in the process of converting them into dramatic action. If excuses were needed for this brief addendum, this frequently encountered blindness to Shakespeare's new dramaturgical strategies offers sufficient rationale. But the intriguing alterations Shakespeare makes in More's account of Richard's attempts to justify the abrupt execution of Lord Hastings, grounded as these artistic devices are in the endeavor to create dramaturgical unity within the confines of act 3, offer significant justification on their own to warrant a short tribute to Shakespeare's expertise at maintaining a smooth flow in a work constructed of independent dramatic units.

Throughline of the Sequence

Though 3.5 is not a key scene, it has, nevertheless, been thoroughly developed. Observe how adroitly the rusty armor scene is built up. Its subject is an insurrection—a feigned insurrection but one that has to be rendered with enough reality to make its onstage witnesses believe in it. The motivation behind it—this is a persuading action—has to do with Richard's need to move the Mayor of London into his camp. Richard and Buckingham stage the insurrection (the instigator of which, they claim, is the recently executed Lord Hastings) to persuade the Mayor that, having plotted treason, Hastings deserved his death. And the Mayor is being tricked into giving witness to the truth of the accusation.

More, as noted above, devotes a mere paragraph (an adroitly witty one) to the fact that Richard and Buckingham try to make the insurrection seem authentic by jumping into some old armor that happens

to be nearby, as if haste required sudden and speedy defense. The play, too, specifies that to open 3.5 Richard and Buckingham comes on stage "in rotten armor, marvellous ill-favored." Shakespeare, in thinking about this paragraph in More, imaginatively divides the action into four distinct units, each with its own tempo and its own tone. Moreover, the changes in tone and tempo are achieved without major changes in personnel on stage. Richard's activity effects the changes: the segments record changes that accord with Richard's chameleon-like ability to adapt rapidly to shifting situations. Each of the four segments represents a stage in Richard's movement from instigating the action (explaining to the Mayor the necessity of the hurried execution of Hastings) to achieving his goal (procuring the Mayor's attendance at Baynard's Castle as a witness to the justice with which Richard and Buckingham had proceeded).

The prologue (3.5.1–11). The scene opens with Richard's provocative question to Buckingham: "Come, cousin, canst thou quake and change thy color . . . / As if thou were distraught and mad with terror?" (3.5.1, 4). The jocularity of the opening scene—the self-confidence, the camaraderie of the two conspirators—plays against the solemnity of the closing moments of the previous scene. Stark juxtapositions of this kind occur frequently in the play. The Hastings scene ends with "Off with his head," and the tone becomes solemn. The last thing we hear is Hastings' death speech. Then suddenly we have a jolly conversation about acting skills, which serves the purpose of associating theatrical illusion with treachery and hypocrisy.

Enter the Mayor (3.5.12–21). With the arrival of the "audience" (Catesby brings in the Mayor), the joking ceases and the actors shift their energies to their roles. Thus ensues, before the eyes of the Mayor, a mock battle, with a pretended insurrection occurring on the other side of the Tower wall. There is nobody on the other side of this fight; it is all created out of the imagination of Richard and Buckingham. The change from "Can you counterfeit the deep tragedian?"—with the suggestion that it is going to be tremendous fun—to fighting off a legion of attackers who seem to be storming the gate is exhilarating. Suddenly the two ill-clad dukes are presenting a struggle against forces set on, presumably, by Hastings. It has to look real to the Mayor, for the purpose of the whole of this ruse is to persuade the Mayor that Hastings' execution was justified and had to be handled expeditiously. Time was short. Richard knew nothing about "the extreme peril of the case" until early this morning when "our persons' safety, / Enforc'd us" to take this speedy action (44–46). The Scrivener will later comment on this subject of the wondrous haste with which the action was conceived. Though the Scrivener is not taken in, the Mayor is.

The opening ploy of this cleverly wrought scene (3.5.15–21), then, offers to the Mayor visual evidence of the fear Hastings' treachery has evoked in those whose lives (by God's mercy) have been so miraculously spared.

"Here is the head of that ignoble traitor" (3.5.22–34). Richard's hench-men, Ratcliffe and Lovel, dash in in the next beat carrying the head of the traitor, "the dangerous and unsuspected Hastings" (23). The introduction of the head allows for a shift in tone, a shift in tempo, a shift in mood. Richard seizes the opportunity offered by the appear-ance of the severed head to play a different role, that of the loving but shocked and betrayed friend. His pious lamentation creates a kind of mock solemnity:

> So dear I loved the man that I must weep.
> I took him for the plainest harmless creature
> That breath'd upon the earth a Christian;
> Made him my book, wherein my soul recorded
> The history of all her secret thoughts. (3.5.24–28)

The conspirators pick up and play against Hastings' sincere lament, giv-ing a feigned one, in which the reputation of Hastings is totally reversed. Buckingham dubs him "the covert'st shelt'red traitor / That ever liv'd" (3.5.33–34).

Winning over the Mayor (3.5.34–71). Another transition occurs in the next segment. The conspirators now address the Mayor directly, pressing upon him further contrived evidence geared to persuade him of their rectitude. "The subtle traitor/ This day had plotted, in the Council-house, / To murther me and my good Lord of Gloucester" (37–39); in other words, now you can understand why we acted so expeditiously. The remainder of the scene is designed to get the Mayor, who is both flattered and intimi-dated by the Dukes, to do what he ultimately (and happily) volunteers to do—to vouch for the authenticity of the charges against Hastings and to go before the citizens to explain our "just proceedings in this cause" (3.5.66). He is the more ready to do this because they make him feel guilty for his late arrival on the scene. "Had you been here," they say, "you would have seen it all." The Mayor succumbs to the flattery. Their word is enough: "Your Grace's words shall serve / As well as I had seen, and heard him speak" (3.5.62–63). Different actors may endow the Mayor with differing degrees of servility, but the drive should be toward the Mayor's acceptance of the proffered ruse. Having accomplished their purpose of persuading the Mayor that the execution was justified, the rogues send the Mayor out to placate the people.[1]

The marching orders for Buckingham's mission (3.5.72–102). In the conclud-ing beat of this episode, Shakespeare leaves Richard and Buckingham alone together. Now, for the second time in the sequence, one hears the authentic voice of Richard, but this time the original jocularity con-nected with the play-acting is replaced by a sense of true urgency. In the first part, they are only *playing* urgency—"we had to put down the insurrection." In the second part, the urgency is real. No sooner has the Mayor departed than Richard all but explodes. "Go after, after, cousin Buckingham. / The Mayor towards Guildhall hies him in all post" (72–73). Make haste! Follow the Mayor. The whole notion is that the situation requires immediate action.

With the Mayor accepting his imposed role and moved out of the way, Richard and Buckingham now focus on the need to convince the citizens to abandon the idea of promoting the coronation of the heir apparent, which is scheduled for the next day. The burden of this task falls to Buckingham. Richard is sending Buckingham to the Guildhall to deliver an oration to the citizens gathered there, acquainting them with certain "facts" about Richard's brother, the newly deceased King Edward, and about the two young princes, Edward's heirs. Richard gives Buckingham precise instructions. At the Guildhall, he is to dis-parage King Edward, to "urge his hateful luxury / And bestial appetite in change of lust," for example, "Which stretch'd unto their servants, daughters, wives, / Even where his raging eye or savage heart, / Without control, lusted to make a prey" (3.5.75, 80–84). Further, Buckingham must not only "infer the bastardy of Edward's children" but must infer also that Edward himself was illegitimate:

> Tell them, when that my mother went with child
> Of that insatiate Edward, noble York,
> My princely father, then had wars in France,
> And by true computation of the time,
> Found that the issue was not his begot;
> Which well appeared in his lineaments,
> Being nothing like the noble Duke my father. (3.5.86–92)

The gist of the lies Richard has concocted and would have Buckingham foist upon the citizens at the Guildhall is that the royal line descends from Richard, Duke of York, directly to Richard, Duke of Gloucester.

This intensely important dialogue at the conclusion of the sequence serves in part as one of Shakespeare's substitutions for the Shaa and Buckingham speeches in More, which don't appear directly in Shakespeare but which will be reflected in the induction to 3.7. It is worth noting that

here in 3.5.72–94, where Richard instructs his man, Shakespeare condenses the essence of the arguments that form so famous and so lengthy a segment of More's account of Richard's plot to unseat the nephew. Needless to say, Buckingham shares Richard's enthusiasm for engaging in deception, which both of them envision as a kind of play-acting:

> Doubt not, my lord, I'll play the orator
> As if the golden fee for which I plead
> Were for myself—and so, my lord, adieu. (3.5.95–97)

Both exit intent on shaping the future. Can Buckingham's oration bring the citizens into Richard's camp?

Observe how Shakespeare deliberately manipulates the audience's expectations here. The way the separate departures of Richard and Buckingham are presented, the audience has every reason to anticipate that the next scene they see will take place at the Guildhall, where Buckingham plays the orator before the assembled citizens. The ruse makes for a riveting surprise when Buckingham returns to the stage, having already played the orator—and failed.

The Interlocking Functions of This Satellite Sequence

So far we have demonstrated that the rusty armor scene has the components of a fully developed sequence in itself. Though subordinate in function, it is a complete action, mounted on the specific dramatic question, *Can Richard and Buckingham convince the Mayor of Hastings' guilt?* But much can be discerned by reviewing the functions accomplished by the individual segments of this episode. The rusty armor scene is an excellent example of a unit that exists solely to serve the dramaturgical purpose of covering over the seams between adjacent units—a marvelously well-realized interlocking sequence. Without the rusty armor scene, the Hastings episode and the Baynard's Castle episode would stand like two huge land masses, facing one another but divided by the cavernous gap between them.

Notice how Shakespeare accomplishes this task of effecting the transition between what would otherwise be two relatively self-contained, independent units. The first half of the rusty armor scene carries the Hastings episode forward to its conclusion, while the second half of the scene introduces the material of the Baynard's Castle episode, thus interlocking the two major units in the action of this one subordinate unit. As the reader will perceive, the rusty armor scene isn't a foreign substance bluntly wedged in between two episodes to plug what would otherwise

be a fissure. The subject matter is effectively pertinent. The pretense of the insurrection extends the Hastings episode forward to a "concluding" judgment while, at the same time, the addition of the Mayor to Richard's party becomes an important aspect of Richard's success in getting himself declared king at Baynard's Castle.

Yet 3.5 achieves even more than merely serving as a hook that locks the two units together. The sense of urgency with which Shakespeare endows Richard's masquerade at Baynard's Castle originates in the action of the rusty armor scene. The maneuvers orchestrated here by Richard and Buckingham establish the idea that time is of the essence. Their frantic bustle conveys the illusion that they are working against the clock. Before they can move on to dealing with the recalcitrant citizens, they must generate the perception that they executed Hastings only after learning that he was the instigator of a rebellion. Then, once the Mayor is convinced of their fortunate success in thwarting the rebels, they immediately shift their attention to the next deception they must create—the citizens' loyalty to the heir apparent must be undermined by disseminating a convincing accusation of the illegitimacy of King Edward and his subsequent adultery, so that the populace will accept Edward's brother Richard as the true heir. Throughout the scene they—the characters, not the playwright—keep moving the plot forward. The marvel (so inconspicuously wrought) is that Richard and Buckingham, who rushed in to begin the scene that ends the Hastings episode, rush out having set in motion the Baynard's Castle episode. When we meet Buckingham again, he will have been to the Guildhall without us. His task will be to make a sturdy report about the obstinacy of the citizens, thereby establishing the resistance with which Richard of Gloucester will be faced in his attempt to unseat the princes.

More's Homage to Jane Shore and Shakespeare's Omission of It

To conclude this section without a mention of Thomas More's resolution to preserve some awareness of the valor of Mistress Jane Shore under the intense persecutions she endured at King Richard's command would be to do an injustice to the *History*.[2]

Shakespeare's conscious omission of the eulogy More offers to the lady who had been Hastings' mistress—the notorious "Shore's wife"—is a clear indication of the new economy in his maturing craftsmanship. More discourses on Richard's persecution of Mistress Shore at this point in his *History*—at the end of his record of Hastings' demise, for she had been implicated as one (if not the chief) of Hastings' alleged abettors.

Exactly here, between the Hastings and Baynard's Castle episodes, More injects his touching tribute to Mistress Shore. There is no doubt that his *History* would be the worse without this interlude, which has the effect not only of making us think better of a much-maligned woman but also endows us with a telling insight into More's own compassionate nature. That More was fully aware of the fact that his digression in defense of a fallen woman would lay him open to criticism from both the literary and the historical sides is apparent from this passage. "I doubt not," he acknowledges, "some shall think this woman too slight a thing to be written of and set among the remembrances of great matters" (*History*, 66). One has to admire a man who jeopardizes the integrity and literary quality of his work to speak well of one for whom everyone else has contempt.

Nevertheless, from either a literary or a dramaturgical point of view, there was hardly a worse place to interrupt the flow of the narrative moving toward Richard's acquisition of the crown. Shakespeare was not going to risk such a distraction. He wanted a swift build, moving from Hastings' execution directly to Richard's crowning. Where the author of *The True Tragedy of Richard the Third* puts Jane Shore at the center of a subplot and where Laurence Olivier introduced Pamela Brown into Edward's household as Mistress Shore to float silently and mysteriously through his film version of *Richard III*, Shakespeare himself cuts out More's compassionate aside completely. Shakespeare recognizes that his drama needs scenes that will fulfill structural functions. There has to be movement and direction and a sense of growing urgency to counteract the tendency of individual episodes to stand rigidly solitary, as the Mistress Shore interlude does in the *History*. Shakespeare focuses instead on creating a subordinate episode, the "rusty armor" scene, designed primarily for the purpose of locking together the major plot episodes on either side of it, cogently pulling those fully developed dramatic units together. Jumping over the many pages of More's prose dedicated to the hard plight of Jane Shore, Shakespeare opts to dramatize instead the scene that gives Richard the opportunity to show how he and his cohorts turned the supposed insurrection into a real one and follows up the dramatic condemnation of Hastings as a traitor by moving directly to the passage in which More describes how Richard pretended to ward off the attacking forces Hastings had presumably set in action. It was left for others, Nicholas Rowe, for one, to dramatize the life of the woman who had been mistress to King Edward and Lord Hastings.

NOTES

Preface: Shakespeare's Search for
the Essence of Dramatic Form

1. G. R. Hibbard's *The Making of Shakespeare's Dramatic Poetry* deserves high praise.

2. For the critical assumptions underlying this study, see Charles A. Hallett and Kenneth E. Frost. "Poetry and Reality: The Zetema and Its Significance to Poetics." *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 17 (1977): 415–43.

3. Compare Claudio's speech on restraint versus liberty in *Measure for Measure*:
   > *Lucio.* Why, how now, Claudio, whence comes this restraint?
   > *Claudio.* From too much liberty, my Lucio, liberty:
   > As surfeit is the father of much fast,
   > So every scope by the immoderate use
   > Turns to restraint. Our natures do pursue,
   > Like rats that ravin down their proper bane,
   > A thirsty evil, and when we drink we die. (*Measure,* 1.2.124–30)

4. In his recent investigation of the art of peripeteia, Bert O. States has an extensive analysis of the plot of *Oedipus Rex* and Aristotle's commentary on it. At one point he is driven to lament that because its very nature consists of being in continuous motion, the action of a play frustrates attempts at analyzing it. He does think that there might be a solution, however:
   > One way around the problem may be to take a unit of text small enough to allow us the luxury of seeing a complete action unfold before our eyes. Unfortunately...there isn't a play that will serve the purpose. (59)

   States could have found such units in Shakespeare's plays, where the unit he sought,, small enough to permit us to see a complete action unfold before our eyes, is ubiquitous. More often than not, in Shakespeare, the act, the scene, or the sequence is the epitome of an extraordinarily complete action. We believe Shakespeare discovered the concept of the unit of action while reading Sir Thomas More and went on to utilize it systematically as the basic structural device in all his subsequent plays.

5. J. Dover Wilson quotes C. H. Herford's gloss to the line in which Richard claims to have a "secret close intent" that justifies the inclusion of the Lady Anne scene in the play, and John Jowett continues the tradition in *The Tragedy of King Richard III* (157).

6. Robert Y. Turner reminds us "that a quick survey of courtship scenes in Shakespeare's preceding dramas shows that [none of them] take the shape of a gradual overcoming of a reluctant lady. As soon as Margaret hears from Suffolk

that she would be married to England's king, she assents upon condition of her father's approval (*1 Henry VI*, V.iii). When Edward IV shifts from intimations to a proposal of marriage, Lady Gray assents (3 Henry VI, III.ii). In *Errors* (III. ii) Antipholus of Syracuse tries to court Luciana, but they talk at cross purposes. In *Shrew* (III.i) Lucentio and Bianca engage in one brief courtship under the guise of tutoring, but Lucentio hardly gets beyond stating his real identity. Petruchio's courtship of Katharina takes the form of a battle of wits: they parry and thrust without reaching any agreement; in fact, the comic point of the scene is that there is no agreement even though Petruchio asserts that there is (II.i). In *Two Gentlemen* the only full-scale courtship, Proteus's attempt to woo Silvia, is abortive, for she spurns him (IV.ii). It would appear, then, that Richard's courtship of Lady Anne marks a leap in Shakespeare's development of dialogue" (*Shakespeare's Apprenticeship*, 75–76). Nor does the lover meet with success in works that have been proposed elsewhere as sources for the scene. Richard courts his niece Elizabeth in Thomas Legge's *Richardus Tertius* but doesn't win her. Seneca's tyrant Lycus is as roundly refused when he proposes to Megara in *Hercules Furens*.

1   "More Virtually Does Shakespeare's Work for Him": Dogmas of the "More Myth"

The phrase "More virtually does Shakespeare's work for him" is taken from Richard Hardin's "Thomas More (1478–1535)," *Major Tudor Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Critical Sourcebook*, pp. 354–55.

1. See, for example, Geoffrey Bullough, ed. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, Volume III. Earlier English History Plays: "Henry VI," "Richard III," "Richard II";* Kenneth Muir. *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays.*
2. See E. M. W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays* (204–20).
3. Plausible grounds have been advanced for hypothesizing that More's "life of Richard III was designed to be a rhetorical and grammatical exercise" either for his own children or for students, as "More began composing the work at the time he had been given permission to teach grammar at Oxford" (Ackroyd, 157).
4. See Hanham's segment on "Literary Construction," pp. 174–85, and Stephen Gresham, "The Dramaturgy of Tyranny: More's *Richard III* and Sackville's *Complaint of Buckingham*": "More and Sackville create a dramatic vision of tyranny and its corrosive effects....Through careful attention to characterization, plot, and language both artists dramatize [the theme of tyranny and its attendant civil disorders] to heighten the reader's response" (35, 37). Judith P. Jones quotes R. W. Chambers as stating that More's *History* "moves away from the dull recording of events toward interpretation and dramatization" and adds that the *History* "has been seen as a milestone in the development of biography, drama, and history" (49–50). The prevailing confusion is aptly addressed in Judith H. Anderson's *Biographical Truth: The Representation of Historical Persons in Tudor-Stuart Writing.* "Reading modern discussions of [More's] *Richard* we might find it hard to remember that this *History* is not, as a matter of record, a stage play, whether a five-act play, a morality play, or a mock-morality play. No one denies that More's dramatic talents and contacts with playwrights were considerable, but we might for these reasons assume that he could have written the *Richard* as a play if he had wished to do so and that his choice of another form, one more mixed and less dramatic, is

significant" (76). For a wider view of More's understanding of the terms *comic* and *tragic*, see Michael P. Foley, "Comedy, Tragedy, and St. Thomas More," *Moreana* 46, no. 176 (June, 2009): 143–55.

5. "Doctor Shaw" is one of the two clergymen summoned to Baynard's Castle by Shakespeare's Richard (see 3.5.98–105, 3.7.95–99).

6. Thomas Legge, whose Latin play *Richardus Tertius* (written and performed at Cambridge) was much admired at the time, follows More's *History* far more closely than Shakespeare does: Legge's play, a transformation of history into speech for the stage, brings the Reverend Shaa, the Duke of Buckingham, and their interminable discourses onto the stage.

7. As Turner notes in *Shakespeare's Apprenticeship,* Shakespeare's "training in rhetoric colored his understanding of dramaturgy so that it is not far wrong to say that he composed his first chronicle plays along the lines of an oration and understood his duties to be like those of an orator, his audience to be like listeners of an oration willing to be instructed by patterns of moral behavior" (5).

8. In *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's History Plays*, Warren Chernaik writes: "More's Richard is, in all essential qualities, Shakespeare's Richard" (49) and then goes on to impose More's views upon Shakespeare's scenes with no awareness that he is conflating two radically different conceptions of Richard's abilities. The practice is a common one.

9. Cf., for example, Richard S. Sylvester, ed., *The History of King Richard III and Selections from the English and Latin Poems*: "It was More's narrative, whether read in the *English Works* of 1557 or in the histories of Grafton, Hall, and Holinshed, that provided Shakespeare with both plot and inspiration for his *Tragedy of Richard III*" (xii); Kenneth Muir, *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays*: "Shakespeare's conception of his villain-hero, Richard III, came ultimately from Sir Thomas More's *History of Richard III*, which was afterwards embodied in the *Chronicles* of Hall and Holinshed" (32); Anthony Hammond, ed. *King Richard III*: "Shakespeare's 'source' was the account of Richard which not only supplied him with the bulk of his information, but which fixed in his mind a tone, a general approach, toward the subject. This source was Sir Thomas More's *History*; for the rest, we shall find that other materials surface regularly and vividly enough in the play to describe them as minor sources, but they do not combine the first and second classes of source the way More's work does. In this book we find the Richard of the play: a witty villain, described in ironical terms by the author. Shakespeare modifies More in two ways: by adding to him…and by omitting materials he included" (75); John Jowett, ed., *The Tragedy of King Richard III*: "It can scarcely be doubted that Shakespeare's encounter with More in the source material fuelled the difference in the dramatization of history between the Henry VI plays and *Richard III*. Shakespeare engages more fully with More than the surrounding account, responding to More as a source of structured narrative episodes" (20).

10. Notwithstanding frequent assertions that More was writing drama, reputable scholars have not disputed More's place as a historian. C. S. Lewis, for example, despite his recognition of the "dramatic moulding of [More's] story," does not view More as a dramatist. More's "is not an economical style, but it lives. We must not, however, represent a sixteenth-century book as a modern one by over-emphasizing merits which are really subordinate. More is not an early Strachey nor even an early Macaulay. The *Historia* in its entirety will succeed only with readers who can enjoy the classical sort of history—history as a grave and lofty Kind, the prose sister of epic, rhetorical in expression and moral in purpose. If read in the

right spirit, More's performance will seem remarkable" (166–67). In *Biographical Truth*, Judith H. Anderson definitively resolves the major critical debate that has raged over the genre of More's *History* for decades—how to categorize a work that excels as history, as biography, and as literature (75–109).

11. William Roper tells us that "This Sir Thomas More after he had been brought up in the Latin tongue at St. Anthony's in London, was, by his father's procurement received into the house of the right reverend, wise and learned prelate Cardinal Morton. Here, though he was young of years, yet would he at Christmastide suddenly sometimes step in among the players, and never studying for the matter, make a part of his own there presently among them, which made the lookers-on more sport than all the players beside" (*Roper's Life of More*, 210). Peter Ackroyd elaborates on the incident in his biography of More by describing "what kind of drama would have been prepared for the occasion" and noting that "Morton's chaplain by the year of More's entry into service, Henry Medwall, was a skilful dramatist who supplied material both for professional actors (the *mimus* or the *histrio*) and occasional players. At least two of his works survive and one of them, *Fulgens and Lucrece*, has been dated with reasonable certainty to the time of More's sojourn at Lambeth Palace" (33). Among critics who use this information about More's early fondness for the drama as evidence that More's *History* is a work of drama, one might cite Arthur Noel Kincaid (226).

12. Stephen Greenblatt's analysis of More's passage is definitive:

> But why should men submit to fantasies that will not nourish or sustain them? In part, More's answer is *power*, whose quintessential sign is the ability to impose one's fictions upon the world: the more outrageous the fiction, the more impressive the manifestation of power....Richard III cast his ruthless seizure of the throne in the guise of an elaborate process of offer, refusal, renewed offer, and reluctant acceptance. The point is not that anyone is deceived by the charade, but that everyone is forced either to participate in it or to watch it silently. In a brilliant passage of his *History of Richard III*, More imagines the talk among the common people who have just witnessed the sinister farce. They marvel at the whole performance, since no one could be expected to be taken in by it, but then, as one of them observes, "men must sometime for the manner sake not be aknowen what they know." After all, a bishop goes through a similar charade at his consecration, though everyone knows he has paid for his office. And likewise, at a play, everyone may know that the man playing sultan is, in fact, a cobbler, but if anyone is foolish enough to "call him by his own name while he standeth in his majesty, one of his tormentors might hap to break his head."...To try to break through the fiction is dangerous—one can have one's head broken. To try to take a part of one's own, "to step up and play with them," is equally dangerous. On the one hand, the great have the means to enforce their elaborate, theatrical ceremonies of pride; on the other, those ceremonies are usually performed, ominously, on scaffolds. (*Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, 13–14)

13. "More's comment is important since it ultimately affected the whole of Shakespeare's conception of Richard Gloucester" (Jones, *Origins*, 214).

14. Many admirers of the resulting play comment that *Richard III* is written from Richard's point of view. Larry Champion, stating that "Richard's perception informs the plot" and that the spectators share Richard's perspective (43), provides the statistics: "Through twelve soliloquies and four asides (179 lines, 5 percent of

those in the entire play), Richard provides the eye—albeit jaundiced—through which the spectator observes the action" (61). Hugh Richmond observes that "Richard remains the archetypal manipulator with whom the dramatist himself must be equated insofar as he drives his plots forward" (*Critical Essays*, 18). And Mary Ann McGrail observes that Richard "speaks of the action of the play being motivated and controlled from within him" (47). Richard warms to the task that Shakespeare calls upon him to accomplish; in fact, a mysterious alchemy seems to develop between these two collaborators.

15. Quoted from Noble's discussion of Richard of Gloucester in *How to Do Shakespeare*. See "Apposition" (22–26). Also pertinent are Michael Neill's assumptions in "Shakespeare's Halle of Mirrors": "The prologuelike speech with which Richard opens his play, summarizing previous action and outlining the shape of that to come, creates for him a kind of extradramatic status. . . . In the speech itself the presenter-function is conflated with that of a playmaker. . . . The plot of the play is virtually indistinguishable from Richard's plotting and . . . his character-istic way of working out his plots is theatrical: consequently, the action tends to resolve itself into a series of plays within the play with Richard as author-actor" (26–27).

16. See Percy Lubbock's perspicacious analysis of the subject of point of view in nar-rative fiction, pp. 251–64 in *The Craft of Fiction*.

17. See Satin, *Shakespeare and His Sources*, p. 4, note 1.
    While Act II of Shakespeare's play begins in 1483, with Edward IV at the point of death, Act I combines events of 1483 with events of twelve previous years to form one continuous and swift-paced unit. Richard tells us in I.ii.241–242 that he stabbed Edward, Prince of Wales and son of Henry VI, some three months since . . . at Tewksbury," an event of the year 1471. Clarence is confined to the Tower quite early in Shakespeare's play (I.i.42–45) though he was actually sent there in February, 1478. Despite this twelve-year span and juggling of chronology, the basis of Act I rests upon Holinshed's history of Edward V [i.e., an acknowledged copy of More's *History*], which begins in 1483. The only noteworthy exception is the reference (I.ii.55–56) to the corpse of Henry VI bleeding afresh, a couplet probably suggested by two earlier sentences from Holinshed which read: "The dead corpse was conveyed from the Tower to the Church of St. Paul and there laid on a bier or coffin bare-faced; the same in presence of beholders did bleed. From thence he was carried to the Blackfriars and bled there likewise.

18. The phrase "geological fault" was first used by C. L. Barber and Richard Wheeler in *The Whole Journey: Shakespeare's Power of Development*. "*Richard III* pulls in two directions," they argue. "It presents the disruptive and subversive—Richard's sav-age play and the web of curses as they shape the action—in historical and psy-chological perspective centered in familial tensions; [however,] the restoration of order is by ritual, which is presumed to reestablish ceremony. The combination does not fully work" (123).

19. The several aspects of Margaret's role as a "worthy spiritual antagonist to Richard" are cogently explicated by Hugh Macrae Richmond in *Shakespeare's Political Plays* (80–84). See also the analysis of the Senecan passages in A. P. Rossiter's *Angel with Horns* and in Marie Helene Besnault and Michel Bitot, "Historical Legacy and Fiction: The Poetical Reinvention of King Richard III," in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, ed. Michael Hattaway, pp. 117–22. For

another point of view, see Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories*.

20. The phrase is Jowett's (*The Tragedy of King Richard III*, 39).

21. See, for example, Janis Lull, *King Richard III*, p. 6.

22. Our own approach is more closely aligned with that advocated by Brian Vickers in *Appropriating Shakespeare*. (See pp. xii–xiii, xv.)

2   "Thou Art a Traitor. Off with His Head!": Applying the Ricardian Shock to De Casibus Narrative

1. For a background study of this subject, see Paul Budra's *"A Mirror for Magistrates" and the "de casibus" Tradition*. See also Lily B.Campbell, ed. *The Mirror for Magistrates*.

2. Nicholas Grene's statement is typical: "More's history, formed on the model of classical life-writing, stands apart from the chronicle mode into which it is set, by the way the personality of its protagonist is dramatized in elaborately described situations complete with invented speeches. It is from More directly, for instance, that Shakespeare takes the brilliantly vivid council scene in which Richard asks for the dish of strawberries from the Bishop of Ely's garden, before his tyrant's tantrum leading to the summary execution of Hastings" (120–21).

3. Scholarly speculation over the years has focused primarily on More's sources for the details of the Hastings episode: were the details historical or imagined? On the one hand, there are those who maintain that there is sufficient evidence pointing directly to John Morton (l420?–1500) as More's informant. Morton was the Bishop of Ely from whom Richard requests strawberries in the Tower scene, and coincidentally it was in Morton's household that More had served as a page in his youth. Those who hold this position point to the wealth of detail in More's account, which they claim indicates that More had as his source someone with firsthand knowledge of the events. Meanwhile, there are those who contend that More's source remains a mystery and, as for the wealth of detail, that is exactly the kind of technique an imaginative and creative author like More would have invented to create the illusion of actuality. The debate continues, with no sign of either side's relenting. Nevertheless, despite the controversy over More's source for the Hastings episode, there is no doubt that the event did occur on June 13, 1483, and recent research indicates that it took place pretty much as More recorded it.

4. David Kastan speaks eloquently about the necessity for making the distinction between the aims of Renaissance historians and the aims of Elizabethan playwrights. "No real evidence has been brought forward to justify the (unlikely) assumption of an identity of dramatic and historiographic interests," he writes, and notes that while Thomas Nashe "admits that the *subject matter* of English plays '(for the most part) is borrowed out of our English chronicles,'…playwrights tend to "disclaim any kinship with the historians." Kastan notes that John Marston preferred not to "relate any thing as an historian but to inlarge every thing as a Poet" in the same way that Thomas Dekker preferred to write "as a Poet, not as a Historian" because "the two do not live under one law" ("The Shape of Time," 262–63). One can perceive that in adapting More's *History* for the stage Shakespeare seems to be making a similar claim.

5. Richard's firm control over his subordinates contrasts significantly with the wimpiness of the Richard in Thomas Legge's *Richardus Tertius*. As Legge's translator Robert J. Lordi points out, Legge's Richard is "a fearful, vacillating, often

subordinate character" whose schemes are invariably invented by his crafty aides, Lovel and Catesby (Lordi, *Thomas Legge's "Richardus Tertius,"* xii).

6. Larry Champion points to "significant alterations" Shakespeare made "from the several sources he presumably utilized....In none is Hastings imprisoned at the instigation of his enemies at court, the queen and her kinsmen; and in none does he naively miscalculate his fortunes with Richard just prior to his condemnation" (66).

7. Antony Hammond quips that "Omens...are thick to the point of embarrassment about the obtuse Hastings," but he notes that "they are woven by Shakespeare into a web of numinous threats which strengthen the ritual seriousness of the play" (*King Richard III*, 99).

8. In describing Richard's tendency to break into formal situations to disrupt them, Heather Dubrow perceives the additional political advantage Richard gains from the distraction caused by the "discovery" that the man presiding over this council is a traitor. Not only does Richard dispose of Hastings, an obstacle in his path. Richard's late arrival at the meeting, as she remarks, "cuts short plans to crown his nephews." Richard, that "master of interruption," effectively "stages the ways he will obstruct narrative movements" (178).

9. "Unlike *3 Henry VI*, with its sprawling, sometimes ill-articulated action*, Richard III* pulses with a beat that quickens as the play proceeds. Even such surcharged moments as Richard's 'Off with his head' when he sends Hastings to the block (III.iv)...are adjusted to the rising movement of the scenes where they occur" (Baker, 750).

10. Many scholars demonstrate that Shakespeare, at this point, was also responding to challenges presented by Christopher Marlowe's dynamic protagonists, Tamburlaine and Barabas. This book limits itself to More's influence. For a thorough study of the relationship between Shakespeare and Marlowe, see Robert A. Logan's *Shakespeare's Marlowe: The Influence of Christopher Marlowe on Shakespeare's Artistry.*

11. J. Dover Wilson, Introduction to *Richard III*, pp. xxiii–xxviii.

12. York's program for obtaining the crown is to sit back and watch those who might impede his progress destroy themselves. His advice to his newly acquired accomplices, Warwick and Salisbury, defines his technique:

> I am not your king
> Till I be crown'd, and that my sword be stain'd
> With heart-blood of the house of Lancaster;
> And that's not suddenly to be perform'd,
> But with advice and silent secrecy.
> Do you as I do in these dangerous days:
> Wink at the Duke of Suffolk's insolence,
> At Beauford's pride, at Somerset's ambition,
> At Buckingham and all the crew of them,
> Till they have snar'd the shepherd of the flock,
> That virtuous prince, the good Duke Humphrey.
> 'Tis that they seek, and they in seeking that
> Shall find their deaths, if York can prophesy. (*2H6*, 2.2.64–76)

The point is that one's fate is determined and, since York can prophesy what will happen to these people who stand in his way, since he can presume that their fates are already sealed, he need not take action against them. All York need do is watch them fall. Both Shakespeare and York are relying on the fate active in the

de casibus tragic vision to do their work. York won't have to clear his way to the throne, and Shakespeare is relieved of the task of inventing stratagems and ploys for York to employ in this enterprise. The result is that there is precious little dramatic action to Shakespeare's plot. And with little to do, York has no opportunity to develop much character, let alone to succeed as a protagonist whose overarching goal can hold three plays together.

13. Many scholars have analyzed Clarence's dream. Emrys Jones (*Origins of Shakespeare*, 206–11) offers a particularly fine account of how "the classical is made English, the English is enriched and rounded out on classical forms and prototypes" in Clarence's dream through Shakespeare's imaginative borrowings from Virgil and Spenser. See also John Jowett's remarks on "Unquiet Slumbers" in the Oxford edition of *Richard III*, 48–53.

14. See Lopez, "Time and Talk in *Richard III* I.iv," 308–12.

15. For a different slant on the subject of the Murderers' view of their task, see Paola Pugliatti, *Shakespeare the Historian,* 207–8.

16. Lopez remarks that "In *Richard III* I.iv Clarence does nothing *but* demonstrate his nobility and humanity. Shakespeare goes out of his way to make Clarence sympathetic" (311). In this regard, one remembers John Gielgud's portrayal of Clarence in the Olivier film.

17. Shakespeare's use of this passage as the basis for the beat structure of *Richard III* 2.1 is demonstrated in chapter 2 of our book, *Analyzing Shakespeare's Action: Scene Versus Sequence,* pp. 11–20.

18. Shakespeare's inspiration for the little drama between Lord Stanley and King Edward seems to be an anecdote taken not from 1483, where More's contribution was spliced into Hall's *Chronicle*, but from the year 1478, "The XVII. Yere of Kyng Edward the IIIJ." In this chapter, the *Chronicles* report Edward's reaction to the death of Clarence—five years before Edward's own death. The encounter in the source, like the lament Shakespeare writes for Edward, has the roundness of a scene. In Hall's version, there is first the account of the "folysh Prophesye" that troubled the king, who "by reason thereof began to stomacke & greuously to grudge against the duke," his brother George. This and other grudges having been appeased, a new matter for discord arose between the two brothers. Apparently, a servant of George, Duke Clarence,

> was sodainly accused (I can not say of treuth, or vntruely suspected by the Dukes enemies) of poysonyng, sorcery, or inchauntment, & therof condempned, and put to taste the paynes of death. The duke, which myght not suffer the wrongfull condemnacion of his man (as he in his conscience adiudged) nor yet forbere, nor paciently suffer the vniust handelyng of his trusty seruaunt, dayly dyd oppugne, and with yll woordes murmur at the doyng thereof. The king much greued and troubled with hys brothers dayly querimonye, and contynuall exclamacion, caused hym to be apprehended, and cast into the Towre, where he beying taken and adiudged for a Traytor, was priuely drouned in a But of Maluesey.... [A]lthough kyng Edward were consentyng to his death and destruccion, yet he much dyd bothe lamente his infortunate chaunce, and repent hys sodayne execucion. Inasmuche, that when any person sued to hym for Pardon or remission, of any malefactor condempned to the punishment of death, he woulde accustomably saye, & openly speke, O infortunate brother, for whose lyfe not one creature would make intercession, openly spekyng, and apparantly meanynge,

that by the meanes of some of the nobilitie, he was circumuented, and brought to hys confusion. (Hall, 326)

19. Compare *Taming of the Shrew*, where Shakespeare chose not to dramatize the most important event in the play but to have a messenger describe it. "In Shakespeare's own version of the wedding, neither Kate nor Petruchio comes onstage. We never see the wedding. We only hear about it. We have to take Gremio's word for it that at the church Petruchio behaved like 'a devil, a devil, a very fiend' and Tranio's that Kate was 'a devil, a devil, the devil's dam' and Gremio's again that Kate was 'a lamb, a dove, a fool to him' (3.2.154–56). If the 'mad-brained bridegroom' engendered a 'mad marriage,' if Petruchio was prepared to rival Kate in creating chaos, if, in spite of all of that, Petruchio managed to keep curst Kate at the altar and marry her—for that, too, we have to take Gremio's word. We aren't invited to the wedding that was promised as the climax of Petruchio's arrival" (10). Charles A. Hallett, "'For she is changed, as she had never been': Kate's Reversal in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Shakespeare Bulletin* 20 (2002), 10. This essay offers observations about scenic structure (or the lack thereof) in Shakespeare's early comedy.

20. Compare Shakespeare's use of the shocking report to effect the scene's climax in *1H4*, 2.4.523–58; *Much Ado* 4.1.87–92; *Othello* 3.3.197–200; or see *Analyzing Shakespeare's Action*, "Reporting and interrogating sequences," 135–51.

3   "For on That Ground I'll Make a Holy Descant—": Two Con Men Show How Their Thespian Skills Brought Richard's Cause "to a Happy Issue"

1. See, for example, *The Plantagenets,* Archived Film, directed by Adrian Noble (January 6, 1989; Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford. Viewed at Shakespeare Centre). The citizen audience doesn't applaud the acceptance speech of Anton Lesser's Richard. In this production, the priests in Richard's entourage have to intimidate the citizens into applauding. These citizens are vocal throughout the scene, but they show a definite preference for the crowning of the young prince. They raise their cheers earlier in the scene when Richard suggests that the crown be awarded to Prince Edward but show little enthusiasm for Richard. For a fuller analysis of the performance, see Gillian Day (76–79), who quotes Anton Lesser as stating that "Richard and Buckingham are merely seeking to fulfil a formula: it must be *recorded* in the annals, that on such-and-such a date, under duress of the people, Richard accepted the crown."

2. Chapter 4 in *Songs of Death: Performance, Interpretation, and the Text of "Richard III,"* pp. 74–88.

3. "Conscience and Complicity in *Richard III*." The Norton editor presents Berger's essay as being the high point of a book of selected essays being offered to students on how to read and understand the play. In methodology, Berger follows the lead of Patricia Parker and Linda Charnes.

4. Using Hall's *Chronicle* and Thomas Legge's *Richardus Tertius* to determine Shakespeare's meaning, Hassel reasons that the citizen audience must have been bribed. "That the audience is bought and sold is a compelling explanation of such apparent discontinuities; it also fits comfortably with what we have been hearing of this rotten charade for the last three scenes. It must be all surface, this last little play of theirs, for form only. Richard will be proclaimed king by a handful of hired actors. Only with such a purchased audience could his histrionics

possibly work. It is not to Richard's credit here that he congratulates himself and Buckingham for the artistic success of such a reception" (83).

5. Berger rejects Anne Righter Barton's argument in *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* that Shakespeare "diverge[s] on this point from the source of the scene in Thomas More's life of Richard." Barton is wrong, says Berger, when she asserts that the "'ingenuous souls are deceived' by 'the brilliance of Richard's perfor-mance.'" In a lengthy analysis of 3.7, Berger concludes that the scene is unnecessary to the play. For Berger, "Richard's [long] performance becomes puzzling as soon as we ask at whom it's aimed and what it seems intended to accomplish. Is it drawn out because the onstage audience are hard to convince?" (405). Berger says no. More's *History,* Berger reasons, clearly states that the citizens saw through Richard but were powerless to alter the situation. Consequently, Shakespeare's 3.7 is not about Richard's urgent need to win over the citizens. People in the theater audience are to assume "not only that *the citizens aren't deceived* but also that *Richard doesn't expect to deceive them*." Richard's performance in the Baynard's Castle scene, declares Berger, is motivated by his desire to show the theater audi-ence how much the citizen audience "lets him get away with…it mocks the citizens' desire for the ritual cover that helps them excuse their complicity in the usurpation" (411–12). Berger fervently maintains that Shakespeare has *not* "diverge[d] on this point from the source of the scene in Thomas More's life of Richard" (405).

6. Compare Richard S. Sylvester's appraisal of More's point of view:

> Richard's world, as More imagines it for us, is indeed vicious. Cabals and sudden death are constant terrors. The protector and his cohorts present one face to the world and another to each other. Those who suffer under their machinations appear to be mere spectators at a play, watching a kind of impudent mime that may, at any moment, involve them in the action. Richard casts himself in role after role, but More never lets us doubt that men can see through his disguises. Each of the protector's triumphs turns on a piece of bad acting–during Shaa's sermon he actually misses his entrance cue—in which even the least of the citizens can discern that the role and the man do not square. (*History … and Poems*, xviii).

7. Some commentators, Paul Prescott, for example, suggest that Buckingham "address the theatre audience as if we too were citizens of London. Not only does this offer a practical solution to a spatial and acoustic quandary," he argues; "it also intensifies our sense of involvement—and complicity—in Richard's rise" (70–71). This prac-tice was followed in a recent production at the Swan Theatre, primarily because the stage was too small to hold a separate citizen audience. Throughout the scene, the Buckingham and the Richard both addressed the spectators as though the specta-tors were the citizens they needed to persuade. This meant that the spectators were being asked to "play" both the audience that is to be duped and the audience that is to applaud the duping action—an uncomfortable situation and one that deflects from the ingenuity of Shakespeare's ingenious multileveled scenic structure.

8. James R. Siemon considers the possible meanings of this passage in the newly edited Arden Edition of *Richard III*, pp. 10–13. F. W. Brownlow's perception is interesting in this regard. "Shakespeare," he reminds us, "always conscious of his technical adroitness, is teaching his audience to recognise the means he uses to please them. The habit of annotating his own work stayed with Shakespeare to the end of his career, a curious little pedantry or touch of self-consciousness in his style." Brownlow is speaking of *2 Henry VI*, but the comment applies here.

9. For the quotations in this paragraph, see Logan's edition of More's *History*, pp. 128–29. Among the sources and analogues that Logan cites are *The New Chronicles of England and of France* (printed 1516/7) and *The Great Chronicle of London*. Louis L. Martz praises the formal speeches More had "imagined for his speakers in the humanistic history of *Richard III*" as "nothing less than a small classical oration, a Phillipic, or a Catilinian oration" (98).

10. See Robert Y. Turner, chapter 1, note 8.

11. This difference between a static structure and a vigorous one, between staged narrative and dramatic action, becomes vividly apparent when one views Ralph Richardson's performance as the disappointed Buckingham in this segment and then watches Malcolm Storry play the role. There is a marked contrast. Richardson envisions the Buckingham of 3.7.1–55 as a returning messenger and the passage as necessary exposition, and therefore strives to convey the story Buckingham has to tell with absolute clarity. But to avoid losing the attention of the audience, he invented interesting stage business to enliven the lines. Thus, when we see Richardson's Buckingham apprising Richard of his encounter with London's citizens, we also find him deeply absorbed in the activity of preparing his dinner. Richardson's nonchalance in spearing a piece of cheese and putting it upon a piece of bread or of going over to pour out a glass of wine calls attention to the interesting décor in the room and to the skills with which he can manipulate himself between and around the furniture as he fills his plate. This sophisticated nonchalance creates as it were a scrim between the lines and their meaning that distracts from the playwright's emphasis on the citizens' silence. In the Bill Alexander production, the effect is radically different. The actors here, Antony Sher and Malcolm Storry, agree that the dialogue in the scene focuses on the obstinate silence of the citizens and employ their talents to bring this awareness to the audience. Storry, playing Buckingham, comes down harshly on every available image that disparages the Londoners. He barges into Baynard's Castle forcefully, complaining to Richard in no uncertain terms that "the citizens are mum, say not a word." This Buckingham works Richard up so that Richard too is incensed against the citizens: "What tongueless blocks were they!" cries Sher's Richard, as if the concept were almost incredible. "Would they not speak?" In this production, Storry's Buckingham, in the immediacy of his ire, has so overstated the case that Sher's Richard briefly panics. *Richard III*, VHS, directed by Laurence Olivier (1955; London Film Productions, Ltd., 2000). *Richard III*, Archived Film, directed by Bill Alexander (September 1, 1985; Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford. Viewed at Shakespeare Centre).

12. In David Weil Baker's recent essay, "Jacobean Historiography and the Election of Richard III," readers will find a fascinating account of this famous "pre-coronation petition" and its role in subsequent British history. Baker writes of the remarkable discovery of the 1484 Act of Settlement by "William Camden, a founding member of the Society of Antiquaries, [who] brought this parliamentary act to light in the sixth and final edition of *Britannia,* which was published in 1607 and translated from Latin into English by Philemon Holland in 1610.... The Parliament of Richard III had ratified a pre-coronation petition urging Richard III to take the throne by 'lawful election' of the 'three states assembled' as well as by 'inheritance.'" The text of the petition "was included in the parliamentary act" (313).

13. Shakespeare demonstrates a similar reliance on dramatic irony as opposed to dramatic resistance in his adaptation in *3 Henry VI,* act 4, scene 7, of details borrowed

from Hall's lively account of Edward IV's activities in Yorkshire in 1461. Notice that Shakespeare pares down conflicts involving persuasion to the bare essentials of the narrative. Returning from exile in France, the deposed King Edward stands before the walls of York demanding that the Mayor unlock the gates to him. The Mayor spurns this request. Hall reports in his *Chronicle* (291) that "the whole daye was consumed in doutfull communicacion and ernest interlocution" before the townspeople could be persuaded that Edward meant no harm. In Shakespeare's staging, Edward reassures the Mayor with a single sentence, and the Mayor with like brevity announces himself persuaded. The gates swing open as if operated by an electronic eye (*3H6*, 4.7.1–39). The same abruptness stands out in the succeeding conflict between Edward and Sir John Montgomery, who has rushed to York with his troops to help King Edward regain his crown (*3H6*, 4.7.40–78). Edward declares his intention to remain quiescent within the walls of York until "we grow stronger;" for now, "we only claim our dukedom." Montgomery's three-line threat to withdraw his troops in the face of such cowardice "persuades" Edward to abandon his cautious stance, whereupon a proclamation is read restoring King Edward's title, and the scene closes with Edward ready to lead an army against Henry's forces on the morrow. In each case, the resistance that would render the persuasion convincing dissolves almost as soon as it is introduced, as though effected through the medium of the playwright rather than through negotiations between the characters.

14. Ramie Targoff, "'Dirty' Amens: Devotion, Applause, and Consent in *Richard III*," (75).

15. It is because of Shakespeare's new awareness of the "full dramatic potentialities" of the persuasion scene, Turner concludes, that Richard's "courtship of Lady Anne is without parallel in drama until this time in its deceptive, artful strategy" (74). In his analysis of "scenes of persuasion" (i.e., scenes in which one character gradually "gains control over another through the artful use of words"), Turner instructively contrasts two approaches to the crafting of such scenes:

> The dialogue of persuasion would have a ready appeal to playwrights trained in rhetoric because they could transpose to the stage with very few adjustments a traditional deliberative oration. Yet such a simple version of the persuasion scene between an orator who delivers a speech and his listeners who assent hardly realizes its full dramatic potentialities. To do this, the playwright should pay as much attention to the listener submitting to the oratory as he does to the speaker exercising the artful tactics of his control. When the playwright meets the many demands of the situation, he produces one of the major experiences that drama as an art form is particularly equipped to foster. Iago's temptation of Othello comes immediately to mind." (67)

Ironically, the first of these processes is the one many commentators attribute to Shakespeare when they blithely assume that all Shakespeare had to do was to convert More's eloquent orations into dialogue form. Working with Richard and attempting to reproduce Richard's techniques taught Shakespeare otherwise.

4   "Was Ever Woman in This Humor Woo'd? / Was Ever Woman in This Humor Won?": Richard's Boast of His Prowess as Lover *and* Playwright

1. See "Burbage's *Richard III*," pp. 33–47 in *King Richard III. Shakespeare in Performance.*

2. Nora Johnson concludes her study of *The Actor as Playwright in Early Modern Drama* with the observation that it is not characteristic of Shakespeare to seek fame as a playwright (161). There is an "absence of direct self-promotion" in Shakespeare. (165).

3. "Richard woos Lady Anne (his most unlikely conquest in the play; I've never seen it work) by being pathetic, vulnerable" (*Year of the King,* 18).

4. *Illustrated London News*. "I've cut the wooing-of-Lady-Anne scene in two," Olivier tells Alan Dent, "in an attempt to make it more credible." See Marliss C. Desens, "Cutting Women Down to Size," pp. 263–64, for a record of the alterations Olivier made in filming the wooing scene. Of the Loncraine version of this scene, Desens remarks, "so much dialogue is cut and nothing put in its place to hold the scene together" that "we do not know why Anne said yes to [Richard], nor do we particularly care" (264).

5. P., G.M., "*Henry VI* and *Richard III*: B.B.C. Shakespeare," *Cahiers Elisabéthains* 24 (October 1983): 82.

6. *Richard III*, VHS, directed by Laurence Olivier (1955; London Film Productions, 2000). *Richard III*, Archived Film, directed by Bill Alexander (September 1, 1985; Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford. Viewed at Shakespeare Centre). *Richard III*, VHS, directed by Jane Howell (1982, BBC-TV, Ambrose Video, 1987).

7. *Two Gentlemen of Verona, Titus Andronicus*, the three *Henry VI* chronicle plays, and some or all of *Edward III*. Others, as Anthony Holden notes, point to *Taming of the Shrew* or *Comedy of Errors* as Shakespeare's first play (98–105). As Robert Y. Turner noted, "a quick survey of courtship scenes in Shakespeare's preceding dramas shows that [none of them] take[s] the shape of a gradual overcoming of a reluctant lady" (see Preface, note 2).

8. For a historical study of Lady Anne, see Michael Hicks, *Anne Neville, Queen to Richard III*.

9. Contrast the handling of Richard's approach to Anne with that created by Seneca for the tyrant Lycus in the wooing scene in *Hercules furens*, a play often cited among the many sources Shakespeare has drawn upon for individual details in this scene. Lycus deems that marriage to the dead king's daughter Megara will consolidate his power as the new ruler. Megara, like Anne, detests her wooer. Moreover, Megara's hatred for Lycus stems from the same source as Anne's loathing for Richard—Lycus had killed Megara's father and brothers. Richard had killed Anne's husband and her husband's father. The situation in which Lycus approaches Megara had a convenient aptness to the historical situation that existed in 1472 when Richard married the widowed Anne Neville. Shakespeare may very well have found Megara's opening stance suitable for the positioning of Anne in the reversal scene Richard was constructing. To have Richard out-Lycus Lycus by accosting Anne while she was in mourning would serve the purposes of both playwright and character in an appropriately daring display of craftsmanship. That both couples debate their differences in stichomythic acrimony is regularly noted in commentaries on Shakespeare's scene. But Lycus lacks the dramatic talents of Richard. Moreover, as the wooing episode in Seneca's play progresses, its similarity to the wooing scene in *Richard III* grows dimmer. Shakespeare did not find the concept of a reversal in the construction of Seneca's scene. Seneca's Lycus makes no headway with the lady, and shortly thereafter, Hercules, Megara's husband, comes on stage, rendering Lycus' suit a futile endeavor. For an English version of Seneca's *Hercules furens*, see *Jasper Heywood and his Translation of Seneca's "Troas," "Thyestes" and "Hercules furens,"* ed. H. DeVocht.

10. Discussing the stichomythia found in the play's dialogue and emphasizing "the stylization of verbal patterning (with its neatly over-exact adjustments of stroke to stroke, as in royal tennis)," Rossiter reflects that "those reversals of intention" in the characters' lines reflect "the pattern of the repeated reversals of human expectation, the reversals of events, the anticipated reversals (foreseen only by the audience)," which occur throughout the play (5).

11. Nelsen, Paul. "Merry Meetings: An Interview with Director Michael Grandage on His Production of *Richard III* Starring Kenneth Branagh." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 21, no. 1 (Winter 2003): 30–33.

12. *Richard III*, DVD, directed by Richard Loncraine (MGM/UA, 1996).

13. There is an interesting lead-up to the climax in the performance between David Troughton and Jennifer Ehle. Ehle's Anne doesn't realize what Richard is driving at when he offers her a Plantagenet "of a better nature" than her Edward, and she asks "Where is he?" She hasn't understood that Richard is referring to himself. Only when he says, "Here," indicating "Me," does she grasp his meaning and then she displays her revulsion. Troughton's Richard cringes after Anne spits at him—he is confused, inquires why she spit at him as if he really wants an answer. He is completely taken aback by her action and seeks an explanation. *Richard III*, Archived Film, directed by Steven Pimlott. (September 30, 1995, Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford. Viewed at Shakespeare Centre).

14. Different sources have been suggested for the appearance of Richard's sword in the Lady Anne scene. John Jowett notes that "Shakespeare seems to draw on [Seneca's] *Hippolytus* for Richard's gambit of offering Anne his sword" (23). Others call attention to the brief wooing scene in Legge's *Richardus Tertius,* where Richard offers to kill himself if Lady Elizabeth would have him do so (though very soon after that he waxes far more serious about killing Elizabeth with the same sword). Robert J. Lordi, editor and translator of the English version of *Richardus Tertius*, concludes that "despite the possibility that Shakespeare might have known *Richardus Tertius* and despite the striking similarity of the wooing scenes in the two plays, there is virtually no evidence that he used *Richardus Tertius* ("The Relationship of *Richardus Tertius* to the Main Richard III Plays," p. 153). Many subsequent critics cite Lordi's conclusion.

5   "The Most Arch Act of Piteous Massacre / That Ever Yet This Land Was Guilty of": How Shakespeare's Method of Exposing Richard Differs from More's

1. Shakespeare's Richard, in "correcting" More's version of the story, has seen the value of placing the Duke of Buckingham in the awkward position that the historical Richard had allotted to Brackenbury, the constable in the Tower, who, in the *History*, is Richard's first choice as the assassin of the boy princes. The substitution is another of the strokes of genius that constantly turn up in this play. The unknown author of *The True Tragedy of Richard the Third* makes no such alteration. *The True Tragedy* follows the story as it appears in More (see scene xii, lines 1189–1210, especially the passage in which Robert Brokenbery, when surrendering the keys to the princes' cell, informs Maister Terrell that "the king oftentimes hath sent to me to haue them both dispacht, but…my heart vvould neuer giue me to do the deed").

2. Shakespeare's spelling is Tyrrel but More's spelling is Tyrell.

6   "To Her Go I, a Jolly Thriving Wooer":
The Second Wooing Scene (4.4.199–431)

1. Robert B. Pierce declares that "the episode is an extended and less effective version of Anne's courtship, probably in order to suggest [Richard's] lessening power. His arguments are often perfunctory, as though he were bored with the need to deceive still another foolish woman.... The last line of the speech tapers off into petulance" (116). Similar examples are abundant.

2. Quotations from "The IIJ Year of Kyng Richard the. IIJ" are taken directly from Hall's *Chronicle*. (See Kendall, *Richard III: The Great Debate*, p. 29: "In order to complete the story of King Richard's reign there is appended to [More's] *History* a 'continuation' composed by [Richard] Grafton for his edition of Hardyng's *Chronicle*. Hall's continuation (in his *Chronicle*) is much more elaborate. The reader will quickly remark 'what a falling off was there!' between Thomas More's masterwork of dramatic irony and Grafton's pedestrian chronicling, based on Vergil's *Anglica Historia*"). Bear in mind that as the textual source for quotations from the chapter that Hall titled "The Pitifull Life of Kyng Edward the Fift," this study uses More's own *History* (ed. George M. Logan).

3. Commentators tend to admire the Elizabeth More renders in the sanctuary scene. Richard Marius has glowing words for the depiction: "When Richard and his council demand the release of the little Duke of York from sanctuary, Queen Elizabeth appeals to the quality of mercy in her tormentors and finds none. But in the fervor of her appeals and in the depths of her grief, she attains, in our eyes, a heroic and tragic stature. 'The law of nature,' she protests, 'wills the mother to keep her child.' We know all along that Richard's iron heart is not to be melted by such a plea, so we see in her sad figure almost the archetypal mother who can only weep while war, famine, pestilence, and death consume her sons" (106). Judith P. Jones remarks that More portrays "the queen energetically arguing with the cardinal, who is using all of the tricks of rhetoric and logic, including threats, to persuade her to surrender her son. Rhetorical skill, intelligence, and emotional control enable the queen to match the cardinal's subtleties, but her efforts are futile." Jones concludes that "the queen's devotion, strength, and sagacity magnify the extent of Richard's chaotic destructiveness" (56–57). For a fuller and sympathetic biography of the life of Elizabeth Woodville, see Arlene Okerlund, *Elizabeth Wydeville: The Slandered Queen*.

4. Richard B. Wheeler reminds us that "it is as to a mother that [Richard] turns to Edward's widowed queen...He goes on to promise her first 'grandam's name,' then the chance to be 'mother of a king.' As he moves toward increased intimacy, he calls her 'my mother,' then 'dear mother.' He celebrates his success by calling her 'happy mother'" (187).

5. As the editor of the Oxford edition of *Richard III* notes, the more highly polished Folio text "has 14 extra lines, in which the Queen accuses Richard of responsibility for killing her sons" (Jowett, 310).

6. Emrys Jones, "Richard III and Queen Elizabeth," 203–7, esp. 206.

7. Antony Hammond's position is similar: Richard's wooing endeavor in "IV.iv is a failure, owing to the recalcitrance of his new leading lady, Queen Elizabeth" (113).

8. Cf. Peter Holland, xxxv; Edward I. Berry, 97.

9. Susan Brown, "Queen Elizabeth in *Richard III*," 101–13, esp. 112. See also Michael Taylor, "Introduction," *Richard III*, xxxi–xxxii. Commenting that *Richard III*

"offers readers and performers numerous occasions for different, conflicting inter-pretative possibilities," Taylor notes that "the encounter between Richard and Elizabeth in the fourth act is a good illustration of the open season on interpreta-tion." He describes how several different "Elizabeths" have rendered the scene's conclusion in recent productions.

10. Hassel, 65–66.

11. See also F. W. Brownlow, pp. 65–66: "Yet even in this latter part of the play, when he begins to be troubled by insecurity, Richard can persuade the Queen-Mother whose boys he killed to agree to his marriage with her daughter."

12. Charles Marowitz, "Reconstructing Shakespeare," 1–10.

13. J. Dover Wilson contrasts Shakespeare's handling of the matter of the marriage between Princess Elizabeth and Henry Earl of Richmond with that found in the "reported text" published in 1594 as *The True Tragedy of Richard III.* Shakespeare, Wilson argues, seems uninterested in the marriage per se. Indeed, Wilson finds himself "at a loss to understand what the Queen-Mother's intentions are" and feels it "strange that Shakespeare should leave his audience in doubt for over a hundred and twenty lines whether or no the ancestress of his own Queen Elizabeth had sold her daughter to a man whose hands were red with the blood of her sons, even though we are undeceived shortly after" (pp. xliv–xlv). He goes on to stress that in *The True Tragedy of Richard III* the author displays more distinctly political inten-tions: "How differently the whole dynastic business was dealt with in the original of *The True Tragedy* may be gathered from the prominence of the Princess from the outset, . . . from her betrothal with Richmond on the stage, and above all from the conclusion of the text which takes the form of a prophetic vision of the glories coming to the Tudor dynasty and in particular to Elizabeth the Great herself." Wilson points to the absence of Princess Elizabeth from Shakespeare's play and from this scene in particular as evidence against Tillyard's then-prevailing theory "that Shakespeare's 'main end' in *Richard III*" was to glorify the House of Tudor (xlv).

14. "As with all great Shakespearians, [Branagh] makes some lines seem so new-minted you rush back to the text to check it, and find he's revealing anew what was already written. [He delivers the line] in such cut-the-crap tones that the audience laughs aloud." Alastair Macauley, *Financial Times*, in *Theatre Record* 12 (25 March 2002): 363.

15. Donna J. Oestreich-Hart suggests a different kind of debt to Ovid than we intuit. See "Therefore, Since I Cannot Prove a Lover," *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 40 (2000): 241–60. Robert A. Logan cites "the scene in which Richard tries to convince Queen Elizabeth that her daughter Elizabeth should be his next bride (IV.iv.200–430)" as evidence of his contention that Shakespeare, in Marlovian fashion, pulls "all the stops out in order to awe us and, in so doing, to lead us to acknowledge the author's artistic powers." He argues that the characters' speeches in the scene so deliberately call attention to "the playwright's linguistic skills" that viewers and readers alike tend to "break with the reality of the world of the play" into "the reality of the world of the writer where, in a detached and reflective state, we can more properly view the mechanics of the dramaturgi-cal technique and even their rationale" (47). His point is that both Marlowe and Shakespeare expect their audiences to have a double awareness: the spectator is of course absorbed in what the characters are doing but is encouraged at the same time to "bestow a proper importance" on the imaginative effects and achieve-ments of the playwright, that is, on *how* the dramaturgical and linguistic effects have been achieved.

16. Barbara Hodgdon discusses how Shakespeare's handling of Richard's extended speech and "Elizabeth's biting response" to it in the Folio skillfully absorbs the future of England into "the play's historical present." In doing so she develops the idea that Shakespeare's Richard is unwittingly and ironically made to voice "Richmond's future as his own" (110–11).

17. Katharine Goodland shows how *Richard III* "encompasses a struggle between Richard's will to forget the dead, to effect political amnesia by a perpetual orientation toward the future, and the mourning women who embody the past, the insistence and intrusion of memory upon human actions." See "'Obsequious Laments': Mourning and Communal Memory in Shakespeare's *Richard III*" (56).

18. Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin argue that in *Richard III* "the women are deprived of theatrical power and agency, both of which are appropriated by Richard." Howard and Rackin condemn Shakespeare for not allowing the audience "to see Elizabeth deciding to bestow her daughter on Richmond" and disapprove of his providing only a "laconic report" of the fact when she does so. Shakespeare, they feel, focuses on Richmond rather than on Elizabeth, and, to the playwright, "whether or when the queen gives her consent is of so little consequence that it is never clearly specified in Shakespeare's script." Howard and Rackin, for these reasons—for the alleged failure to give theatrical power and agency to the women characters—place themselves among the "number of critics [who] have accepted Richard's judgment at the end of their encounter that the queen is a 'relenting fool, and shallow, changing woman.'" See *Engendering a Nation*, 108–9. We would counter that much of the power of 4.4.199–431 derives from the fact that Shakespeare has given theatrical power and agency to Queen Elizabeth in abundance. McGrail argues that the women in the play function "not as participants in the action of the plot, but as knowers of its significance" (52). In a fascinating analysis of the three queens, Judith H. Anderson makes a strong argument for the theatrical power of Margaret's role. Shakespeare, says Anderson, renders Queen Margaret as "a correlative to the elemental and emotional depths in the play. . . . The association of the deep with the primitive, irrational, and subconscious is overwhelming. Margaret is part of this symbolism, as her entrance from behind the other actors suggests. Her bitter incantations and historically allusive presence—together the sum of her identity—extend this symbolism to history, the depths of time" (*Biographical Truth*, 121–22).

19. That Queen Elizabeth becomes the inquisitor, "this, and not the 'wooing' duplication that distresses so many commentators, is the point of the scene" (Ralph Berry, 54). Berry adds that the "spiritual ordeal that Queen Elizabeth is subjected to [by the bitter Queen Margaret] . . . invests with greater authority [Elizabeth's] dissection of Richard" (56). L. C. Knights remarks that Queen Elizabeth, engaged in a formal rhetorical duel with Richard (IV.iv.376–80), shows him step by step, that there is nothing he can swear by and be believed" (23).

20. Jones, "Richard III and Queen Elizabeth," 206.

21. Thomas F. Van Laan reasons that Elizabeth "gives in to [Richard's] demands finally—or seems to—but even then it is not a king she yields to but 'the devil'" (418). "[Richard] clearly has lost the capacity he once had to convince others through his play-acting that he is someone or something else. He does eventually seem to win her over, but not through deluding her. The only way he can secure even her feigned acquiescence is through naked threats of the dire consequences that will ensue if she continues to refuse him" (144).

22. Wolfgang Clemen has argued against such an option, citing the fact that "in the plays of his early and middle periods Shakespeare never fails to let us into the

secret of any sudden and extraordinary dissimulation of this kind" and "here we are provided with no explanatory aside, nor has Elizabeth previously been portrayed as a dissembler" (191).

23. See Robert Y. Turner's perspicacious reading of Elizabeth's role in the second persuasion scene, pp. 78–81 in *Shakespeare's Apprenticeship.* Turner states that "Elizabeth's moral judgments of [Richard's] behavior are as clear and accurate as Richmond's" (80), that "the Devil cannot tempt Queen Elizabeth because she knows who he is" (81).

24. Cf. the conclusion reached by Judith H. Anderson: "Richard's 'wholeness'—his consistency and magnitude—is an empty one. He is in actuality an inversion of human wholeness, a parodic black hole, an absolute space in the center of his own being" (116).

7 "Here Pitch Our Tent, Even Here in Bosworth Field": Meanwhile, Back at the Tetralogy . . .

1. In a chapter called "*Richard III* and *Theatrum Historiae*" in *Shakespeare, The Queen's Men, and the Elizabethan Performance of History,* Brian Walsh studies Shakespeare's use of historical memory to link the final play of the tetralogy closely to its predecessor, *3 Henry VI.*

2. See Price's influential commentary on Shakespeare's first tetralogy, "Construction in Shakespeare."

3. "Touches of melodrama should not prevent us from seeing that Richard's dialogue with himself . . . not only points forward to the deeper searchings of the self-division caused by evil in *Macbeth*, it helps to explain why *Richard III* is so much more than an historical pageant, more even than a political morality play. It is one instance among others of Shakespeare's sure sense—his sane, sure probing—of what lies behind the heavy entanglements of public action" (L. C. Knights, 24).

4. There is a wide variety of appraisals of Richard's soliloquy. A. D. Nuttall waxes ecstatic over it. Stating that "Where before, in the manner of the old morality, [Richard] used his soliloquies to talk to us, the audience, now he is talking to himself." Nuttall goes so far as to single out this soliloquy as the origin of "a new species of privacy," to which "we become eavesdroppers" (53). Studying the Marlovian influences in Richard's soliloquies, Robert A. Logan stresses that Shakespeare's Richard "is most Marlovian . . . when he is emotionally wrought up after the full realization of the consequences of his villainy (V.iii.178–207). In this, he is like Faustus just before he is taken to Hell. . . . Both men have looked inward and now, with a strong awareness of a universal ethical scheme, see that they are irretrievably damned. Their intensely emotional self-reflections and agony are apparent. . . . The two protagonists both articulate with tremendous force their suffering on a psychological torture rack" (41). Harold Bloom's appraisal is markedly different. Bloom brands Richard's soliloquy as inept. "This Richard has no inwardness," writes Bloom, "and when Shakespeare attempts to imbue him with an anxious inner self, on the eve of his fatal battle, the result is poetic bathos and dramatic disaster." Bloom remarks that "The peculiar badness [of the passage] is difficult to describe, though the fallacy of imitative form is nowhere better illustrated. The disjunctions in Richard's self-consciousness are meant to be reflected by the abrupt rhetorical questions and exclamations of lines 183–89, but no actor can salvage Richard from sounding silly in this staccato outburst. We can see what Shakespeare is trying to accomplish when we study the speech, but we cannot

do for the poet what he has not yet learned to do for himself" (66–67). Stephen Greenblatt concurs (Cf. *Will in the World*, 299–300).

5. "First, Shakespeare omits the tour de force of Richard's audacious hypocrisy at the opening of his speech to his chieftains.... Shakespeare's second omission from Hall [is] Richard's contrived admission of considerable guilt.... In Hall, the cleverness, the will to deceive, the enormous energy and delight in religious hypocrisy which Shakespeare has so effectively used in his Richard of acts 1–3, is still there, still full of dramatic potential. He essentially says, 'The Devil made me do it, but I have repented, clearly purged the sin away. You would be less than Christian men if you did not forgive me as God has forgiven me.' Shakespeare completely eliminates the audacious attempt.... Further omitted in Shakespeare's oration is a passage from Hall which Shakespeare would surely have appropriated for his more clever and vigorous Richard of acts 1 or 2. The passage directly celebrates the wit and policy of the Machiavel.... Wit and policy were once Richard's stock in trade. Now they are becoming his potent adversaries, denied him at this most crucial moment by Shakespeare's excising hand" (Hassel, 37–39). See *Songs of Death*, chapter 2, "Richard versus Richmond: Aesthetic Warfare in Act 5," for fuller details of Hassel's fine analysis of Shakespeare's changes and omissions.

6. Modern scholars have little regard for Shakespeare's rendering of the true saint destined to balance Richard's earlier impersonation of one. J. Dover Wilson famously dismisses Richmond as "a stick" (xliv). M. M. Reese thinks of "pasteboard" (225). Sandra Clark affirms that "for audiences of the present day [Richmond] is a disappointingly shadowy antagonist for the outrageously vital and dynamic Richard III" (108). Judith H. Anderson makes the same point in another way. "Richmond's nature lacks depth. He is a Tudor blazon without fully human dimension. He is not realized as a character in and of the play. He is moral and fictional but neither whole nor quite credible: the illusion of biographical truth is not in him.... Shakespeare's image of Henry VII's character has not interfered with our assessing the historical King" as did Shakespeare's image of Richard III. There is nothing memorable, she adds, about Shakespeare's avenging angel: "Richmond's concluding speech, a vision of forgiveness, fidelity, hope, and harmony sharply opposes the evils of Richard's reign. Yet the redemptive Richmond neither appropriates nor cancels Richard's real influence. Richmond does not re-possess Richard's imagination or, as a dramatic figure, his power. Richard, Clarence's dream, and Margaret are what we remember" (122–23).

7. Emrys Jones presents the definitive argument for such an interpretation in a cogent analysis of the scene in an essay he entitles "Bosworth Eve" (*Essays in Criticism* 25 [January 1975]: 38–54). Since our purpose calls for a recognition of what Shakespeare sacrifices (pageantry, even when performed on the playhouse stage, need not produce *drama*), we feel obliged to refer the reader to Jones' admirable appreciation of the celebratory aspects Shakespeare's fifth act.

8   Later Uses of the Ricardian Template: Crafting the Fifth Act of *Coriolanus*

1. In Plutarch, though the Roman Senate sends ambassadors to Coriolanus "chosen out of his kindred and acquaintance" (165) and later decrees that "the whole order of their priests [should] go in full procession to Marcius with their pontifical array" to urge him to withdraw his army (166), Shakespeare invents his own

particulars for each embassy, making each a separate dramatic unit and orches-
trating the three appeals as a series of intensifying scenes.

Appendix: Interlocking Episodes of Action:
Shakespeare's Use of More's "Rusty Armor"
Scene (3.5.1–109)

1. Julie Hankey notes, with appropriate disapproval, that "during the eighteenth
century, the Lord Mayor was played as a buffoon, and there are traces of the
tradition in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries." She cites the anecdote that
records George II's preference for Taswell's Mayor over Garrick's Richard when
he attended a performance of *Richard III* at the Drury Lane in September 1755
"'When Richard was in Bosworth field, roaring for a horse, his majesty saide
"Duke of Grafton, will that Lord Mayor not come again?' " (179–80).
2. Though historians remind us that Shore's wife was called Elizabeth, not Jane, it is
under the latter name that the lady is best known.

WORKS CITED

Quotations to Shakespeare cited in the text are from *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans and J. J. M. Tobin. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.

For the convenience of the reader, citations to Thomas More's *History of King Richard the Third* in our text are to the edition prepared by George M. Logan: *The History of King Richard the Third: A Reading Edition*. By Thomas More. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005. It is known that Shakespeare had two versions of More's *History* before him, one in Hall's *Chronicle* and another in Holinshed's. The Holinshed version that Shakespeare used is said to have been derived from the same authoritative text used by More's twentieth-century editors, R. S. Sylvester, Paul Murray Kendall, and George M. Logan—the text prepared by More's nephew, William Rastell.

Ackroyd, Peter. *The Life of Thomas More*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1998.

Anderson, Judith H. *Biographical Truth: The Representation of Historical Persons in Tudor-Stuart Writing*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.

Anonymous. *The True Tragedy of Richard the Third, 1594*. Ed. W. W. Greg. Malone Society Reprints: Oxford University Press, 1929.

Baker, David Weil. "Jacobean Historiography and the Election of Richard III." *Huntington Library Quarterly* (September 2007) 70, no. 3: 311–42.

Baker, Herschel. "*Henry VI, Parts 1, 2,* and *3*" and "*Richard III.*" In *The Riverside Shakespeare,* 2nd ed. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans and J. J. M. Tobin. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.

Barber, C. L., and Richard P. Wheeler. *The Whole Journey: Shakespeare's Power of Development*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Berger, Harry, Jr. "Conscience and Complicity in *Richard III.*" In *Richard III: Authoritative Text, Contexts, Criticism*. Ed. Thomas Cartelli. A Norton Critical Edition. New York: W. W. Norton, 2009. 400–17.

Berry, Edward I. *Patterns of Decay: Shakespeare's Early Histories*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1975.

Berry, Ralph. *Tragic Instance: The Sequence of Shakespeare's Tragedies*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999.

Besnault, Marie Hélène, and Michel Bitot. "Historical Legacy and Fiction: The Poetical Reinvention of King Richard III." In *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*. Ed. Michael Hattaway. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 106–25.

Blanpied, John W. "The Dead-End Comedy of *Richard III.*" In *William Shakespeare's "Richard III."* Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 1988. 61–72

Bloom, Harold. Shakespeare: *The Invention of the Human.* New York: Riverhead Books, 1998.

Brennan, Anthony. *Shakespeare's Dramatic Structures.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986.

Brown, Susan. "Queen Elizabeth in *Richard III.*" In *Players of Shakespeare 4.* Further Essays in Shakespearean Performance by players with the Royal Shakespeare Company. Ed. Robert Smallwood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Brownlow, F. W. *Two Shakespearean Sequences: "Henry VI" to "Richard II" and "Pericles" to "Timon of Athens."* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977.

Budra, Paul. *"A Mirror for Magistrates" and the* de casibus *Tradition.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

Bullough, Geoffrey. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources in Shakespeare.* Vol. 3: *Earlier English History Plays: "Henry VI," "Richard III," "Richard II."* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960.

Burns, Edward. *William Shakespeare, "Richard III."* Writers and Their Work. Devon: Northcote House, 2006.

Campbell, Lily B., ed. *The Mirror for Magistrates.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.

Cartelli, Thomas, ed. *Richard III. Authoritative Text, Contexts, Criticism.* A Norton Critical Edition. New York: W. W. Norton, 2009.

Chambers, R. W. *Thomas More.* New York: Harcourt Brace, n.d.

Champion, Larry S. *Perspective in Shakespeare's English Histories.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980.

Charnes, Linda. *Notorious Identity: Materializing the Subject in Shakespeare.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Chernaik, Warren. *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's History Plays.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Cibber, Colly. *The Tragical History of King Richard III.* 1700, 1721.

Clark, Sandra. *Renaissance Drama.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.

Clemen, Wolfgang. *A Commentary on Shakespeare's "Richard III."* Trans. Jean Bonheim. London: Methuen, 1968.

Colley, Scott. *Richard's Himself Again: A Stage History of "Richard III."* New York: Greenwood Press, 1992.

Cox, Brian. *The Lear Diaries: The Story of the Royal National Theatre's Productions of Shakespeare's "Richard III" and "King Lear."* London: Methuen, 1992.

Day, Gillian. *Shakespeare at Stratford: "King Richard III."* The Arden Shakespeare. London: Thomas Learning, 2002.

De Vocht, H., ed. *Jasper Heywood and his Translations of Seneca's "Troas," "Thyestes" and "Hercules Furens."* Louvain: A. Uystpruyst, 1913.

Dent, Alan. "*Richard III:* A Disclaimer." *Illustrated London News* 228 (January 7, 1956): 228–30.

Desens, Marliss C. "Cutting Women Down to Size in the Olivier and Loncraine Films of *Richard III.*" In *Shakespeare Performed: Essays in Honor of R. A. Foakes.* Ed. Grace Ioppolo. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000.

Dessen, Alan C. *Shakespeare and the Late Moral Plays.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.

Dubrow, Heather. *Shakespeare and Domestic Loss: Forms of Deprivation, Mourning, and Recuperation.* Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Foley, Michael P. "Comedy, Tragedy, and Saint Thomas More." *Moreana* 46, no. 176 (June 2009): 143–55.

Goodland, Katharine. "'Obsequious Laments': Mourning and Communal Memory in Shakespeare's *Richard III.*" In *Shakespeare and the Culture of Christianity in Early Modern*

England. Ed. Dennis Taylor and David Beauregard. Studies in Religion and Literature, No. 6. New York: Fordham University Press, 2003.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

_____. *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare.* New York: W. W. Norton, 2004.

Grene, Nicholas. *Shakespeare's Serial History Plays.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Gresham, Stephen. "The Dramaturgy of Tyranny: More's *Richard III* and Sackville's *Complaint of Buckingham.*" In *Quincentennial Essays on St. Thomas More: Selected Papers from the Thomas More College Conference.* Ed. Michael J. Moore. Boone, NC: Albion, 1978. 35–42

Hall, Edward. *Hall's Chronicle; Containing the History of England . . . Editions of 1548 and 1550.* (London, 1809). New York: AMS Press, 1965.

Hallett, Charles. "For She Is Changed, as She Had Never Been": Kate's Reversal in *Taming of the Shrew.*" *Shakespeare Bulletin* 20 (2002): 5–13.

Hallett, Charles A., and Elaine S. Hallett. *Analyzing Shakespeare's Action: Scene versus Sequence.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Hallett, Charles A., and Kenneth E. Frost. "Poetry and Reality: The Zetema and Its Significance to Poetics." *International Philosophical Quarterly* 17 (1977): 415–43.

Hammond, Antony, ed. *King Richard III.* By William Shakespeare. Arden Edition. London: Methuen, 1981.

Hanham, Alison. *Richard III and His Early Historians: 1483–1535.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Hankey, Julie, ed. *Richard III.* Plays in Performance. London: Junction Books, 1981.

Hardin, Richard F. "Thomas More (1478–1535)." In *Major Tudor Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Critical Sourcebook.* Ed. Alan Hager. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997.

Hassel, R. Chris, Jr. *Songs of Death: Performance, Interpretation, and the Text of "Richard III."* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987.

Heilman, Robert. "Satiety and Conscience: Aspects of *Richard III.*" In *Essays in Shakespearean Criticism.* Ed. James L. Calderwood and Harold E. Toliver. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1970. 137–51. Reprinted from *Antioch Review* 24 (1964): 57–73.

Hibbard, G. R. *The Making of Shakespeare's Dramatic Poetry.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

Hicks, Michael. *Anne Neville, Queen to Richard III.* England's Forgotten Queens. Stroud, Gloucestershire: Tempus, 2006.

Hodgdon, Barbara. *The End Crowns All: Closure and Contradiction in Shakespeare's History.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Holden, Anthony. *William Shakespeare: The Man behind the Genius, A Biography.* Boston: Little, Brown, 1999.

Holland, Peter, ed. *The Tragedy of King Richard the Third.* By William Shakespeare. New York: Penguin Books, 2000.

Howard, Jean E., and Phyllis Rackin. *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories.* London: Routledge, 1997.

Johnson, Nora. *The Actor as Playwright in Early Modern Drama.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Jones, Emrys. "Bosworth Eve." *Essays in Criticism* 25 (January 1975): 38–54.

_____. *The Origins of Shakespeare.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

_____. "Richard III and Queen Elizabeth." In *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's "Richard III."* Ed. Hugh Macrae Richmond. New York: G. K. Hall, 1999.

Jones, Judith P. *Thomas More.* Boston: Twayne, 1979.

Jowett, John, ed. *The Tragedy of Richard III.* By William Shakespeare. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Kastan, David Scott. "Shakespeare and English History." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare.* Ed. Margreta de Grazia and Stanley Wells. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

_____. "The Shape of Time: Form and Value in the Shakespearean History Play." *Comparative Drama* 7, no. 4 (Winter 1973–74): 259–77.

Kendall, Paul Murray. *Richard III.* New York: W. W. Norton, 1955.

_____, ed. *Richard III: The Great Debate.* New York: W. W. Norton, 1965.

Kincaid, Arthur Noel. "The Dramatic Structure of Sir Thomas More's *History of King Richard III.*" *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 12, no. 2 (Spring 1972): 223–42.

Kirsch, Arthur. *The Passions of Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1990.

Kott, Jan. *Shakespeare Our Contemporary.* Trans. Boleslaw Taborski. London: Methuen, 1964.

Knights, L. C. *William Shakespeare: The Histories: "Richard III," "King John," "Richard II," "Henry V."* Writers and Their Work: No. 151. Harlow, Essex: Longman, 1962, 1971.

Legge, Thomas. *Richardus Tertius.* See Lordi, Robert J.

Levin, Harry. "The Tents on Bosworth Field: *Richard III*, V,iii, iv, v." In *Scenes from Shakespeare.* Ed. Gwynne B. Evans. New York: Garland, 2000. 47–66.

Levin, Richard. *New Readings vs. Old Plays: Recent Trends in the Reinterpretation of English Renaissance Drama.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Lewis, C. S. *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Logan, George M. "Introduction." *The History of King Richard III: A Reading Edition.* By Thomas More. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.

Logan, Robert A. *Shakespeare's Marlowe: The Influence of Christopher Marlowe on Shakespeare's Artistry.* Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007.

Lopez, Jeremy. "Time and Talk in *Richard III* I.iv." *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 45 (Spring 2005): 299–314.

Lordi, Robert J. "The Relationship of *Richardus Tertius* to the Main Richard III Plays." *Boston University Studies in English* 5 (Autumn 1961): 139–53.

_____, ed. *Thomas Legge's "Richardus Tertius": A Critical Edition with a Translation.* New York: Garland, 1979.

Lubbock, Percy. *The Craft of Fiction.* New York: Viking Press, 1957.

Lull, Janis, ed. *King Richard III.* By William Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

_____. "Introduction." *The Second Part of Henry the Sixth.* By William Shakespeare. The Pelican Shakespeare. Ed. by William Montgomery. New York: Penguin Books, 2000.

Macauley, Alastair. *Financial Times*, in *Theatre Record* 12 (March 25, 2002): 363.

Mancini, Dominic. *The Usurpation of Richard III.* 2nd ed. Trans. C. A. J. Armstrong. Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1989.

Marius, Richard. *Thomas More: A Biography.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.

Marowitz, Charles. "Reconstructing Shakespeare, or Harlotry in Bardolatry." *Shakespeare Survey* 40 (1987): 1–10.

Martz, Louis L. *Thomas More: The Search for the Inner Man.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

McGrail, Mary Ann. *Tyranny in Shakespeare.* Applications of Political Theory. London: Lexington Books, 2001.

Meisel, Martin. *How Plays Work: Reading and Performance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Moulton, Richard G. *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist: A Popular Illustration of the Principles of Scientific Criticism*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906.

More, Thomas. *The History of King Richard III: A Reading Edition*. Ed. George M. Logan. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.

_____. *The History of King Richard III, The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*. Vol. 2. Ed. R. S. Sylvester. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

_____. *The History of King Richard III and Selections from the English and Latin Poems*. Ed. Richard S. Sylvester. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.

Muir, Kenneth. *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.

Mulryne, J. R. "Where We Are Now: New Directions and Biographical Methods." In *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography*. Ed. Takashi Kozuka and J. R. Mulryne. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006.

Neill, Michael. "Shakespeare's Halle of Mirrors: Play, Politics, and Psychology in *Richard III*." In *William Shakespeare's "Richard III."* Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 1988. Reprinted from *Shakespeare Studies* 8 (1975): 99–129.

Nelsen, Paul. "Merry Meetings: An Interview with Director Michael Grandage on His Production of *Richard III* Starring Kenneth Branagh." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 21, no. 1 (Winter 2003): 30–33.

Noble, Adrian. *How to Do Shakespeare*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Norwich, John Julius. *Shakespeare's Kings. The Great Plays and the History of England in the Middle Ages: 1337–1485*. New York: Scribner, 1999.

Nuttall, A. D. *Shakespeare "the" Thinker*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Oestreich-Hart, Donna J. "Therefore, Since I Cannot Prove a Lover," *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 40 (2000): 241–60.

Okerlund, Arlene. *Elizabeth Wydeville: The Slandered Queen*. England's Forgotten Queens. Stroud, Gloucestershire: Tempus, 2005.

P., G. M. "*Henry VI* and *Richard III*: BBC Shakespeare." *Cahiers Elisabéthains* (October 24, 1983).

Palmer, D. J. "The Self-Awareness of the Tragic Hero." In *Shakespearian Tragedy*. Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 20. London: Edward Arnold, 1984. 129–58.

Palmer, John. *Political Characters of Shakespeare*. London: Macmillan, 1945.

Pearlman, E. *William Shakespeare: The History Plays*. New York: Twayne, 1992.

Pierce, Robert B. *Shakespeare's History Plays: The Family and the State*. Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1971.

Plutarch. *Plutarch's Lives of Illustrious Men*. Trans. A. H. Clough. Boston: Little, Brown, 1880.

Prescott, Paul. *Richard III*. The Shakespeare Handbooks. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Price, Hereward T. "Construction in Shakespeare." University of Michigan *Contributions in Modern Philology* no. 17 (May 1951).

Prior, Moody E. *The Drama of Power: Studies in Shakespeare's History Plays*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Pugliatti, Paola. *Shakespeare the Historian*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.

Rackin, Phyllis. "*Richard III*: A Modern Perspective." In *The Tragedy of Richard III*. By William Shakespeare. Ed. Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine. The New Folger Library Shakespeare. New York: Washington Square Press, 1996. 337–49.

Reese, M. M. *Cease of Majesty: A Study of Shakespeare's History Plays*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1961.

Richmond, Hugh Macrae. "Introduction: *Richard III* Restored." *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's "Richard III."* New York: G. K. Hall, 1999.

_____. "*King Richard III*." Shakespeare in Performance. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.

Richmond, Hugh Macrae. *Shakespeare's Political Plays*. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1977.

Righter, Anne. *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1962.

Roper, William. "Roper's *Life of More*." In *The Utopia of Sir Thomas More including Roper's Life of More and Letters of More and His Daughter Margaret*. Ed. Mildred Campbell. New York: Walter J. Black, 1947.

Rose, Mark. *Shakespearean Design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Rossiter, A. P. *Angel with Horns*. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1961.

Satin, Joseph. *Shakespeare and His Sources*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1966.

Seneca, *Hercules furens*. Trans. Jasper Heywood. From *Jasper Heywood and his Translations of Seneca's "Troas," "Thyestes" and "Hercules furens."* Ed. H. De Vocht. Louvain: A. Uystpruyst, 1913.

Shapiro, James. *Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare?* New York: Simon & Schuster, 2010.

Sher, Antony. *Year of the King: An Actor's Diary and Sketchbook* (1985). Reprinted. London: Nick Hern Books, 2004.

Siemon, James R., ed. *Richard III*. By William Shakespeare. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2009.

Spivack, Bernard. *Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil: The History of a Metaphor in Relation to His Major Villains*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

States, Bert O. *The Pleasure of the Play*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Sylvester, Richard S., ed. *The History of King Richard III*, *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*. Vol. 2. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

_____, ed. *The History of King Richard III and Selections from the English and Latin Poems*. By Thomas More. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.

Targoff, Ramie. "'Dirty' Amens: Devotion, Applause, and Consent in *Richard III*." *Renaissance Drama* N.S. 31 (2002): 61–84.

Taylor, Michael, ed. "Introduction." *Richard III*. By William Shakespeare. London: Penguin Books, 2005.

Tillyard, E. M. W. *Shakespeare's History Plays* (1944). Reprinted. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1986.

Traversi, D. A. *An Approach to Shakespeare*. Vol. 1: *From "Henry VI" to "Twelfth Night."* 3rd ed. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Anchor Books, 1969.

Trollope, Anthony. *Framley Parsonage*. Vol. 1: *The Works of Anthony Trollope*. Parliament ed. Vol. 6. New York: E. R. DuMont, n.d.

Turner, Robert Y. *Shakespeare's Apprenticeship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Van Laan, Thomas F. *Role-Playing in Shakespeare*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.

Velz, John W., ed. "Introduction." *Shakespeare's English Histories: A Quest for Form and Genre*. Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 133: 1996.

Vickers, Brian. *Appropriating Shakespeare: Contemporary Critical Quarrels*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Walsh, Brian. *Shakespeare, the Queen's Men, and the Elizabethan Performance of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Wheeler, Richard P. "History, Character and Conscience in *Richard III*." In *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's "Richard III."* Ed. Hugh Macrae Richmond. New York: G. K. Hall, 1999. 176–93.

Wilson, J. Dover, ed. *Richard III*. By William Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Wymer, Rowland. "Shakespeare and the Mystery Cycles." *English Literary Renaissance* 34, no. 3 (2004): 265–85.

SHAKESPEARE'S *RICHARD III*—INDEX OF SCENES ANALYZED

Note: **Boldface** entries indicate major passages.

INDEX

Note: **Boldface** entries indicate major passages.