A SELECTIVE AND CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF

SHAKESPEARE'S RICHARD III:

1945 TO 1980

By

JAMES ALTON MOORE

Bachelor of Science in Education
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas
1965

Master of Arts
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas
1967

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
May, 1982

A SELECTIVE AND CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF

SHAKESPEARE'S RICHARD III:

1945 TO 1980

Thesis Approved:

David S. Berkeley
Thesis Adviser

_Paul G. Kep___

Samuel H. Woods, Jr.

Walter G. Scott

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

This bibliography is primarily concerned with the selection and evaluation of criticism written on Shakespeare's Richard III from 1945 to 1980, although a few works of the years 1940-1944 are included which help to clarify later critical trends. I have also included selective commentary upon the life and reign of the historical Richard III, for it seems to me that such information is germane to criticism of Shakespeare's history plays and especially to the play which helped to "create" the historically controversial and enigmatic Richard III. Although several editions of Richard III provide significant criticism, since they are readily available in both single volumes and collected works, I have excluded them from this study. I have also excluded commentary upon stage history, stage and film performances, and reviews in order to concentrate upon criticism and historical commentary more directly concerned with interpretation of the text. Finally, I reluctantly omitted unpublished theses because in the inevitable process of selection, the great quantity of published criticism took precedence.

This study has three major objectives. First, it is intended to provide scholars with ready access to a wide range of Richard III criticism published in books and journals. Many excellent Shakespeare bibliographies exist, of course, but sections on Richard III are often limited by the inclusionary scope of these volumes. Other bibliographical sources for Richard III criticism, while abundant, are disseminated among

iii

(usually) annual bibliographies in periodical publications or within the documentation of books and articles.

A second major objective is to provide scholars with an overview of major trends and directions of Richard III criticism since World War II. The year 1945 not only marks an obvious turning point in world history which has profound implications for literary study, but it also denotes the beginning of "Tillyardian" criticism of Shakespeare's history plays with the publication of E. M. W. Tillyard's The Elizabethan World Picture (1943) and Shakespeare's History Plays (1944). The second of these is particularly relevant to this dissertation, for undoubtedly no other critic since World War II more greatly influenced the criticism of the histories, for good or ill.[1]

A third objective is to evaluate the quality of Richard III criticism from 1945 to 1980. Therefore Chapter VI is a critical bibliography in which, after identifying the main issues of each reference, I then point out the merits of the work based upon the significance of its contribution to Richard III criticism, the degree to which it fulfills its stated purpose, and its quality relative to other works within this bibliography.

All documentation in the body of this study is placed in parentheses within the text and refers to Chapter VI by item number and date. This

---

[1] Norman Sanders, "American Criticism of Shakespeare's History Plays," Shakespeare Studies, 4 (1976), 11-24. Sanders provides an excellent overview of history play criticism since 1778. I find that my format in Chapter I is similar to his, although I have selected general works mainly because they contain substantial criticism specifically on Richard III.

is not an uncommon method, but I was particularly guided by the technique of Larry S. Champion.[2]

I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee for their patience, accessibility, and invaluable guidance. I am especially indebted to Dr. David Shelley Berkeley for suggesting that I write a Shakespeare bibliography and then allowing me great latitude in choosing the subject and developing the format. With his consistent good humor and wise counsel, Dr. Berkeley is a model for the academic professional. I am grateful also for the encouragement from my colleagues in the English Department and the cooperation of the administrative officials of East Central Oklahoma State University, where I have been happy to teach since 1967. President Stanley P. Wagner, Vice President Billy Jett Tillman, and Vice President for Academic Affairs Gene Stephenson have granted sabbatical leaves and exceptional courtesies necessary for the completion of this project. I am also deeply grateful to Head Librarian John Walker and Interlibrary Loan personnel of the ECOSU Linscheid Library. They have provided me with access to most of the data in this bibliography and often have exceeded the bounds of their usual duties in doing so.

I must thank my parents, Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Main, for instilling within me a desire for excellence which has brought me through many a dark hour to this point. Finally, no words can express my loving gratitude for the thousands of sacrifices, both large and small, to which my wife Jan and our dear children Jeffrey, Jill, and Juliet have submitted in order that I might live out my dream.

---

[2]Compiler, "King Lear": An Annotated Bibliography. 2 volumes. The Garland Shakespeare Bibliographies. General Ed., William Godshalk (New York, 1980).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The end of World War II marked the appearance of a number of impor-
tant works of criticism which treated Shakespeare's history plays in
general and which had profound and lasting effects upon the direction of
such criticism for decades to come. Perhaps the most influential of
these early critical ideas has been E. M. W. Tillyard's formulation of
the Tudor Myth (Item 7, 1944), a scheme of orthodox political and reli-
gious doctrine promoted by the Tudor monarchs to justify their claim to
the throne. In Shakespeare's history plays Tillyard found that this
scheme influenced Shakespeare's historical interpretation as well as in
his dramatic tendencies, for his major sources (in the First Tetralogy
primarily Edward Hall's The Union of the Noble and Illustre Famelies of
Lancastre and Yorke, 1548, and Raphael Holinshed's second edition of The
Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande, 1587, among others)
glorify the Tudor monarchs; whose dynasty was providentially established
by Henry VII. By the grace and design of God, according to the Tudor
Myth, Henry delivered England from the monstrous tyrant, King Richard
III, by defeating him at the Battle of Bosworth Field in 1485. The hos-
tile image of Richard III Shakespeare acquired ultimately from Polydore
Vergil's Anglica Historia (1534) and Sir Thomas More's The History of
King Richard III (1513). Vergil's work is unabashed Tudor propaganda,
while More's has come to be viewed as a genuine work of art, but they

1

both represent Richard III not only as the standard tyrant, but also as an instrument of God's punishment of England in retribution for the unlawful deposing of the anointed King Richard II in 1399. With Richard III's death and the Lancastrian Henry's marriage to Elizabeth York, the agonizing punishment of the internecine Wars of the Roses ends, and a chastised England enters into the new Tudor era of national unity, peace, and prosperity. (For commentary upon Richard III's historical person as opposed to his image in Shakespeare's Richard III, see the following entries in Chapter VI: Items 22, 1951; 39, 1954; 46, 1955; 82, 1959; 90, 1961; 100, 1962; 106, 1963; 111, 1964; 118, 1965; 125, 1966; 128, 1965; 142, 1968; 144, 1968; 157, 1971; 165, 1972; 176, 1973; 190, 1975; 192, 1975; 209, 1977; 210, 1977; 211, 1977; 212, 1977; 214, 1977; 219, 1977; 222, 1978; 225, 1978; 233, 1978; 236, 1979.)

Such is the overriding theme, indeed, the informing vision, which Tillyard established as central to all other considerations in Shakespeare's history plays, and in none of the plays is this historical scheme more significant than in Shakespeare's Richard III. For the rise and fall of Richard, occurring as it does at this particular historical juncture and taking this particular form, was viewed by Shakespeare's contemporaries as having nothing less than apocalyptic overtones. Of course critics have disputed the prominence of this scheme in Shakespeare's histories, but Tillyard's work remains a catalyst and a constant referent for history play criticism.

Closely following Tillard's lead, John Palmer (Item 8, 1945) admits the prominence of the Tudor Myth in Shakespeare's history plays, but more closely limits Richard III's motives to psychological realism and political expediency than to Providence or Fortune. Another standard

work in the Tillyardian mold is Lily B. Campbell's study (Item 11, 1947) of the history plays. She strongly emphasizes Shakespeare's primary concern with history and politics and his secondary concern with the plotting of the story, but Hardin Craig (Item 13, 1948) was one of the first to concern himself with the relationship between the history plays and the great tragedies. By the early 1950's critical interest in Shakespeare's history plays was increasing, marked by Wolfgang H. Clemen's definitive work on Richard III (Item 59, 1957). Clemen concentrates upon an act-scene-line analysis of style, language, theme, dramatic technique, sources, influences, and almost any other aspect of Richard III which concerns students of the play. In a study of more general significance, M. M. Reese (Item 94, 1961) examines Shakespeare's histories in the context of the influence which produced them, from the Greek concept of history to the social, cultural, philosophical, and religious elements which contributed to their making. In the same year, A. P. Rossiter (Item 95, 1961) treats not only the form and structure of Richard III, but also the character of Richard as actor, Devil-king, scourge, comic figure, and artist-in-evil. Rossiter's essay has also become a standard of Richard III criticism.

S. C. Sen Gupta (Item 113, 1964) typifies those critics who use Tillyard's ideas as a point of departure from which to argue against the predominence of Tudor orthodoxy in Shakespeare's history plays. Reminding us that Shakespeare dramatized his historical sources, Sen Gupta contends that dramatic art transcends moral and political implications in these plays. A. C. Hamilton (Item 132, 1967) follows Sen Gupta in stressing that the early plays of the period concluding with Richard III, Romeo and Juliet, and A Midsummer Night's Dream show that Shakespeare was by

this time an accomplished playwright. However, Wilbur Sanders (Item 145,
1968) initiates a more intense phase of the controversy developing be-
tween the "traditionalists" of the Tillyardian school and the "revision-
ists" who argue that Shakespeare had no intention of adhering to Tudor
orthodoxy in composing the history plays. If the platitudes of the Tudor
Myth were the dramatic and philosophical center of the history plays,
argues Sanders, then they would hardly justify our deference to so sim-
plistic a dramatist as Shakespeare must have been. Leonard F. Dean (Item
148, 1969) is another who will not accept the formulistic approach. On
the contrary, he finds that Richard's downfall is not a matter of divine
retribution at all, but that society purges itself of Richard--a position
that a great number of critics have adopted to some extent. Similarly,
David Riggs (Item 161, 1971) sheds new light on Shakespeare's conception
of history and offers an alternative to the commonly accepted view that
Richard III is a moral agent, a scourge of Christian "dualism." Riggs
insists that Richard belongs in a socio-political frame as a reflection
of Shakespeare's concern with the "new man" of Elizabethan times who cor-
rupts the traditional outward proof of virtue. Another revisionist is
Robert Ornstein (Item 168, 1972), who takes a fresh look at the familiar
fact that Richard is the center of focus in Richard III, but he contends
that the play is not merely a sort of Morality combat between the forces
of Darkness and Light. Moody E. Prior (Item 177, 1973) says that Richard
III is so far from being a rehashing of the Tudor Myth as to be a criti-
cal exploration of it, and, indeed, to be a rejection of such common-
places as it represented by Shakespeare's day. Complaining that the
critics such as Tillyard, Reese, and Irving Ribner (Item 64, 1957) have
neglected the Henry VI plays and their vital connections with Richard

III, Edward I. Berry (Item 189, 1975) determines that the distinctive features of Richard's character and the play's conception of historical process derive from literary dynamics which are set in motion by the plays themselves and are more personal than the usual agencies of Seneca, More, or the Morality tradition.

David L. Frey (Item 199, 1976) handily sums up three main directions of history play criticism which developed after World War II: representative of one extreme is Tillyard, who says that the Tudor Myth is the overriding theme in Shakespeare's histories; representative of the opposite extreme is Virgil K. Whitaker (Item 36, 1953), who says that Shakespeare was totally ignorant of history but created good drama from his sources as he received them; representative of the moderate position (characteristic of later critics) are Rossiter and Sanders, who claim that Shakespeare did not fully subscribe to the Tudor theory of history as found in his sources and that the First Tetralogy causes us to doubt the authenticity of the Tudor Myth. Accordingly, many later critics such as John Jump (Item 195, 1975) base their studies of the history plays on the moderate premise that Shakespeare had no good reason to flout the Tudor Myth in his plays, but that obviously he freely utilized both the providential theory and the humanist concepts which derived from Machiavelli and Guicciardini in drawing his characters. Thus Larry S. Champion (Item 242, 1980) finds that the willingness of later critics to view the history plays on their individual merits, rather than merely as parts of a double tetralogical pattern, enhances the study of Shakespeare's development as an artist as well as an historical interpreter.

While Tillyard's theories tell us a great deal about a significant informing concept behind structure and theme in Shakespeare's history

plays, other critics have been concerned with defining the history play as a genre. One of the methods of definition most frequently employed is to contrast the history play with tragedy. Indeed, Lily B. Campbell (1947) declares Richard III to be a "hybrid" drama, in which history and tragedy come together, but the larger distinction between history and tragedy, she says, lies neither in the source materials, the characters, nor the divine vengeance, but in private as opposed to public morals. "In tragedy God avenges private sins; in history [He] avenges public sins, those of king and subject alike" (p.307). However, one of the most persistent attempts to define the genre comes from Irving Ribner (Items 40, 1954; 64, 1957; 88, 1960). His broad definition includes as a history play almost any drama containing matter which the Elizabethan audience considered to be historical, political, and, for the most part, factual. This definition seems to make Richard III a history play, but some critics go Campbell one step further and declare Richard III not to be history, or even primarily a hybrid, but to be a tragedy. Nicholas Brooke (Item 115, 1965), for example, says that the main conflict in Richard III exists between the non-tragical weight of history and the impressive wit and force of Richard's character. The resulting clash between moral history and human dynamics gives the play a tragic quality, he insists. From another common perspective, Richard III is a model of Senecan revenge tragedy, as explained by Whitaker (Item 119, 1965), among others. On the other hand, Richard III often has been restricted to the melodramatic mode, where R. B. Heilman (Item 140, 1968) classifies it, because he detects an insufficient degree of self-division in Richard's character to raise him from melodramatic to tragic stature. François Faure (Item 164, 1972) disagrees with the large number of critics who

continue to treat <u>Richard III</u> as melodrama; he defines the play as Christian tragedy because of the tragic implications of the conflict between Providence and Richard's indomitable will. Like many present-day critics, Faure believes that the maturity of language and metaphorical technique evident in <u>Richard III</u> is more characteristic of Shakespeare's great tragedies than of his earlier plays.

CHAPTER II

TEXT AND SOURCES

One of the most active areas of Richard III criticism has been tex-
tual study, especially since the 1930's with the publication of Sir
Edmund Chambers' William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems
(1930-31), Sir Walter Greg's Elizabethan Dramatic Documents (1931), and
D. L. Patrick's The Textual History of Richard III (1936). These works
provided a mass of material and facts which threw new light upon play-
house manuscripts and the printing of dramatic texts in the age of Shake-
speare. Since Patrick, the consensus of opinion concerning the state of
the Richard III text probably is best represented by Alice Walker (Item
35, 1953). She confirms that Richard III is based upon memorially con-
taminated texts, Quarto being an acting version of the play which passed
along a legacy of errors to the more authoritative Folio, errors com-
pounded by the uneven skills of the two Folio collators. J. Dover Wilson
(Item 42, 1954) provides an excellent overview of the history and devel-
opment of modern textual criticism, pointing out the duty of the twentieth-
century editor to decide which of the early texts lie closest to Shake-
speare's manuscript. This is not an easy task even with a good text,
says Wilson, but the problem is multiplied if, as with Richard III, bad
or doubtful quartos lie behind the text.

As Wilson implies, textual study of Richard III is fraught with con-
troversy, and J. K. Walton (Item 50, 1955) created a stir with his

8

contention that the Folio <u>Richard III</u> was not printed for the most part
from a corrected exemplum of Q6 as critics have generally agreed, but
was printed throughout from Q3. This prompted Andrew S. Cairncross (Item
57, 1957) to retort that Walton's introduction of "coincidental variants"
to prove the exclusion of Q6 not only proves the opposite, but shows that
Folio was dependent to some degree upon post-Folio Q7 and Q8. Although
Cairncross (Item 58, 1957) concedes that Q3 was one of the copy-texts for
Folio, and is supported by Fredson Bowers (Item 78, 1959), Walton main-
tains his original opinion (Item 75, 1958). Then Kristian Smidt joins in
the fray (Item 114, 1964) with an attack upon the venerable D. L. Patrick's
theory that Q <u>Richard III</u> is a corrupt memorial transmission. Smidt
asserts that Patrick's case is certainly unproven and is very likely
wrong, but Smidt later revises his argument (Item 154, 1970) to allow for
a degree of memorial transmission. E. A. J. Honigmann (Item 117, 1965)
offers an alternative check on the reliability of the copy-text. Where Q
repeats the Holinshed source exactly, and Folio deviates, he thinks that
the Q reading should be more authoritative. While he admits that all the
variations in Q which were derived from Holinshed may not be correct, he
nevertheless contends that they have been too hastily banished from the
accepted <u>Richard III</u> text. In two related studies of Pembroke's Company,
Karl P. Wentersdorf (Items 215 and 216, 1977) determines the size of the
company as a clue to their possible cutting of Q Richard III to accommo-
date their number of players, but he further speculates that they memori-
ally constructed Q1 while on tour in the provinces. Mary Gross (Item
204, 1977) wonders why editors have not questioned the logic of speech
prefixes in I.i, which have Richard asking questions of Hastings which
he could not answer, having just come from prison. Finally, Gary Taylor

(Item 240, 1979) suggests that editors use both quarto and folio texts for a Richard III edition to avoid the unnecessarily extreme problems likely to occur when only one text or the other is utilized.

A problem of textual interpretation is advanced by Robert James Fusillo (Item 45, 1955). Noting that in Richard III, V.iii, the text provides no visual indication of what is happening as Richard and Tudor dream simultaneously, he suggests that their field tents, if not merely left to the audience's imagination, should be represented by two doors leading offstage, perhaps ornamented as tents. Richard Hosley (Item 54, 1956) generally supports Fusillo's conclusions, but Albert B. Weiner (Item 102, 1962) argues that because the text shows Richard calling for a tent, one should therefore be erected onstage, but only one, since Henry Tudor does not call for one. Weiner suggests that while Richard sits at the table which he also calls for, Tudor enters the tent originally pitched for Richard and falls asleep, while Richard falls asleep at the table. The question of the tents at Bosworth Field comes up again as a key illustration in Clifford Leech's study (Item 110, 1964) of Colley Cibber's adaptation of Shakespeare's Richard III for the smaller stages and changing tastes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. More indirectly, Bettie Anne Doebler (Item 180, 1974) implies that in the dream sequence both Richard and Tudor would have been staged in exactly parallel positions in full view of the audience, since in this scene Shakespeare exploits the emotional connotations which such a medieval iconographic tableau of the ars moriendi would evoke for the Elizabethan audience.

Another major area of Richard III study has been sources and influence. Virgil K. Whitaker (Item 36, 1953) traces the influence of

Shakespeare's formal education upon the content and form of his plays, and Cecil Roth (Item 33, 1953) finds evidence in Richmond's prayer (V.iii.112-114) that Shakespeare may have been familiar with the Jewish liturgy. Wolfgang H. Clemen (Item 30, 1954) shows how Shakespeare deviated from his sources to create in Richard III a drama more significant than heretofore realized. And acting upon the suggestion of his personal physician, J. Dover Wilson (Item 68, 1957) speculates that Richard III may have eaten strawberries deliberately to induce an urticarial rash (hives) as evidence that Queen Elizabeth and Jane Shore bewitched him. Responding to Marjorie Thompson's query (Item 56, 1956), Wilson (Item 76, 1958) confirms that he did indeed commit a slight inconsistency in his explanation of the sequence by which Shakespeare referred to his sources while composing Clarence's vision of hell. However, Wilson reaffirms his contention that Shakespeare was inspired by the account of Clarence's dream in Sackville's Induction and that Shakespeare wrote the dream sequence at some time other than the rest of the scene, while he was reading Baldwin's A Myrroure for Magistrates (1559). Additionally, Richard Webster (Item 198, 1975) thinks that there is an "ontological" relationship between Clarence's vision of hell and Dante's hell in the Inferno, while Harold F. Brooks (Item 235, 1979) cites myriad parallels between Clarence's dream and episodes in Spenser, Seneca, and Golding's Ovid.

In two related studies, W. A. Armstrong (Items 10, 1946, and 12, 1948) shows that a preponderance of contemporary didactic works influenced Shakespeare's depiction of the tyrant and, more specifically, that Seneca and Machiavelli strongly influenced the development of the "tyrant-tragedy" genre which includes Richard III. Taking much the same premise, Ruth L. Anderson (Item 103, 1963) establishes the classical origins of

those patterns of behavior in <u>Richard III</u> and <u>Macbeth</u> which Elizabethans conventionally ascribed to ambition and tyranny.

More variously, Homer Nearing, Jr. (Item 14, 1948) thinks that Shakespeare's anachronistic allusions to Julius Caesar as builder of the Tower of London may have come from Lydgate's <u>Serpent of Division</u>. R. A. Law points out Shakespeare's deviations from Holinshed which reveal improvements in <u>Richard III</u> over the source. Similarly, Phillip Williams (Item 23, 1951) demonstrates that in <u>Richard III</u> Shakespeare reversed the order of the battle orations as found in his sources to depict Richard's death as tragic. J. Dover Wilson (Item 29, 1952) speculates that the anonymous <u>The True Tragedy of Richard III</u> may not be a bad quarto of Shakespeare's play, but may be one of its sources. Turning to the medieval and early Tudor morality play tradition, Bernard Spivack (Item 74, 1958) links the history plays, and especially Richard III and other Shakespeare villains, to various conventions such as the Vice figure. In a study of larger scope than Wilson's (1952), Robert J. Lordi (Item 93, 1961) shows that <u>The True Tragedy of Richard III</u> probably is a bad quarto or a memorial text of Shakespeare's play and that of the extant "Richard plays" probably only <u>Richardus Tertius</u> influenced Shakespeare's <u>Richard III</u>, and then only indirectly.

More generally, Emrys Jones (Item 206, 1977) writes a literary biography of Shakespeare, providing insights into his life and times, his sources, and their influence upon the form and themes of his early plays. Edna Zwick Boris (Item 218, 1978) offers another general study which relates the influence of the English Constitution in the early plays and indicates Shakespeare's deep understanding of feudal law and custom. J. J. M. Tobin (Item 230, 1978) suggests that Shakespeare turned to

Apuleius for Tyrell's description of the young princes in <u>Richard III</u>,
IV.iii.1-22. Harold F. Brooks (Item 241, 1980) also finds a classical
origin in Seneca's <u>Troades</u> for the unhistoric amplifications of women in
<u>Richard III</u>.

CHAPTER III

STRUCTURE AND THEME

Perhaps the most prolific area of Richard III criticism since World
War II has been the study of structure and theme. Since E. M. W. Tillyard
(Item 7, 1944) established the Tudor Myth as the overriding structural
and thematic consideration in the First Tetralogy, criticism of Richard
III has consistently used his ideas as a referent. J. F. Danby (Item 16,
1949) says that Shakespeare's Richard III comes close to presenting
Richard as an attractive "new man" of the renaissance, but Tudor ortho-
doxy prevails. Reinhold Schneider (Item 65, 1957) traces the theme of
sovereignty throughout Shakespeare's plays, also finding in Richard III
a "new man" of the renaissance, but one who is frightful rather than
attractive. Only in the late romances and Henry VIII, says Schneider,
does Shakespeare finally settle the question of whether sovereignty
should reside in man or in God. Yet Michael Quinn (Item 83, 1959) feels
that Shakespeare settled the question of sovereignty through a progres-
sively deepening insight into the complexities of Providence versus free
will, culminating in Richard III. The play develops according to cause-
effect logic within the larger frame of Providence, says Quinn, and even-
tually tyranny by its very nature alienates so many of the nobles that
Richmond can come as God's "minister of chastisement" and fulfill the
the promise that the justice of heaven will in time suppress wrongs.
Ronald Berman (Item 130, 1967) also recognizes the "new rationalist" in

14

Richard III and other Shakespeare villains, who have a Machiavellian dis-
regard for the universal moral law which traditionally evokes and sus-
tains order in human affairs; yet Berman too finds that these powers of
order inevitably prevail over the anarchy of the self.

Agreeing essentially with Wilbur Sanders (Item 145, 1968), Gareth
Lloyd Evans (Item 149, 1968) argues that the formalized themes and struc-
tural elements in Richard III are less the true source of power than is
the dynamic character of Richard III himself, and A. L. French agrees
(Item 139, 1968). Henry Ansgar Kelly (Item 153, 1970) goes even further
to assert that the Tudor Myth as a formal construct did not exist during
Shakespeare's time, but is largely the result of the synthesizing powers
of Tillyard's mind. However, Pierre Sahel (Item 169, 1972) takes the
moderate view that although the providential scheme is visible in Richard
III, a system of natural explanations are possible, too, according to
which men act upon their human motivations. In a similar view, Reginald
A. Saner (Item 170, 1972) relates instances in which political violence
returns upon itself in Richard III, a play in which he discovers both
providential and human agents of power. In contrast, Robert E. Burkhart
(Item 179, 1974) concludes that since in Richard III the rules of sin
and retribution are applied unequally, then the play does not adhere to
the Tudor doctrine that obedience and non-resistance are inviolable.
A. L. French (Item 181, 1974) likewise points out the inequity of the
guilty Edward's easy death and Clarence's guilty suffering--neither of
whom is as guilty as Richard.

Andrew Gurr (Item 12, 1974) declares that Stanley's "democratic"
choice to follow Richmond causes Richard's downfall more than did
Richard's conscience or God's intervention. In opposition to the general

trend of critical opinion, however, Paul A. Jorgensen (Item 194, 1975) takes the position that the Henry VI trilogy begins with a strong notion of Fortune; but that the perspective moves steadily toward a Fortune dominated by God, until in Richard III God dominates totally, with no mention of Fortune. Finally, Larry S. Champion (Item 242, 1980) takes the moderate stance that while Shakespeare was bound by the theme and structure imposed by Tudor orthodoxy, he was also free to oppose human dynamics to it, thus creating dramatic tension in the inevitable rise and fall of Richard III.

The theme of order is given a particularly human dimension by Joseph T. McCullen (Item 26, 1952) who studies the theme of the unnatural severing of brotherly bonds in Richard III. He finds that Shakespeare follows a precedent established by earlier Tudor drama in which fratricide leads to innocent suffering and social chaos. The modern audience relates to such grisly themes, says Lewis Palter (Item 126, 1966) more than to the formal structuring and historical themes of Richard III. Yet this intricate patterning of the play interests Nicholas Brooke (Item 135, 1968). He takes the traditional view that the working out of Margaret's curses provides the main thematic and structural shape of Richard III.

Robert B. Pierce (Item 160, 1971) brings us again to the theme of family life in the histories, where "analogic" relationships exist between the family and the state. In the essentially political drama of the First Tetralogy, he says, sundered families, corrupted inheritances, and tainted marriages pervade the language and action. Nevertheless, reflected in this conflict is the contradiction between the need for traditional order and the newer, non-religious view of history, which Richard P. Wheeler (Item 163, 1971) believes Shakespeare was caught in.

Finally, another aspect of the theme of family conflict, reflected in the chaos of the times, centers on the women of Richard III. Madonne M. Miner (Item 244, 1980) shows how they progressively overcome the indignities heaped upon them and, as they transcend the hostilities of York and Lancaster, join in a deeply human outcry against Richard's exploitations.

Of course, Richard III is a study in evil, and thus Benno von Wiese (Item 34, 1953) views Richard as the epitome of evil which is inherent in the world created by internicine war, although a higher nemesis gives the play a tragic perspective. However, Max Lüthi (Item 63, 1957) thinks that Richard chooses to be evil by allowing his outer deformity to become his inner reality. Like von Wiese (1953), Murray Krieger (Item 81, 1959) deems Richard to be a force of history who becomes the inevitable nemesis of "dark generations" of his countrymen whose corruption brings its own punishment. But for Anne Ferguson (Item 120, 1966) human evil is necessary to fulfill the supernatural design expressed in dreams and curses in Richard III and later by the witches and ghosts in Macbeth. Indeed, Siegfried Korniger (Item 124, 1966) says that Shakespeare raised the ghost scene to the highest art form it ever achieved.

Tom F. Driver (Item 86, 1960) treats the theme of time in drama, showing that in Richard III Greek cyclical time and Judeo-Christian linear time function simultaneously. Drawing a similar conclusion, Izumi Momose (Item 112, 1964) observes that in Richard III Shakespeare combines a deterministic, cyclical history with a progressive history, but that Richard's destruction corresponds with the Last Judgment, as through Richmond apocalyptic time asserts its dominance. Michael Steig (Item 155, 1970) traces the evolving theme of grotesqueness in Richard III, showing how the degree of grotesqueness in literature, and the

audience's response to it, changes as society itself becomes more gro-
tesque.   Paul Siegel (Item 229, 1968) also relates Richard III to modern
times, seeing him as the incarnation of the monstrous bourgeois behavior
which came to characterize western culture.

As perhaps the most obviously structured of Shakespeare's history
plays, Richard III has drawn keen interest from such critics as Fred
Manning Smith (Item 9, 1945), whose act-by-act comparison identifies
parallels between that play and Macbeth, revealing that Shakespeare often
repeated successful patterns in his plays.   Wolfgang H. Clemen (Item 30,
1953) explains how devices of anticipation and foreboding occur at criti-
cal points in Richard III to emphasize the nemesis pattern and to unify
the play.   However, Louis E. Dollarhide (Item 92, 1961) finds the unity
disrupted by the opposing patterns of the curses and the "witty king"
motif.   John W. Long (Item 158, 1971) shows that music not only increases
color and pageantry in the histories, but also enhances structural pat-
terns.   In a wide-ranging study, John W. Velz (Item 172, 1972) contends
that Richard III is heavily indebted to the Morality tradition of episod-
ic structure which in the middle ages derived from the necessity of doub-
ling roles.   But the episodic structure which was necessary to early
English drama becomes a virtue in the Elizabethan drama which inherited
it, enriching tone and theme.

While Roy Aycock (Item 174, 1973) finds that Shakespeare merely
added Margaret as a structural device to supplement Richard's self-
destructive tendencies, Stephen L. Turner (Item 178, 1973) argues that
there is a unity between the "curse motif" and the "witty king" motif
which Dollarhide (1963) missed.   The wooing of Elizabeth, says Tanner,
is not a weakened version and a "second climax" to the wooing of Anne,

but rather it is a "modulation" of the first scene, providing a smooth transition to the movement which begins Richard's decline. William B. Toole (Item 187, 1974) finds a structural parallel in the motif of division between the houses of York and Lancaster and the psychic division within Richard himself. The First Tetralogy is unified by Clarence's dream vision, says F. W. Brownlow (Item 100, 1977), who finds that the scene epitomizes the great theme of the transitoriness of power, the ambition for which is the pursuit of death. Finally, in a very systematic approach, Iolanda Lalu (Item 207, 1977) formulates sophisticated games modeled upon the human dynamics which she discovers in Richard III, her purpose being to clarify the interrelationships of character, theme, and structure.

CHAPTER IV

CHARACTERIZATION

As Colley Cibber perceived (Item 110, 1964), the character of Richard III is the single-most compelling focus of <u>Richard III</u>, with his towering intellect, his verbal dexterity and wit, his easy intimacy with the audience, his fascinating disregard for conventional moral and social rules, and his pure will to power. As we may expect, then, character studies abound, not only of Richard himself, but of those characters over whom he casts his ominous shadow. Most post-war critics have treated Richard as more than a melodramatic stock villain. For example, Louis Auchincloss (Item 147, 1969) is convinced that Richard's character develops from a Punch-like comic figure to the serious tyrant, and Phillip Burton (Item 151, 1970) believes that Richard becomes a villain only at the end of <u>3 Henry VI</u> when Edward betrays the ideal for which their father died and Richard fought so earnestly. Yet John Jump (Item 195, 1975) argues that Richard was composed as a ruthless monster whose main function is to be a scourge of England who is destined to fall to God's Deliverer, Richmond. Lise B. Pederson (Item 200, 1976) compares G. B. Shaw's Andrew Undershaft and Richard III, but finds that their differences indicate Shaw's main criticism of Shakespeare: he made romantic distinctions between the hero and the villain and he based characters upon received, rather then original, morality and religion.

Yet Shaw often was more bemused than annoyed by the character of Richard III (Item 96, 1961). His analogy between Richard III and the Punch and Judy show indicates that he could not take Richard seriously on the level of his own serious attempts to dramatize the necessity of man's controlling his own destiny (although in a letter to Forbes Robertson the actor, Shaw urges him to portray a Nietzschean Richard). Richard himself, of course, is famous as a role player, and William E. Sheriff (Item 171, 1972) is representative of those interested in the comic side of Richard as actor. Sheriff determines that through Act III Richard displays a grotesque sense of humor; then in Act IV he drops his twisted comedy and changes to the petulant tyrant whose actions lack the comic overtones provided by the dramatic irony and punning wordplay of the earlier acts. Expanding upon Shaw's Punch analogy, John J. McLaughlin (Item 208, 1977) interprets the wooing of Anne as "high comedy," in which she submits to the brute power of Richard's personality: comparable to Punch's clubbing his victims into submission. Another of Richard's roles is that of "trickster." Thus Phillip Mallett (Item 239, 1979) explains him as a jester-king, a puppet-master who seems to control Providence until it turns on him.

Richard's motivation has been of great interest to most critics. Like many others both before and after him, Donald A. Stauffer (Item 17, 1949) perceives Richard III, Iago, and other characters as villains precisely because they have no inner moral war, and Bernard Spivack (Items 74, 1958, and 134, 1967) finds that Richard's character is motivated from without by the conventions of the mischievous but wicked Vice figure. But interest has centered more upon Richard's psychological motivation, particularly as this relates to his conscience. For example, Gerald H.

Zuk (Item 69, 1957) subjects Richard's character to Freudian analysis, finding that Richard possesses the strongest of egos and exhibits a classic case of wish fulfillment in his quest for the throne, but his vulnerability once he gains it causes him feelings of anxiety. Robert B. Heilman (Item 109, 1964) adds a psycho-sexual dimension to Richard's character, suggesting that the wooing scenes of various kinds in the play give life to the later scenes in a manner unusual to drama, for the process leading to Richard's triumphs leaves him with a feeling of ennui analogous to the animal post coitum triste.

However, the meaning and degree of Richard's conscience have most intrigued critics concerned with his motivation. Daniel E. Hughes (Item 123, 1966), for example, is sure that Richard is more aware of his conscience at the end of the play than at the beginning, and that therefore he is more human; while Macbeth is less aware, less human at the end than he was at the beginning. Conversely, John C. Bromley (Item 156, 1971) emphasizes Richard's ruthlessness. He overcomes all impediments between him and his dead father's affections, says Bromley, a latent desire for which even leads him to kill off his sibling rivals. Like J. P. Cutts (Item 138, 1968), Waldo R. McNeir (Item 159, 1971) finds that Richard's personality fragments into his warring inner selves on Bosworth eve. Turning to the maternal influence upon Richard's character, Alan Hobson (Item 167, 1972) traces the character flaws of both Henry VI and Richard III to their lack of maternal nurturing as infants. Michael Neill (Item 196, 1975) interprets Richard III as an inverse Hamlet, for Richard's similar declaration of self-hood is rooted in despair, but unlike Hamlet he can validate that self only through action. In an argument similar to McNeir's (1971), David Young (Item 234, 1978) says that Richard is

successful largely because he is able to maintain a fictitious "mono-lithic self," avoiding division between that self and the world until the other characters expose his weakness and his self is shattered.

Wolfgang J. Weilgart (Item 28, 1952) says that Richard III is moti-vated by a desire for power and a desire for love, but that his self-loathing ironically prompts him to a reckless courage and provides him with an extraordinary persuasiveness over others. His greatest feat of persuasion, of course, is his seduction of Anne, widow of the Lancastrian Prince of Wales and daughter-in-law of Henry VI. Most of the other char-acters of Richard III have received a great deal of individual attention from critics, especially Margaret, Buckingham, and Hastings. Of these, however, Anne has been the most puzzling because of her marriage to the murderer of her loved ones, even though Richard confesses to her, even as they stand over the corpse of Henry VI with its wounds bleeding afresh at the murderer's presence, that he murdered both her husband and her father (in-law). Wolfgang H. Clemen (Items 59, 1957, and 137, 1968) flatly calls the scene psychologically incredible, while Spivack (1958) says that Anne's motivation lies outside human psychology; to him, Anne's seduction is "the same moral reversal that marked the career of Mankind and all his descendants" (p. 405), for she succumbs to Richard as Mankind yields to the Vice in the morality plays. Yet Denzell S. Smith (Item 162, 1971) pictures Richard as a master of psychology as well as rhetoric, who allows Anne's hatred to vent itself through his invitation to attack him vio-lently, and as her rage naturally expends itself, his bold arguments be-come increasingly effective. Finally, Donald R. Shupe (Item 227, 1978) also finds that the wooing of Anne is plausible by modern psychological standards. Basing his analysis upon a "Mach" (Machiavellian) scale

developed in psychological research, Shupe determines that Richard is an aggressive "high Mach" personality confronting the more passive "low Mach" Anne under conditions which assure him a victory over her.

CHAPTER V

LANGUAGE AND IMAGE

Richard III is widely perceived as a play characterized by formal
language and ponderous imagery, and critics have properly noted its high-
ly artificial speech patterns of Senecan stichomythia and broad images of
war (with attendant brutishness, chaos, and death), family heraldry,
classical and Biblical parallels, prophecies, dreams, Providence, and
Fortune, among many others. Certainly the language and imagery of Richard
III lack the subtlety and dramatic integration of the middle and later
plays, but post-war critics have found it often to be richly ambiguous,
at times pointing to the profound achievement of the great tragedies.
The most astute of these critics is Wolfgang H. Clemen. Besides his mas-
terwork on Richard III (Items 59, 1957; 137, 1968), he has devoted a study
to imagery (Item 20, 1951) which was the first to reveal in specific
terms how Shakespeare's images become more organically related to thought
and emotion from the Henry VI plays to Richard III. The manner continues
to be formalistic and artificial, says Clemen, but a precise image such
as "So, now prosperity begins to mellow / And drop into the rotten mouth
of death" (IV.iv.1) is a very bold image which Clemen thinks would be
inconceivable in Henry VI. Such precise images mark "the commencement of
Shakespeare's peculiar art of expressing abstractions metaphorically"
(p. 50), and like many critics who follow him, Clemen finds the language,
imagery, and structure of Clarence's dream to be psychologically

25

penetrating and richly allusive as its imagistic patterns take us from the everyday world into a vividly realized world of the soul and back again.

In fact, Clarence's dream has been one of the most frequent subjects of Richard III image studies. Muriel C. Bradbrook (Item 19, 1951) considers the Virgilian underworld of Clarence's dream to be the ultimate source of the images of night, darkness, and "a murky, vast and echoing doom" which permeates the play (p. 132). In still another study of Richard III, Clemen (Item 30, 1953) finds in Clarence's dream an example of a new and bold kind of imagery which expresses the abstract issues of fear, anticipation, and foreboding. However, Aerol Arnold (Item 43, 1955) finds that dreams in Richard III and Macbeth function not only to foreshadow events, but also to summarize the details of plot and character. He distinguishes between the allegorical style of Clarence's dream and the more realistic depiction of Richard III's dream in Act V. Resorting to Freudian analysis, Anthony P. Narkin (Item 133, 1967) states that the images of Clarence's nightmare derive from his waking daytime experiences only a few hours earlier. Richard Webster (Item 198, 1975) thinks that Clarence's dream imagery in part derives from ideological inspiration which Shakespeare found in Dante's image of hell in the Inferno, and Harold F. Brooks (Item 235, 1979) cites myriad parallels between the image patterns of Clarence's dream and episodes in Spenser, Seneca, and Golding's Ovid. Karl Weber (Item 245, 1980) notices that Clarence's undersea vision foreshadows action and theme in Richard III, but he also examines such specific imagery as shipwrecks, the corpses of drowned men gnawed upon by fishes, vast wealth, and the famous

"reflecting gems" which have replaced the eyes in dead men's skulls and "mock'd the dead bones that lay scatt'red by" (I.iii.24-33).

Richard's dream in Act V has also received a great deal of attention, but more in relation to the theme of conscience than to imagery (Items 26, 1952; 34, 1953; 80, 1959; 120, 1966; 149, 1969; 163, 1971; 187, 1974; 198, 1975). However, in a notable study of medieval iconography in this scene, Bettie Anne Doebler (Item 180, 1974) concentrates upon the convention of ars moriendi in which the Good Angel and the Bad Angel compete for a dying person's soul. Thus the Elizabethans would have perceived the simultaneous dreams of Tudor and Richard III as the good king and the bad king lying upon the stage as upon their death beds, but Doebler notes that Shakespeare typically extends the moral allegory further to give it tragic implications by personalizing Richard's struggle into a resistance against internal judgment, or conscience.

Commentary upon the imagery in Richard III has thus been wide-ranging and often perceptive, but the language as such has also been an important consideration since 1945. Again, Clemen set the precedents in this area of study, but Phillip Williams (Item 23, 1951), for example, has noted that in Act V Shakespeare reversed the order of the battle orations as found in his sources. One result of this change, argues Williams, is that it prevents Richmond's speech, which emphasizes Richard III's villainy, from canceling out the sympathy which the audience must necessarily feel from the beginning of Richard's oration to his death, since he must die a tragic hero's death despite his villainy. Wolfgang H. Clemen (Items 37, 1954; 59, 1957; 137, 1968) studies the unique mixture of formal Senecan style and informal popular language in Richard III. He finds that by blending the two styles "naturally" into each other,

Shakespeare improves over the technique of previous dramatists. John W. Draper (Item 61, 1957), however, considers the mechanics of Shakespeare's style, analyzing the ratio of slurred to non-slurred words in the dialogue and meter as an indication of how slow or fast a character speaks his lines. Shakespeare's manipulation of the tempo of speech, he thinks, is a device which points to the plot, individualizes character, and sustains the emotion of the style. R. F. Hill (Item 71, 1958) examines Shakespeare's imagery and word play in the early tragedies for a rhetorical balance between language, thought, and feeling, while Ifor Evans (Item 79, 1959) decides that the only competent passage in Richard III is the dream of Clarence, which he finds to be one of the few instances in the play whose imaginative lines depart drastically from the language of "blatant Machiavellian melodrama" (p. 49).

Some critics, of course, are concerned with specific terminology. Mildred E. Hartsock (Item 99, 1962) thinks she has found a new gloss for Richard's use of the term "Humphrey Hour" as an obscene pun for copulation, but Dorothy Norris Foote (Item 108, 1964) counters that Shakespeare would not have punned upon the word "hump," since the word was not current in his time. David S. Berkeley (Item 104, 1963) argues that Wolfgang H. Clemen (Item 59, 1957) too narrowly limits Richard's use of the word "determined" in I.i. Here Richard may be declaring himself unwittingly to be the chosen (i.e., passive voice "determined") instrument of God's wrath as well as one who has chosen (i.e., active voice "determined") to be evil. François Faure (Item 152, 1970) finds in Richard III a new economy of words and suggestive concentration over Shakespeare's previous works, especially through such religious allusions as Richard's oath by Saint Paul and the Petrarchan language of love ironically used in the

wooing of Anne. And in a study of satirical language, Alice L. Birney (Item 175, 1973) takes the basic premise that the force of satirical expression is rooted in the primitive and archetypal curse; therefore, she finds that Margaret d'Anjou of the Henry VI plays has developed into a full-fledged Shakespearean satirist by the time she appears in Richard III. According to J. A. Riddell (Item 197, 1975), Hastings' use of the term "foot-cloth horse" could be glossed as an indication of his feeling of betrayal at the hands of dishonorable men. Finally, Paul Siegel (Item 229, 1978) cites copious references to Richard's use of business terminology, reflected mainly in his colloquial speech. For Siegel such language makes Richard representative of the bourgeois capitalist society which came to dominate western culture.

Finally, Richard's oaths by Saint Paul in Richard III deserve separate consideration. Geoffrey Carnall (Item 105, 1963) expands upon L. C. Knights' observation (Item 101, 1962) that Richard III swears only by Saint Paul, although Mary J. H. Gross (Item 204, 1977) notes that in Richard III, I.i.38, he inconsistently swears by Saint John. She argues that this one oath would be more appropriately assigned to Hastings in the context, but Carnall suggests that Shakespeare placed the six Pauline oaths in Richard'd mouth not only as mock piety but because renaissance tradition held Saint Paul to be unscrupulous like Richard. Unlike Gross (1977), John B. Harcourt (Item 183, 1974) considers Richard's one oath by Saint John to be appropriate in context ("Saint John" appears in I.i. 149 in Folio, but "Saint Paul" appears in the same place in the quarto editions). For in the context of this scene, says Harcourt, Richard is about to "baptize" Clarence and also plays the John-like role as the voice of conscience who rebukes the king (Edward IV). Alistair Fox

(Item 220, 1978) concludes that Richard's Pauline oaths indicate his active refusal to emulate Pauline charity and that his persistence in a Saul-like defiance of the Divine Will is an idea of major concern in More's <u>History</u>.

CHAPTER VI

RICHARD III: A CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

FROM 1945 TO 1980

1940

1. Zeeveld, W. Gordon. "A Tudor Defense of <u>Richard III</u>." <u>PMLA</u>, 55
     (1940), 947-957.

     The extant copies of <u>A Brief discourse in praise of Kinge Richard</u>

<u>the third</u> are all Elizabethan, says Zeeveld, but they were probably

written by a contemporary of Richard III in response to a calumniator

sympathetic to the Tudor cause. Zeeveld determines that the maligner

had been a supporter of Richard III who later sympathized with the Tudors,

namely John Morton, Bishop of Ely. Zeeveld speculates that Morton,

rather than Sir Thomas More, wrote <u>The History of Richard III</u>, since

Morton was Richard's deadly enemy and Sir George Buc's <u>History of the</u>

<u>Life and Reign of Richard III</u> (1619) identifies Morton as the original

author of <u>The History of Richard III</u> in the Latin. Therefore, Zeeveld

argues that the English version of <u>The History</u> is More's translation of

Morton's original. However, the consensus of opinion today holds that

More wrote both the original and the translation. This is verified by

Kendall (Item 46, 1955) and Sylvester (Item 106, 1963).

1941

2. Mroz, Sister Mary Bonaventure. <u>Divine Vengeance: A Study in the</u>
     <u>Philosophical Backgrounds of the Revenge Motif as it Appears</u>
     <u>in Shakespeare's Chronicle Plays</u>. Washington, D.C.: Catholic
     University Press of America, 1941.

Sister Mary provides a background of English attitudes towards vengeance, as these appear in Shakespeare's history plays. <u>Divine Vengeance</u> is a companion volume to the more penetrating study of the plays by Campbell (Item 11, 1947). While Campbell finds that the Elizabethans looked to God for vengeance and rejected the notion of private vengeance, Sister Mary argues that the English people generally approved of revenge by a human agent against a tyrant, "as an enemy of Good and the destroyer of the public good" (p. 100). The question of vengeance centers on the larger question of whether Shakespeare's history plays adhere to the so-called Tudor Myth formulated in the influential work of Tillyard (Item 7, 1944) and opposed by later critics such as Sanders (Item 145, 1968).

3. Semper, I. J. "Shakespeare and St. Thomas More." <u>Catholic Educational Review</u>, 39 (1941), 166-172.

In assessing the influence of More's <u>History of Richard III</u> upon Shakespeare's <u>Richard III</u>, Semper presents a well informed summary of the many facets of More's work from which Shakespeare apparently drew. Semper notes that Shakespeare's sympathetic attitude toward More is evident in the passage which the playwright contributed to Anthony Munday's <u>Sir Thomas More</u>, as well as in those which he wrote for <u>Henry VIII</u>. Not surprisingly, Semper is convinced that Shakespeare's <u>Richard III</u> largely owes its structural unity, superior among the history plays, to his close adherence to More's own emphasis upon Richard as the central focus. Samper attributes many other of the philosophical and dramatical tendencies in Shakespeare's play to a veneration for More as a person, but in doing so perhaps Semper exaggerates the certainty of such influence; can we be positive, for example, that More is at the root of the playwright's hatred of ruthless tyranny or of the inspired patriotism which Semper

discovers in Shakespeare's play? Semper's thesis is flawed by his obvious attempts to apotheosize More. Furthermore, his view of all of Shakespeare's history plays except Richard III as "loose and straggling in form" because they are evidently merely lifted from the "rough and ready" writers such as Hall and Holinshed (p. 168) disqualifies him as a reliable critic.

1942

4. Maas, Paul. "Two Passages in Richard III." The Review of English Studies, 18 (1942), 315-317.

Maas suggests that Richard III, I.i.101-102, of Q2 is an actor's interpolation as a gag to entertain the groundlings. The lines are not in character for either Richard or Brakenbury, contends Maas, nor did the printer of Q1 have good reason to omit these lines. As for Richard III, I.i.32, Maas would emend induction, as found in Q3 and later, to inductious, because the latter term is more fitting to the general sense of the passage, is a substantive transmitted from the first two quartos to later printings, and is etymologically as well as stylistically appropriate. Maas's argument that such emendations bring us closer to the Shakespearean text seems cogent.

1943

5. Small, Samuel A. "Shakespeare's Stage Business." Shakespeare Association Bulletin, 18 (1943), 66-71.

The character of Richard III represents an advance over that of Titus Andronicus, says Small. After the rude spectacle of his first tragedy Shakespeare became progressively more skillful at portraying a character whose stage business indicates his response to inner feeling.

Small concedes that Richard is a demonic figure in the manner of Titus

for the first three acts, but notes that Richard becomes more introspec-

tive when confronted with a formidable antagonist in Richmond. When

Richard's conscience rises to the surface, his speech becomes muddled

and inhibited for the first time. With some insight, Small explains

that with increasing subtlety in Brutus, Hamlet, and, most effectively,

in Macbeth, Shakespeare employs a technique which may be termed a "hush,"

a "humanizing pause," as in Richard's speech immediately following his

dream on Bosworth eve. While Small does not clearly elaborate upon the

technical details of such stage business, his point has significance:

in order to manifest a character's inner feelings, that is, to create a

delicate response to the promptings of a character's conscience, Shake-

speare had to draw a character such as Brutus, for Richard's insensitiv-

ity to the finer feelings and his intellectual domination of the world

around him precluded the stage device of "conscience-suspense" which

foreshadows approaching horror and, in Macbeth, becomes "a self communion

between the man and his soul" (p. 71).

6. Thomas, Sidney. The Antic Hamlet and Richard III. New York: King's
       Crown Press, 1943.

Thomas compares Hamlet and Richard III, viewing them in relation to

earlier drama. Hamlet's antic disposition--his sardonic humor and ironic

self-awareness--is anticipated, says Thomas, in the English morality play

as well as in certain early Shakespearean characters, mainly Richard III.

Thomas holds that Richard is not a Machiavel in the vein of The Prince,

because that work was known only at second hand by the Elizabethans,

whose conception of the Machiavellian ruler was a stereotype distorted

from the original. Nor is Richard III's character derived principally

from the Senecan tyrant, argues Thomas. First, despite popular critical

opinion, Seneca's plays only depict one character who is an unmitigated

tyrant, contends Thomas, and that is Atreus. And yet Thomas sees none

of the ironic self-parody of Shakespeare's villain in Atreus. Thus anti-

cipating Spivack (Item 74, 1958), Thomas believes that Richard's charac-

ter reflects the traits of the Vice figure in the Moralities more than

of the Machiavellian prince or Senecan tyrant. If Thomas is too categor-

ical in denying the Senecan influence and will not accept the English

stage Machiavel as "Machiavellian," he nevertheless breaks ground for

later critics such as Spivack and Orstein (Item 168, 1972) in weighing

the question of influences.

1944

7. Tillyard, E. M. W. Shakespeare's History Plays. London: Chatto &
       Windus, 1944.

Tillyard's criticism of Richard III, and of the history plays in

general, has provoked a great deal of polarized response, especially con-

cerning Shakespeare's adherence to conventional medieval cosmic and Tudor

political order in the histories. For Tillyard, Shakespeare's histories

justify political order as a necessary adjunct to the Great Chain of Be-

ing. He reads Richard III, for example, as a clear statement that

England's troubles have been visited upon it by God as punishment for the

unlawful deposing of the anointed King Richard II, and that Richard III

is the scourge of God from whom God's emissary, Henry Tudor, is destined

to deliver England into a time of peace and glory. Tillyard's viewpoint

has been a direct inspiration for later critics such as Campbell (Item

11, 1947) and Ribner (Item 64, 1957), but as early as 1949, Danby (Item

16, 1949) would interpret the history plays as Shakespeare's progressive

movement away from Tudor orthodoxy toward the condoning of rebellion.
Less drastically, later critics such as Knights (Item 101, 1962) ques-
tioned whether Shakespeare was uncritical of orthodox Tudor doctrine, and
by 1968, Sanders (Item 145, 1968) made bold to attack Tillyard's ideas
as too narrow.

Tillyard's study is a brilliant critical touchstone, however, whether
later commentators attack or embrace his views. Always he looks to the
larger context of Shakespeare's specific dramatic elements; yet he finds
that Richard's dominance as a character is not hindered by the play's
larger thematic end. Indeed, Tillyard must be given credit for seeing
in Richard III not only a demonic will, but a very humanized being as
well. Basically, says Tillyard, Richard logically develops from a psy-
chologically motivated character to one whose human quality deserts him
in Act III, at which point he becomes a melodramatic villain and a symbol
of diabolism. Thus although Tillyard's analysis has had a polarizing
effect, it remains an indispensable study of Shakespeare's history plays,
its influence profound and lasting.

1945

8. Palmer, John. Political Characters of Shakespeare. London:
       Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1945.

With compelling insight, Palmer convinces us that Richard III is a
natural leader whose personal verve and diabolism are attractive charac-
teristics developed in the Henry VI plays. Unlike Tillyard, with whom
he largely agrees, Palmer limits Richard's motives to psychological real-
ism and political expediency. For example, Palmer is one of the first
critics to notice that Richard's inhumaneness emerges only after his

father's death, for he is his father's "boy," as Margaret points out, and worships him. With his father killed, Richard's alienation begins, says Palmer, and for the first time he invokes his bodily deformity as setting him apart from other humans. This is a psychological compensation, argues Palmer, for, having given his best to win the crown for York, Richard must now watch as the wanton Edward, handsome blockhead, woos the widow Elizabeth for his queen and for his pleasure, rather than for the good of the preciously bought crown.

Palmer's study is most vulnerable when he insists that the audience admires Richard as they admire any superior political type who operates with refreshing candor, especially in his murder of the princes. More convincing is his argument that the play asks the audience to suspend its moral judgment in order to admire in Richard an intellect untrammelled by conscience.

9. Smith, Fred Manning. "The Relation of Macbeth to Richard the Third." PMLA, 60 (1945), 1003-1020.

Smith makes an overwhelming case for similarities between Macbeth and Richard III. In an act-by-act comparison, he identifies parallels which earlier commentators had either not identified or had treated mainly as coincidence. Smith goes even further to expand the parallels between 3 Henry VI and Macbeth, a comparison which illuminates the continuity between Shakespeare's early and later works. Smith notes too many parallels to cite, but the fact that Shakespeare often repeated successful patterns in his plays reinforces the theory that he had Richard III in mind while composing Macbeth. Smith suggests that the outline form of Holinshed's account was fleshed out by associations of parallel actions, character, dialogue, and incident in Richard III. Although Smith

does not convince us of his assertion that Shakespeare rewrote <u>Richard</u> <u>III</u> as <u>Macbeth</u>, none of the many later critical comparisons between these two plays is more carefully executed than Smith's.

1946

10. Armstrong, W. A. "The Elizabethan Conception of the Tyrant." <u>The</u> <u>Review of English Studies</u>, 22 (1946), 161-181.

A preponderance of works printed on the subject reveal that Elizabethans were knowledgeable about the ideal of kingship and were, inevitably, keenly interested in its opposite, tyranny. Like Mroz (Item 2, 1941), Armstrong argues that contemporary theory, made national policy through special sermons which Elizabeth caused to be preached throughout the land, allowed resistance to tyrants. However, Armstrong notes specifically that only those tyrants who had unlawfully ascended the throne were not to be tolerated, while a monarch who had lawfully succeeded to the throne, even if a tyrant, was to be left to the judgment of God. Thus Armstrong follows the Tillyardian concept that Shakespeare's plays reflect the Elizabethan view that usurpation is a sin, a view which Armstrong considers central to Shakespeare's interpretation of history. Armstrong founds his assertions upon a careful scrutiny of contemporary writings on the subject of the ideal prince, and his conclusions draw some useful distinctions which point to a definite and prevailing Elizabethan attitude toward tyranny.

1947

11. Campbell, Lily B. <u>Shakespeare's "Histories": Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy</u>. San Marino, California: The Huntington Library, 1947; Reprint, London: Methuen, 1964.

Campbell studies the principles and methods of historiography which were current in sixteenth century England and demonstrates the manner in which Shakespeare applied them in the history plays. She sacrifices background analysis and interpretation of the plays in favor of the development of English Renaissance historiography as exemplified in five of Shakespeare's history plays. Following Tillyard's lead, she strongly emphasizes Shakespeare's primary concern with history and politics and his secondary concern with plot. "The Elizabethans expected any history to act as a political mirror, to be concerned with politics," she writes (p. 16). In her opinion, the fact that the plays of the First Folio are ordered in historical chronology reflects the Elizabethan concern with moral patterning of history. Furthermore, she builds from this meritorious idea the rather one-dimensional viewpoint that Shakespeare wrote his history plays in order to reshape received history for the traditional Elizabethan purpose of teaching politics to the present, bringing the accepted political philosophy of the Tudors to bear upon each problem. Thus seeing the Shakespeare histories as vehicles which express the platform of a typical historical and political thinker of his time, Campbell seems unnecessarily to discount the dramatic achievement of his art.

Nevertheless, Campbell's work maintains a solid position among critical studies of the histories. Her useful distinction between tragedy as based upon God's vengeance for private sins and history as based upon God's vengeance for public sins remains a standard reference point for critics, and the theory is especially relevant to the study of Richard III, which is, as she points out, a hybrid play in which tragedy and history come together.

1948

12. Armstrong, W. A. "The Influence of Seneca and Machiavelli on the Elizabethan Tyrant." The Review of English Studies, 24 (1948), 1-35.

In a sequel to his "The Elizabethan Conception of the Tyrant" (1946), Armstrong discusses the influence of Seneca and Machiavelli upon the Elizabethan stage tyrant, concentrating upon Mordred in Hughe's The Misfortunes of Arthur, Shakespeare's Richard III and Macbeth, and Greville's Alaham. He finds that the tyrants in these works display similarities in their political ambition and that the dramatic action is based upon sinful usurpation of a lawful crown followed by divine retribution. With excellent insight, Armstrong makes the distinction between "tyrant-tragedies," such as Richard III, and "revenge tragedies," such as Hamlet. The lesser tyrant such as Claudius is a criminal who must be slain by the tragic hero to satisfy the obligation laid upon him by the ghost of a dishonored ancestor. In what seems to be a variation upon Campbell's theory of private and public vengeance, Armstrong asserts that the revenge tragedy conforms to the purely literary convention of Senecan and Machiavellian methods for private rather than political ends. However, in the tyrant-tragedy the tyrant is slain for his violation of the political doctrine of hereditary succession and for his breaching of the virtues of ideal kingship as stated by specula principum. This is an excellent study, and Armstrong's distinctions and definitions have not as yet been superseded.

13. Craig, Hardin. An Interpretation of Shakespeare. New York: The Dryden Press, Inc., 1948; Reprint, New York: The Citadel Press, 1949.

Touching upon several aspects of Richard III in a somewhat unassimilated

fashion, Craig explains that Shakespeare's theme is more realistically conceived than Marlowe's and looks forward to the great tragedies rather than back to the Moralities. Two ideas stand out in Richard Third, he says, the conventional opening soliloquy and Richard as an inversion of the Platonic doctrine of a fair soul in a fair body, although Richard in real life, Craig notes, was not as black a villain as the commentaries painted him. Craig lightly traces the influence of Seneca, Plutarch, Marlowe, and Machiavelli upon Richard III, finding that Shakespeare's play owes a great deal to the Hercules plays of Seneca, but that it is a Marlovian tragedy, not Aristotelian. Craig's study adds little fresh material to the body of criticism on Richard III.

14. Nearing, Homer, Jr. "Julius Caesar and the Tower of London." Modern Language Notes, 63 (1948), 228-233.

Nearing examines the origins of Shakespeare's anachronistic allusions to Julius Caesar as the builder of the Tower of London in Richard III, III.i.68-74, and in Richard II, V.i.2. While English historians have dismissed the rumor that Julius Caesar constructed it, says Nearing, other writers such as poets and popularizers of history could not resist the association of the Tower with Caesar. Nearing assumes that Shakespeare had access to Lydgate's Serpent of Division, a biography of Caesar, which may be the source of the allusions in the plays. Nearing's study represents once again the richness of history and tradition which can underlie even the less majestic of Shakespeare's lines.

15. Shanker, Sidney. "Shakespeare Pays Some Compliments." Modern Language Notes, 63 (1948), 540-541.

Shanker notices that Shakespeare's Richard III, V.v.13-15, includes Sir James Blunt among those praised for fighting well against the tyrant,

and that Shakespeare not only mentions Blunt three times in V.iii, but adds the title before his name (the Blunts were knighted in 1588). Shanker cites the connection which the poet had with the Stratford Blunts through his intimate friendship with the Combes, relatives to the Blunts by marriage; thus, Shanker speculates with some reason that in these passages Shakespeare was paying pretty compliments to the descendants of families known personally to him.

16.   Danby, John F. Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature: A Study of "King Lear." London: Faber and Faber, 1949. Second Edition, 1961; reprint, 1965.

Danby advances a boldly original thesis: Shakespeare's development follows three stages to condoning rebellion. Richard III completes the first stage--only a monster such as Richard could rebel against the rightful king. King John marks the second stage--the official Tudor policy prevails. Rebellion now, even against a usurper, can never be justified. Finally, with Julius Caesar begins the third stage--Shakespeare now condones tyrannicide, "camouflaged in Roman, Danish, Scottish, Trojan or ancient British chronicle matter" after the Essex rebellion of 1599 (p. 197).

Danby's ideas swing drastically away from the Tillyardian view of Shakespeare's political orthodoxy (Item 7, 1944) which currently prevailed. Indeed, he asserts the provocative notion that in Richard Shakespeare saw the possibility of a better social alternative to the war and false consciousness of the old society. Nevertheless, while his argument is fascinating and predictive of later trends in the humanist approach to the interpretation of Shakespeare's Richard III, Danby finally offers no conclusive evidence that the playwright intended any other possibility than

the triumph of Richmond and the imposing of the new Tudor order. It is
left to later critics such as Burkhart (Item 179, 1974) to argue dispas-
sionately that Shakespeare's histories do not present rebellion as total-
ly unjustified.

17.   Stauffer, Donald A. Shakespeare's World of Images: The Develop-
        ment of His Moral Ideas. New York: W. W. Norton & Company,
        Inc., 1949.

This work is a general summary of some standard interpretations of
character and theme in Richard Third. Stauffer's comments tend to over-
simplify somewhat through seemingly arbitrary judgments and hasty assess-
ments. For example, while critics generally agree that Richard is a com-
petent politician, although evil, it is too simple to say with Stauffer
that Richard's character can be explained as a Machiavel following the
Marlovian and Elizabethan stereotype. Perhaps we can grant that Richard
as the embodiment of pure evil is Shakespeare's first important moral
idea, as Stauffer argues, but this does not justify the statement that
Richard is philosophically indistinguishable from the Jew of Malta or
Milton's Satan, a sweeping generalization unworthy of this critic with a
fine reputation. The point is that Stauffer seems content here to skim
the surface.

1950

18.   Law, R. A. "Richard III--A Study in Shakespeare's Composition."
        PMLA, 60 (1950), 689-696.

Law assumes that Holinshed was Shakespeare's main source for Richard
III and that any deviations from Holinshed's Chronicles would have been
deliberate. Through close analysis, Law points to several deviations
from Holinshed in Richard III and from these infers Shakespeare's

compositional methods. With considerable acumen, Law reconstructs Shake-
speare's unification of the loosely structured chronicle account. For
example, to increase the unity, Shakespeare adds the historically dead
Margaret as well as unhistorical details such as the wooing of Anne.
Through these and other details, Law discovers significant patterns by
which Shakespeare deviates from Holinshed in order to transfer the func-
tions of certain historical characters to others as an enhancement of
logical structure or character motivation.

1951

19. Bradbrook, M. C. Shakespeare and Elizabethan Poetry: A Study of
      His Earlier Work in Relation to the Poetry of the Time.
      London: Chatto & Windus, 1951. Reprint, 1965.

Bradbrook provides only a brief summary of familiar critical con-
cepts, but the book should be worthwhile as an initial reading for the
student of Richard III. The author accepts the theory that Richard is a
scourge of God visiting punishment upon a guilty England, whose crimes
reach back to the fall of Richard II at Pomfret. She traces the influ-
ences upon Richard III, including Hall's antithetical structuring of the
kings' reigns upon the symmetry of prophecies, curses, omens, and dreams.
This is a useful and informative exercise, as is the identification of
source materials; yet Bradbrook's observations are sometimes very general,
even enigmatic, as when she notes that earlier villains such as Aaron
possess some of the wit but not the virtuosity of Richard, and her state-
ment that many of Richard's characteristics can be found in later charac-
ters--such as Antony (oratory), Edmund (wit), and Iago (envy)--may be
applied to almost any of Shakespeare's dramatic characters. In her final
analysis of Richard, she views him as a pitiful example of man at his

lowest. At the opposite extreme is Palmer (Item 8, 1945), who agrees with Masefield and Shaw that Richard is a sort of admirable superman, a Nietzschean figure who "haunts the imagination and fills the sad chronicles of mankind" (p. 117). One may not agree with Palmer, but one wishes that Bradbrook had more of his critical energy.

20. Clemen, Wolfgang H. The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery. New York: Hill and Wang, 1951.

Clemen revises and augments an earlier work (Shakespeares Bilden: Ihre Entwicklung und Ihre Funktionen im dramatischen Werk, 1936), the purpose of which is to show the relationship between the imagery in Shakespeare's plays and the development of his skills as a dramatic poet. Clemen's study complements (J. Dover Wilson says it surpasses) Caroline Spurgeon's Shakespeare's Imagery and What it Tells Us (1935). In the preface to Clemen's book, Wilson explains that Clemen studies the imagery for the first time as organic to Shakespeare's art, while Spurgeon had studied the statistical aspects as these reveal the dramatist's turn of mind.

Through detailed comparison, Clemen reveals Shakespeare's increasing mastery of imagaic language and his gradually developing command of poetic drama. He further demonstrates that the thought and emotion of Richard III are more organically related to imagery than in 3 Henry VI, a play which lacks connective links, especially between images. Clemen has a penetrating insight into Shakespeare's development as an artist. For example, he notes that in Richard III the images grow out of the total situation--the beginnings of Shakespeare's peculiar art of expressing abstractions metaphorically. Clemen's analyses of Richard III in many different publications are essential reading, especially his Kommentar zu

<u>Shakespeares Richard III</u>, 1957 (trans. 1968), in which he exquisitely, though sometimes laboriously, traces the progress of Shakespeare's art in a single play.

21. Goddard, Harold C. <u>The Meaning of Shakespeare</u>. Chicago: Univer-
       sity of Chicago Press, 1951.

Goddard sets out to study Shakespeare more as a poet than as a dramatist, without the limiting criteria of any particular school or method of criticism. However, Goddard's approach to <u>Richard III</u> is predominantly psychological, often mythological. For example, in an unusual but astute interpretation, he states that Richard suppresses his instincts of love and compassion and builds an exterior facade of iron will and power, only to have his conscience overcome his will, until in killing the princes, he kills the child within himself. Goddard attaches an interesting, if somewhat strained, significance to Richard's plea for a horse during the battle of Bosworth Field; for Goddard, these are the most subtle and profound words in the play, with an undermeaning related to the horse as a "living stream of unconscious energy," the bearer of the consciousness, which "may or may not keep the energy under control" (p. 40). Such a reading has a broadening effect upon our response to the passage, and perhaps Reese (Item 94, 1961) goes too far in the opposite direction in calling this line a "corny" Elizabethan joke, but surely Goddard gives the line a superfluous mythological cast. In all, however, Goddard's commentary is refreshingly unstilted and often insightful.

22. Tey, Josephine. <u>The Daughter of Time</u>. New York: Dell Publishing
       Company, Inc., 1951; New York: Macmillan, 1951.

Of the many Ricardian works of fiction, Tey's is one of the earliest

and most influential accounts of the life and times of Richard III, and
with its considerable historical integrity and very respectable style,
Tey's story deserves to be included in any bibliography which deals with
the historical background of Richard III. Tey defends Richard from his
traditional image as a monstrous son, husband, brother, uncle, and king.
The protagonist of the novel, Scotland Yard detective Alan Grant, dis-
covers through close reading of history and astute deduction that such
historians as "the sainted More," Gairdner, and other traditionalists
were hopelessly biased in their support of the Tudor Myth. Tey's grasp
of available historical material fares well in comparison with the later
authoritative biography of Kendall (Item 46, 1955), but her hero goes on
to "prove" that Henry Tudor more than likely executed the princes, since
he had the most to gain from the annihilation of the Yorkist line--which
he and his son Henry VIII proved in their judicial murders of the remain-
ing York heirs.

23. Williams, Phillip. "Richard the Third: The Battle Orations."
    English Studies in Honor of James Southhall Wilson. Ed.
    Fredson Bowers. University of Virginia Studies, Vol. 4, 1951,
    pp. 125-130.

Reviewing pre-Shakespearean versions of Richard III, Williams finds
that Shakespeare reversed the sequence of the battle orations as found in
his sources. This is not a trivial change, urges Williams, because since
Shakespeare's play is not only history but tragedy, the audience must
sympathize with Richard at the end--the villain must die a tragic hero's
death. However, if Richmond's oration had followed Richard's in the tra-
ditional order, says Williams, this would have allowed Richmond's speech
emphasizing Richard's villainy to cancel out the sympathy engendered by
Richard's oration to his troops. Despite Richard's past villainy,

continues the author, the reversing of the traditional order to some extent evokes the audience's sympathy for Richard from the beginning of his oration to his death. This argument may be considered in light of Campbell's theory (Item 11, 1947) that Richard III is a hybrid of history and tragedy. If we can then believe that Richard's oration is indeed calculated to evoke the audience's sympathy, then Williams' point is not a small one.

1952

24. Clemen, W. H. Wandlung des Botenberichts bei Shakespeare. Sitzungs-
berichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philo-
sophisch-historische Klasse, 4 (1952). Munich, 1952.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

25. Maugeri, Aldo. "Edward II," "Richard III," and "Richard II." Note
Critiche. Messina: V. Ferrara, 1952.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

26. McCullen, Joseph T. "Brother Hate and Fratricide in Shakespeare."
Shakespeare Quarterly, 3 (1952), 335-340.

In a number of his plays, Shakespeare develops the traditional theme of the unnatural sundering of brotherly bonds. In Richard III, says McCullen, Shakespeare follows a precedent set by earlier Elizabethan drama in which fratricide leads to innocent suffering and social chaos. This article offers no fresh insights, but serves to remind us of the significance of the Cain and Abel theme in Richard III, Hamlet, and King Lear, among others.

27. Röhrman, H. Marlowe and Shakespeare: A Thematic Exposition of
Some of Their Plays. Arnhem: van Loghum Slaterus, 1952.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

28. Weilgart, Wolfgang J. Shakespeare Psychognostics: Character Evolu-
       tion and Transformation. Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1952.

Despite its impressive title, Weilgart's work is a slight study of

vague psychological formulations. He says that Richard III is motivated

both by a desire for power and a desire for love, both of which his

brother Edward achieves. One of Weilgart's more promising thoughts is

that Richard does not undergo a transformation of character in the tragic

sense, but that proposition simply dies with the platitude that Richard's

destiny is to hate all life and joy and that he is "a champion of evil

for its own sake" (p. 39). The article seems to be a translation, per-

haps from German to Japanese to English, and unfortunately the cryptic

style badly obscures the meaning.

29. Wilson, J. Dover. "Shakespeare's Richard III and The True Tragedy
       of Richard the Third, 1594." Shakespeare Quarterly, 3 (1952),
       299-306.

Remarking that critics have neglected one of the fullest and best

treatments of the sources of Shakespeare's Richard III, G. B. Churchill's

Paleaestra X: Richard the Third up to Shakespeare (1900), Wilson pro-

poses to show some of Churchill's more striking parallels between Richard

III and the anonymous The True Tragedy of Richard III; Wilson hopes to

prove that the latter play cannot be a bad quarto of Shakespeare's Richard

III, and that "on the contrary Shakespeare must himself have borrowed

either from T. T., or from the old play it represents" (p. 306). Wilson

adds a few parallels of his own to support his case, but a final comment,

though seemingly incidental, bears almost as much weight as his entire

argument, i.e., "Yet if he did use the old play he made a completely new

job of it" (p. 306).

1953

30. Clemen, Wolfgang H. "Anticipation and Foreboding in Shakespeare's Early Histories." <u>Shakespeare Survey</u>, 6 (1953), 25-29.

Clemen argues that Shakespeare is not only superior to other dramatists in creating a sense of anticipation and foreboding, but also that his use of omen, prophecies, and other portents, especially in <u>Richard III</u>, constitutes only a part of such unifying elements in his early plays. Clemen shows how Shakespeare creates a balanced interplay between what the audience and characters are allowed to know about the future and what actually occurs, as in the dramatic irony of <u>Richard III</u>, III.iv, as Hastings awakens both to reality and to the actual powers of prophecy which he had ignored. Conventional devices of foreboding occur in the <u>Henry VI</u> plays, says Clemen, but in Richard III they take on a greater unifying structural significance. Other such devices which Clemen notices are dreams, the speeches of anonymous citizens, and even single words which carry an ironic meaning. Finally, he shows that <u>King John</u> has relatively few devices of anticipation and foreboding compared to the earlier plays, a demonstration that such devices are more integrated into the plays of Shakespeare's middle and later periods. No critic is more specifically knowledgeable and thorough than Clemen in the study of <u>Richard III</u>.

31. Feuillerat, Albert. <u>The Composition of Shakespeare's Plays: Authorship, Chronology</u>. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

32. Pearce, Josephine A. "Constituent Elements in Shakespeare's History Plays." <u>Studies in Shakespeare</u>, University of Miami Publications in <u>English and American Literature</u>. Miami: Miami University Press, 1953, pp. 145-152.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

33.　Roth, Cecil.　"Shakespeare and the Jewish Liturgy."　The Times Liter-
　　　　ary Supplement.　Friday, May 15, 1953, p. 317.

In his contribution to the long-debated issue as to whether Shake-

speare ever actually met a Jew, Roth notes the interesting parallel be-

tween the traditional Jewish night prayer and Henry Richmond's prayer be-

fore sleeping (V.iii.112-4).　Although Christians are familiar with a

part of the Jewish night prayer from Psalms 31:5, and especially as

Jesus' last words in Luke 23:46, Christians would not have associated the

words with entrusting the soul to God before going to sleep, says Roth.

He concedes that the parallel may be coincidental, although Shakespeare

did have ample opportunity to read the Jewish liturgy in translation.

34.　von Wiese, Benno.　"Gestaltungen des Bösen in Shakespeare's drama-
　　　　tischem Werk."　Shakespeare-Jahrbuch (Heidelberg), 89 (1953),
　　　　51-71.

In a comparison between Richard III, Macbeth, Claudius, Iago, and

other Shakespeare villains, von Wiese distinguishes the nature of evil

as it exists in the world of each character.　For Shakespeare, he con-

tends, evil is a reality, which he expresses in his drama, not philosoph-

ically, but aesthetically.　Indeed, von Wiese sees evil manifested in al-

most all of Shakespeare's characters to some degree.　However, the author

is mainly concerned with distinguishing the evil in Richard III from that

in Macbeth and Hamlet.　He makes a useful distinction between the idea of

conscience in Richard III, which has the narrow sense of an absolute

power set against the will to resist it, and in Hamlet, whose world is

pervaded by conscience, unsuppressed and generally recognized.

However, in his best analysis, von Wiese shows that the world of

Richard III sharply contrasts with that of Macbeth.　Rather than a world

of pervasive evil inhabited by a figure of almost allegorically evil sta-
ture, Macbeth portrays a world of order inhabited by a protagonist who is
an absolute agent existing outside the natural world in the form of the
witches, although their power to lead him into evil is generated by the
ambition which already resides within him. Richard is fully conscious
of evil from the beginning, says von Wiese, while Macbeth's sense of evil
grows progressively, and he always, unlike Richard, has a desire to dis-
tinguish between good and evil. Finally, while most critics seem to
agree with von Wiese's contention that Richard III is not among the high-
est ranks of Shakespeare's tragic achievements, some would be surprised
that this critic denies Macbeth full tragic stature on the grounds that,
while it succeeds in depicting the highest form of hell, it does not de-
pict the highest form of noble action born out of catastrophe.

35. Walker, Alice. Textual Problems of the First Folio: "Richard III,"
      "King Lear," "Troilus & Cressida," "2 Henry IV," "Hamlet,"
      "Othello." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Walker amplifies the idea, posited by Daniel in the late 19th cen-
tury, that the Folio texts of Richard III and King Lear were printed from
corrected quartos. She develops the theory that in Richard III, 2 Henry
IV, Hamlet, and Othello "spellings foreign to the normal habits of
Jaggard's compositors left no doubt that his 1623 copy consisted of cor-
rected quartos" (p. 3). Her method is fourfold: to discover the aims of
the collator and to determine his approximate margin of error; to identify
the manifest errors common to F and Q in order to know their probable
character; to consider the sort of manuscript available to the collator
of F, a method of determining the kind of manuscript with which Q was
collated, leading in turn to an assessment of how far the manuscript

reading may have deviated from Shakespeare's intentions; to judge the reliability of the compositors in reproducing with reasonable accuracy the collator's copy.

Although she does not solve the quandary posed by the Richard III text, Walker brings considerable light to the probable details of the editing and printing of F1. She thereby encourages new avenues of editorial emendation, as in the argument of Walton (Item 50, 1955) that the exclusive source of copy for the Richard III F is Q3. Walton is countered by Smidt (Item 154, 1970) with a somewhat more balanced speculation that Shakespeare's autograph manuscript, being incomplete or otherwise defective, was newly transcribed, the missing elements being provided by Qq 1-6.

36. Whitaker, Virgil K. Shakespeare's Use of Learning: An Inquiry into the Growth of his Mind & Art. San Marino, Calif.: The Huntington Library, 1953.

Whitaker cites evidence from Shakespeare's plays to prove that while he had "small Latine and lesse Greek," he made miraculously effective use of his cultural background as well as his ordinary religious and academic training. For example, several kinds of evidence point to the conclusion that Shakespeare's reading on the First Tetralogy was limited to the period covered by these plays. Contrary to Tillyard's findings (Item 7, 1944), says Whitaker, Shakespeare was "profoundly ignorant of English history," but as a good novice dramatist he made the best use of the main story lines which were familiar to his audience. Whitaker takes the reasonable view that Shakespeare's first concern in the histories was to develop characters who made the story interesting and plausible, and then choose vivid details to enhance and enliven character portrayal. Going on to illustrate Shakespeare's great familiarity with the Book of Common

Prayer as well as the Bible (especially Matthew, Psalms, and Luke) and Seneca, Whitaker makes the important point that not only did Shakespeare have an excellent common education, but that his continual classical allusions, especially to Ovid, are striking, and despite T. W. Baldwin's statement in 1947 of the (then) fashionable theory that Shakespeare had not read Seneca, Whitaker cites allusions which definitely indicate the contrary.

Nor did Shakespeare's education cease with his formal schooling, argues Whitaker. The wooing of Anne, for instance, demonstrates Shakespeare's growing acquaintance with the courtly love tradition, for Richard's persuasive technique rests largely upon the tradition that the lover who suffers for a season deserves the lady's reward; she not only caused his sufferings, but is equally guilty with him of any crimes which he may commit on her behalf--obviously Shakespeare depended upon the parody of this tradition to account for Anne's improbable surrender. Whitaker's work is an enlightening source-influence study and provides insights into Shakespeare's creative process as well.

1954

37. Clemen, Wolfgang H. "Tradition and Originality in Shakespeare's
     Richard III." Shakespeare Quarterly, 5 (1954), 247-257.

Clemen argues that a new dramatic unity evident in Shakespeare's Richard III must be seen as a decisive factor in relation to the development of English popular drama in general, since all sorts of plays, not only the histories, shared the unintegrated mixture of heterogeneous elements, from the juxtaposition of farcical incident and serious pathos to antithetical colloquial and rhetorical language. Clemen convincingly asserts that Shakespeare's unifying and tightening structure in Richard

III is multi-leveled, more than a mere focusing upon a single character
which critics usually cite. With his usual density of scholarship,
Clemen shows that the blending of formal with popular language is "natu-
ral" in Richard III. He points to IV.iv, for example, as an illustration
of Richard's rhetorical language experimentally contrasted to his collo-
quialism in other scenes. Thus Richard's rhetoric and his "popular
speech" represent another "first" in Renaissance drama: the character-
ization of a person through his language.

If Clemen's purpose was to convince his readers of the significance
of Richard III both as dramatic art and as a representation of the his-
torical genre, he succeeds. In a plan that anticipates his great full-
length study of Richard III (Items 59, 1957; 137, 1968), Clemen carefully
notes three main directions of Shakespeare's original handling of tradi-
tion: (1) his superior sense of dramatic form and art; his feeling for
essentially dramatic values; and his consequent endeavor to integrate
heterogeneous elements in the play; (2) his conscious and deliberate use
of dramatic conventions; and (3) his discovery and revelation of the
human aspect as the new element in traditional materials.

38. Freeman, Leslie. "Shakespeare's Kings and Machiavelli's Prince."
       1564-1654: Shakespeare Encomium. Ed. Ann Paolucci. The City
       College Papers, I, New York: The City College, 1954, no pp.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

39. Myers, A. R. "The Character of Richard III." History Today.
       August, 1954, pp. 511-521.

The character of Richard III is the absolute monstrosity which
emerged from a long tradition of commentary beginning with Richard's con-
temporaries such as the vacillating Yorkist-Lancastrian John Rous, to
More, to the chronicles of the sixteenth century. Thus Myers sums up

this tradition succinctly and temperately, touching upon the major issues concerning the discrepancies between the Richard III of legend and myth and the "real" Richard III. Myers presents a common sense account of his subject, and his study is an excellent source to be read as a supplement to Kendall (Item 46, 1955). Both studies throw the extreme Lancastrian bias of Rowse (Item 128, 1966) into relief.

40. Ribner, Irving. "The Tudor History Play: An Essay in Definition." PMLA, 69 (1954), 591-609.

While Campbell (Item 11, 1947) made careful distinctions between tragedy and historical genres (excepting the hybrid Richard III), Ribner's definition is based upon an "easy merging" of the medievalist Christian and the Renaissance historiographies and the fact that Elizabethans did not distinguish clearly between history and tragedy as modern critics tend to do. Indeed, says Ribner, history and tragedy have been closely linked since the beginning of western civilization. Thus he defines the Tudor history play as that drama which is based upon what the Elizabethans considered to be a source of history, so long as the history contained therein did not pass into legend, as in Hamlet. Otherwise, he asserts, the history play and the tragedy share common roots, and in a full-length study (Item 64, 1957) he somewhat dubiously includes all Tudor drama in some category of history play.

41. Schirmer, Walter F. Glück und Ende der Königinen Shakespeares Historien. Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein Westfalen, Heft 22. Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1954.

This work was not available for annotation.

42. Wilson, J. Dover. "On Editing Shakespeare: With Special Reference to the Problems of Richard III." Talking of Shakespeare. Ed. John Garrett. London: Hodder & Stoughton, in association with Max Reinhardt, 1954, pp. 231-257.

Wilson's excellent summary of the history and development of Shakespeare textual criticism is couched in terms which the educated nonspecialist can hope to understand. He carefully explains the untrustworthy techniques of editors, emendators, and printers from Shakespeare's day to the 1930's, when the methods of textual criticism, which began its modern period with A. W. Pollard's Shakespeare Folios and Quartos (1909), entered a second, and revolutionary, phase with the 1930-31 publication of Sir Edmund Chambers' William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems, followed by Sir Walter Greg's Elizabethan Dramatic Documents (1931). Wilson credits these great scholars with providing a mass of material and facts which shed light upon playhouse manuscripts and the printing of dramatic texts in the age of Shakespeare. Wilson is the only editor besides Peter Alexander to have attempted an edition of Richard III between D. L. Patrick's establishment of the true text in The Textual History of Richard III (1936) and 1954, and Wilson's assessment of editorial work remaining to be done continues to hold true today: there is still much "cleansing" of the text to be done. Wilson offers unqualified praise of Walker's study (Item 35, 1953) as an exemplary guide to modern editorial emendation.

1955

43. Arnold, Aerol. "The Recapitulation Dream in Richard III and Macbeth." Shakespeare Quarterly, 6 (1955), 51-62.

Perhaps Arnold did not closely read Clemen's "Tradition and Originality," which appeared in Shakespeare Quarterly the year before his article, for Clemen's study clearly nullifies Arnold's claim that Shakespeare's use of dreams to recapitulate the action of the play has escaped

notice. Nevertheless, Arnold attacks the thesis of Shakespeare's original use of dream convention from a broader perspective than Clemen's. Playwrights other than Shakespeare, contends Arnold, employed the conventional dream device of summarizing the significant details of plot and character and foreshadowing events, while the dreams of Clarence, Richard, and Lady Macbeth are more innovative. Their dreams not only recapitulate past details, but also serve to integrate character and action with theme. The three-part dream of Clarence is allegorical, says Arnold, while Richard's is not. The ghosts at Bosworth Field are brought on stage, an innovation which looks forward to the essentially realistic dream devices of Macbeth. Korniger (Item 124, 1966) expands upon the progressively realistic depiction of ghosts in subsequent plays. In contrast to the dreams of Clarence and Richard, notes Arnold, Lady Macbeth's sleepwalking dream distorts time sequence and confuses events, yet every line directs the audience to a definitive event. His main point in convincing: in these two plays, Shakespeare achieves increasingly subtle and complex dramatic effects by innovating upon the conventional dream motif of medieval and early Tudor drama.

44. Clemen, Wolfgang H. "Clarences Traum und Ermordung." Sitzungs-berichte d. Bayer. Akadmie d. Wissenschaften. Munich, 1955.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

45. Fusillo, Robert James. "Tents on Bosworth Field." Shakespeare Quarterly, 6 (1955), 193-194.

Fusillo's premise is modest but significant, for he offers a plausible solution to a staging problem in Richard III which had been little noted. He points out that the dream sequence in Richard III, V.iii, is the first instance of "two wholly distinct groups--each represented as

being in a different locale--sharing the stage" (p. 193). Since the text
of the play provides the audience with no indication of what is happen-
ing in the dream scene, the presence of tents poses some difficulty in
conveying the impression of two camps in different places simultaneously.
Although all editors have assumed that Richard and his party actually
pitch a tent onstage, says Fusillo, the many allusions to the tent may
mean that it was to be imagined by the audience, was not physically pre-
sent, and was therefore not confusing to the Elizabethan audience. How-
ever, if two tents were represented, he says, they would best be depicted
by separate doors onto the stage, perhaps draped or adorned to resemble
tents. Hosley (Item 54, 1956) supports Fusillo's conjectures, but Weiner
(Item 102, 1962) insists that only one tent is necessary, to be pitched
by Richard's party but to be used by Richmond. Finally, Doebler (Item
180, 1974) strongly urges an iconographic interpretation which indirect-
ly supports Fusillo's ideas. Clearly, Fusillo created a point of conten-
tion, but for the critic its significance lies as much in the meaning
and intent of the lines as in the actual staging method.

46. Kendall, Paul Murray. Richard the Third. New York: W. W. Norton
       & Company, Inc., 1955.

Kendall's biography of Richard III remains the standard account of
the life and times of the Yorks from Richard of York to the death of his
youngest son, Richard III. Beginning with the conflict between Margaret
and the Duke of York, with felicitous style and compelling detail the
work relates the events and the complex political crosscurrents which
lead to the crowning of Edward IV, the intrigues of his court, Richard's
usurpation of the throne from Edward's heirs, Richard's short, but sur-
prisingly fruitful, reign, and his death at Bosworth Field. Although

Kendall terms his account a biography rather than a history, his narrative is admirably bolstered by scholarly treatment of available historical sources on the subject.

Kendall's image of the historical Richard III is humanistic, personalized, an approach which may seem to reveal a bias toward the Yorkist cause, but which Kendall perceives as a balanced and intelligent method of dealing with a highly controversial historical figure. Certainly Kendall convincingly portrays Richard as a product of his violent times, a fallible human with a sense of duty rather than the patent monster of Lancastrian commentators of whom the latest is Rowse (Item 128, 1966).

Myers (Item 39, 1954) presents a balanced perspective on the historical probabilities of Richard's character and provides an excellent summary of both sides of the controversy which supplements Kendall. The debate continues to rage. Kendall (Item 118, 1965) tried again to settle it once for all, but Hanham (Item 192, 1975) would have none of that, and Champion (Item 242, 1980) felt called upon to yet again offer a sane perspective upon the issues.

47. Nathan, Norman. "The Marriage of Richard and Anne." Notes and Queries, 2 (1955), 55-56.

According to Nathan, Richard's "secret close intent" (I.i.157-162) is to marry Anne in order to become king, but the passage does not clarify how Richard's marrying of Anne will help him to the throne. Nathan speculates that Shakespeare relied upon some background material to clarify the matter for his knowledgeable audience, such as the Book of Samuel and the Book of Kings where the annointing of the king is given great significance. But Nathan is more persuasive in his notion that Richard courts Anne for political gain. Within the context of the play,

she is the widow of Henry VI's son and as Richard's wife would establish
a religiously sanctified line of descent from Henry VI to Richard, a line
which the children of Edward IV did not have. Still, Nathan offers very
little evidence for his theories. Does the presence of Henry's corpse
during the wooing of Anne symbolize the passing of Henry's rights to
Richard through his possession of Anne? Nathan's assertion of such a
proposition would be better stated as a question; in the absence of clear
textual evidence, we must be content with the certainty that Richard woos
and marries Anne for political advantage, as he attempts to do, and as
Richmond succeeds in doing, with Elizabeth York.

48. Parsons, Howard. "Richard III." Notes and Queries, 2 (1955), 175-
        176.

Parsons suggests that pleasing should be emended to pleaded in I.1.9
and that amorous should be emended to amorist's in I.1.14.

49. Parsons, Howard. "Shakespeare Emendations: Richard III." Notes
        and Queries, 2 (1955), 288-289.

Parsons offers emendations of diffus'd (I.2.75), rejects emendation
of F effect (I.ii.121); and calls for a comma after Looke (I.iii.289) in
order to preserve its Elizabethan meaning.

50. Walton, J. K. The Copy for the Folio Text of "Richard III," with a
        Note on the Copy for the Folio Text of "King Lear." Auckland
        University College, Monograph Series No. 1, Auckland, New Zealand:
        The Pilgrim Press, 1955.

In his foreword, Walton explains that the main purpose of his three-
part study is to show that the Folio text of Richard III was not printed
for the most part from a corrected exemplum of Q6 as critics have general-
ly agreed, but that F is based throughout upon an exemplum of Q3 which
had been corrected by a collator of uneven skills. Walton includes a

note in his book on the copy-text for Folio Lear, theorizing that also due to varying efficiency in the collation, anomalies in the incidence of variants occur between the Q and F Lear. Bowers (Item 78, 1959) generally discredits Walton's conclusions, although Bowers (Review of Walton, SQ, 10 [1959], 91-96) previously had thought the study to be a breakthrough in the vital question of whether Q3 or Q6 was the printed copy used by Jaggard to set the type for F Richard III. Although Bowers contends that Walton's unqualified rejection of Q6 as the source of F is unjustified, Bowers admits that some evidence for Q3 influence exists. Nevertheless, he considers Walton's case to be inconclusive. Cairncross (Item 58, 1957) anticipates Bowers' conclusions, saying that the copy for Richard III seems to have consisted mainly of Q1 and Q3, supplemented by Q6. Walton takes exception to prevailing theory as expounded by Walker (Item 35, 1953) that Q3 served only to fill in gaps in the manuscript used by the collators of F. Like Smidt (Item 154, 1970), Walton takes a bold approach to the textual criticism which has not been fully accepted by established textual critics, although Smidt, who disagrees with Walton, is closer than he to the prevailing consensus.

51.   Worsley, Thomas Cuthbert. "King Richard." New Statesman and Nation, 49 (1955), 354.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

1956

52.   Barnet, Sylvan. "Coleridge on Shakespeare's Villains." Shakespeare Quarterly, 7 (1956), 11-20.

With devastating effect, Barnet assesses Coleridge's misapplications of Platonic aesthetic theories to Shakespeare's villains. Because like

all the romantic critics Coleridge held that only the moral man could produce great literature, says Barnet, he assumed that Shakespeare's method of Artistic creation was to find the truth of his characterizations through meditation upon some part of himself. Thus Coleridge sought to mitigate the villainy of Shakespeare's characters on the grounds that they must represent some aspect of Shakespeare's personal nature. Barnet makes his case: "In a variety of methods," he says, "not all of which were mutually consistent, Coleridge attempted to force Shakespeare's plays into the mold of his own aesthetic theory" (p. 20).

53. Hodgins, Frank, and Audrey Hodgins. "Teaching Guide for Richard III." English Journal, 45 (1956), 138-140, 144.

A sound critical perspective underlies this guide to the teaching of Richard III. The authors warn that Richard is often viewed from the modern perspective as simply degenerate, but that he may be studied as analogous to a modern unscrupulous man with ambition to get ahead in a success-oriented culture. They correctly note, however, that Elizabethans would have perceived Richard in the context of the Great Chain of Being, wherein man, part angel, part beast, must not violate Order. As a teacher's guide, especially on the secondary and perhaps undergraduate levels, the Hodgins' suggestions are useful.

54. Hosley, Richard. "More About 'Tents' on Bosworth Field." Shakespeare Quarterly, 7 (1956), 458-459.

Hosley responds to Fusillo (Item 45, 1955), who suggests that the tents in Richard III, V.ii, may have been represented, not by property tents or a curtained space for discoveries, but by tiring house doors to the stage of an Elizabethan playhouse. Hosley notes that Fusillo's suggestion gives rise to the notion that Richard III was written for a stage

similar to that pictured in the drawings of the Swan playhouse, with a raised platform stage with merely two doors to the tiring house and very few props. Hosley cites references in 3 Henry VI which support Fusillo's conclusions.

55. Sisson, C. J. New Readings in Shakespeare. Vol. II. The Histories, the Tragedies. Shakespeare Problems. Ed. J. Dover Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

56. Thompson, Marjorie. "The Clarence Scenes in Richard III: A Query Concerning the New Cambridge Edition." The Modern Language Review, 57 (1956), 221-223.

Thompson raises a query as to whether a discrepancy exists in J. Dover Wilson's theory that Shakespeare created the Clarence scenes as an afterthought. If I.iv originally began at line 76, and if Shakespeare added lines 1-75 as an afterthought as Wilson speculates in his New Cambridge Edition, then, asks Thompson, does it follow that the Clarence passages in I.i, or at least that part which also derives from the A Mirror for Magistrates, were also an afterthought? Wilson answers yes (Item 76, 1958).

1957

57. Cairncross, Andrew S. "Coincidental Variants in Richard III." The Library, 12 (1957), 187-190.

While admitting that Walton (Item 50, 1955) contributed greatly to textual criticism by eliminating Q6 as the main copy for F Richard III, Cairncross, like Bowers (Item 78, 1959), will accept neither Walton's total exclusion of Q6 as a copy-text nor his exclusive designation of Q3 as such. Then Cairncross (Item 58, 1957) attacks Walton's theories on a more general level, and Walton (Item 75, 1958) defends them.

58. Cairncross, Andrew S. "The Quartos and the Folio Text of <u>Richard III</u>." <u>The Review of English Studies</u>, 8 (1957), 225-233.

Anticipating the arguments of Bowers (Item 78, 1959), Cairncross asserts that the F <u>Richard III</u>, although set up by two compositors, A and B, "was printed from <u>three</u> of the six quartos then available--Q1, Q3, and Q6--used in some sort of rotation, and corrected with varying degrees of accuracy from an authentic manuscript" (p. 15). Noting the trend of editors to proceed on the theory that one quarto copy was used to set the print, Cairncross launches his study on the basis that Walton (Item 50, 1955), who attacks the use of Q6 and declares Q3 to be the source of F throughout, shows that there is something radically wrong with the present form of the one-quarto theory. Yet Cairncross's theory appears to be neither stronger nor weaker than others such as Bowers' or even Smidt's (Item 114, 1964), which argues that the variations between Q1 and F are the natural result of the author's various revision of his foul papers, or of misreading, or of deliberate changes by the copiers, but not entirely of corrupt memorial transmission.

59. Clemen, Wolfgang H. <u>Kommentar zu Shakespeares "Richard III."</u> Gottingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1957.

See Bonheim's translation of this work (Item 137, 1968), which excludes "Verhältnis zu Quelle," sections at the end of each scene-analysis of the original text. No doubt these are omitted for reasons of expedience, but it should be noted that these comments provide detailed comparisons between Shakespeare's text and his sources. The resulting illumination of Shakespeare's dramatic transformations of the sources is valuable. However, in the translation, Clemen somewhat accounts for criticism on Richard III which appeared in the interim between the original book and the translation.

60. Coe, Charles Norton. <u>Shakespeare's Villains</u>. New York: Bookman Associates, 1957.

Coe devotes a chapter to the comparison of Richard III, Macbeth, and Lady Macbeth, because they gained the throne through murder and were forced to retain their advancement through violence. Furthermore, he says, they are villains who dominate their plays. Essentially, Coe finds Richard to be more psychologically well-rounded than almost any previous Shakespearean hero, although the wooing of Anne Coe believes is completely outside psychological probability. Apparently Coe does not allow for any other logical pattern or motivation which might inform the scene, as Palmer does, for example (Item 8, 1945). In all, Coe's treatment of <u>Richard III</u> is light indeed.

61. Draper, John W. <u>The Tempo-Patterns of Shakespeare's Plays</u>. Anglistiche Forschungen; Heft 90. Heidelberg: Carl Winter--Universitätsverlag, 1957.

In a very mechanical and statistical approach to Shakespeare's plays, Draper's study reviews the general act-scene outline of the tempo in each play. The ratio of slurred to non-slurred words in dialogue and meter indicates "tempo," how slow or fast a character speaks his lines. Arguing that Elizabethans established a character's humor according to the tempo of his speech, Draper concludes that Shakespeare manipulated the tempo of dialogue to point the plot, to individualize the characters, and to sustain the emotion of the style. Conveniently, Draper provides a chart of the tempo patterns in <u>Richard III</u> (pp. 32-33), including the average number of lines which each character speaks and the average ratio of slurred to unslurred words. He is able to show that the tempo of <u>Richard III</u> is much slower than the later tragedies and offers several theories to account for this. The significance, however, he admits is

unclear to him. Draper's study is a valuable contribution to the analyses of Shakespeare's growth as a dramatist-poet, although tempo alone is somewhat limited as a criterion for expressing the dominant pace of a play, and is even more limited as an index to characterization and scene development.

62. Kantorowicz, Ernst H. The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

63. Lüthi, Max. Shakespeares Dramen. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1957.

Lüthi's main thesis is that the evil in Richard III as Shakespeare conceived it is not a matter of predestination, but derives from Richard's decision to allow his outer deformity to dictate his whole personality. Instead of accepting his exterior as an unimportant appearance defect, in the baroque manner which recognizes that nothing is what it seems to be, Richard consciously allows his deformed body to take over his whole being, says Lüthi. Like Clemen (Item 59, 1957) and unlike Berkeley (Item 104, 1963), Lüthi thinks that Richard is "determined to prove a villain" merely out of his own free will, which means that he makes himself into what he did not need to be: a slave of nature and a villain by choice. Lüthi's chapter on Richard III clarifies the sense of continuity in the First Tetralogy, developing the thesis that the self-destruction of England is the symbol of the self-destruction of man. Richard's downfall, he adds, comes from the evil inherent in denying the spiritual realities of his humanity. Lüthi limits his viewpoint too narrowly to what Richard might have been, which may be seen as irrelevant to the question of what he is, but his study is cogent.

64. Ribner, Irving. The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Acknowledging his deep indebtedness to Tillyard, Lily B. Campbell, and J. Dover Wilson, the author applies his definition of history plays to Shakespeare's works: history plays, Ribner says, derive generally from classical and humanist philosophies of history, having as their chief purpose a didactic treatment of political and providential themes. Any play which "appears to fulfill what we know the Elizabethans considered to be the legitimate sources of history," and which "is drawn from a chronicle source which we know that at least a large part of the contemporary audience accepted as factual" may be called a history play (p. 27). Expanding upon his earlier attempt, Ribner (Item 40, 1954) offers an extremely broad historical study of the development of the English history play, including not only political plays, but also what he calls "legendary" history, "biographical" history, and "historical romance." Ribner adds little to Tillyard (Item 7, 1944) on the First Tetralogy, tracing the influences upon the plays such as the Morality tradition and Marlovian and Senecan tragedy. One of his more dubious assertions is the notion that, like Marlowe's work, Richard III offers "a total absence of the slightest gleam of comedy," although Thomas (Item 6, 1943) had long ago identified comic aspects of Richard's character derived mainly from the English Vice figure.

65. Schneider, Reinhold. "Das Bild der Herrschaft in Shakespeares Drama." Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, 93 (1957), 9-37.

In a study of impressive scope, Schneider examines the question posed in Shakespeare's drama as to where sovereignty should reside, in God or man. Schneider traces the image of sovereignty through Shakespeare's histories, tragedies, and comedies, as it develops, changes,

and reaches its final form in <u>Henry VIII</u> and the romances. Turning to the English kings to find the answer to the paradox of power and ethics, says Schneider, Shakespeare chooses Henry VI, a legitimate king who is unfit to lead, but he has the mysterious transcendental quality, exhibited in his essence and fate, which in Shakespeare's world view typifies kingship: the gift from a higher power than man. But with the fall of Henry VI occurs the frightening conception of Richard III, whose origin Schneider sees as the "nightfall" in Shakespeare's history. In Richard, says Schneider, Shakespeare initiates the presence in his drama of an evil of metaphysical origins, which cannot therefore be quashed. Of course, Shakespeare advances Henry Tudor, who, as God's agent defeats Richard, but Schneider insists that not Richmond alone, but Richard's conscience, heaven, hell, and "fair St. George" simultaneously bring about Richard's defeat. Schneider's sense of the continuity in Shakespeare's treatment of evil throughout the canon is excellent. Shakespeare's final word on the subject, he argues, is to be found in Henry VIII, who knows, like Prospero, that power lies in truth and beauty and that "Herrschaft ruht auf Demut": the ability to rule depends upon humility.

66. Traversi, Derek A. <u>Shakespeare from "Richard II" to "Henry V."</u> Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

67. Wada, Yuchi. "Machiavellism and Richard III." <u>Studies in English Literature</u> (Eibungaku Kenkyeu), 27 (1957), 131-173.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

68. Wilson, J. Dover. "A Note on <u>Richard III</u>: The Bishop of Ely's Strawberries." <u>The Modern Language Review</u>, 52 (1957), 563-564.

Prompted by a letter from his personal physician, Wilson speculates that Richard III ordered strawberries from the Bishop for the purpose of eating them to deliberately bring on an "urticarial rash" due to Richard's supposed allergy to strawberries. Supposedly he displayed the outbreak upon his arm as proof of the witchcraft of Jane Shore and Queen Elizabeth. Never mind that both More and Shakespeare say that Richard displayed a withered arm rather than a rash; this can be explained away as textual error or superstition inherent in the times. Professor Wilson, of course, only offers a suggestion.

69. Zuk, Gerald H. "A Note on Richard's Anxiety Dream." The Imago, 14 (1957), 37-39.

Unfortunately, Zuk's analysis of Richard's dream treats a literary character as if he were a patient on a couch. Richard possesses one of the strongest of egos, he says, but his is a classic case of wish fulfillment (gaining the crown) diminishing the strength of the ego. Richard becomes fearful and anxious when he gains the crown because he is not a leader but a destroyer of leadership, says Zuk. As is often the case, psychoanalytical criticism is attractively neat, but at its worst such interpretation ignores too many dramatic and literary criteria which would account for the play as a work of art and not as a clinical study. However, Shupe (Item 227, 1978) does an unusually good job of relating psychoanalytical methodology to the study of literature.

1958

70. Fergusson, Francis. Shakespeare: The Pattern in His Carpet. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1958.

This work contains all of the essays that were written in the course of about eleven years to introduce the plays in the Laurel

Shakespeare series, reprinted in Dell paperback with minor changes, and arranged chronologically according to the four main phases of Shakespeare's career. Fergusson sees Richard III in the psychological frame of a "deformed child who becomes a spiritually distorted man, and takes savage and ironically smiling vengeance upon the world for his misfortune" (p. 52). To his credit, Fergusson admits that Shakespeare was more interested in theatrical effect than psychology as such, but the essay adds little to existing literary criticism.

71. Hill, R. F. "Shakespeare's Early Tragic Mode." Shakespeare Quarterly, 9 (1958), 455-469.

Hill considers the early history plays to be tragedy, since Shakespeare apparently looked to Senecan tragedy for guidance and experimented with the tragic mode. Hill argues that criticism of Shakespeare's early histories would benefit from a general recognition of his adherence to rhetorical tragic methods; thus Hill examines Shakespeare's imagery and wordplay in the early tragedies for a rhetorical balance between language, thought, and feeling, which he apparently finds in Richard III. Clemen (Item 20, 1951) had already shown the relationship between Shakespeare's increasing mastery of imagaic language and his gradually developing command of poetic drama as evidenced in Richard III, so Hill's contentions are not surprising.

72. McElderry, B. R., Jr. "J. R. Lowell and Richard III--A Bibliographical Error." Notes and Queries, 5 (1958), 179-180.

McElderry notes that Richard the Third and the Primrose Criticism (A. C. McClurg & Co.: Chicago, 1887) has been incorrectly attributed to J. R. Lowell in two bibliographical sources. Actually the work is an anonymous reply to Lowell's views on Richard III, says McElderry, first

presented in a lecture delivered before the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution in 1883.

73. Shapiro, I. A. "Richard II or Richard III or . . .?" _Shakespeare Quarterly_, 9 (1958), 204-206.

Shapiro takes a refreshingly common sense approach in questioning the complacency of critics who have accepted an obviously suspect dating of _Richard II_ by Sir Edmund Chambers, who assigned the date 1595 to the composition of that play, based upon a letter written in that year by Sir Edward Hoby inviting Sir Robert Cecil to visit. The key passage is "K. Richard [shall] present him selfe to your vewe." Shapiro thinks that Chambers' authority has outweighed the apparent invalidity of interpreting the "Richard" in the letter to be Richard II, since _Richard III_ was written before it. The logic is inexorable: Such eminent Shakespeare editions as the New Arden Shakespeare and the New Cambridge edition have adopted a dating based upon a source which does not contain proof of performance of Shakespeare's _Richard II_, _Richard III_, or any other play.

74. 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.

Spivack argues brilliantly that the apparent discrepancy between the stated intentions of Don John, Iago, Aaron, and Richard III and their actual deeds can be explained by their common derivation from the old Vice figure of the Moralities. We must understand pre-Shakespearean English drama, he says, before we can fully appreciate these characters. Unlike the majority of Shakespeare's criminals, in these four there is no moral relationship between them and their crimes; their motives bear no causative relationship to the limitations inherent in general humanity; their

direct addresses to the audience indicate their detachment from moral in-

volvement in the human relationships of their respective plots; and only

these four of Shakespeare's criminals proclaim themselves as types rather

than individuals. In brief, Spivack asserts that these four are Vice

figures and are intelligible only as such.

In a compelling analysis of the wooing of Anne, Spivack shows that

no other scene more clearly demonstrates Richard's Vice characteristics.

Although Thomas (Item 6, 1943) noticed that Richard's wooing of Anne re-

sembles an episode in the morality play The Three Lords and Three Ladies

of London, Spivack traces the relationship between Shakespeare's scene

and the moralities which explains Anne's seduction as "the same moral

reversal that marked the career of Mankind and all his descendants: she

has thrown over her alliance with virtue" (p. 405). Her new alliance is

with evil itself as represented by the Vice Richard. Although many crit-

ics disagree with Spivack and continue to see Richard as a psychological

type of the inhuman man, as does Ornstein (Item 168, 1972), no critic has

surpassed Spivack in arguing an intelligible, and intelligent, frame of

reference for Richard's enigmatic motives.

75. Walton, J. K. "Coincidental Variants in Richard III." The Library,
      13 (1958), 139-140.

Walton responds to Cairncross (Item 57, 1957), who attacks the hypo-

thesis of coincidental variants set forth in Walton's work (Item 50,

1955). While Cairncross had argued the significance of even the most

apparently insignificant variations between texts, Walton rejects Cairn-

cross's argument by analogy with Hamlet and insists that since the Folio

Richard III read "news, but" (IV.iv.536) cannot be proven incorrect,

then Cairncross probably errs in maintaining that the passage represents

a conjectural emendation of the same passage in Q6. Thus Walton main-
tains his position that Folio Richard III is exclusively dependent upon
Q3, despite the partial concessions of Cairncross. Bowers (Item 78,
1959) supports Cairncross along with a consensus of critics as against
Walton.

76. Wilson, J. Dover. "The Composition of the Clarence Scenes in
   Richard III." The Modern Language Review, 53 (1958), 211-214.

Wilson responds to Thompson (Item 56, 1956) and acknowledges a dis-
crepancy in his New Cambridge edition of Richard III. After having
argued that Shakespeare was led from the perusal of Clarence's dream in
Sackville's Induction to Baldwin's "tragedy" of Clarence in the same
volume of A Mirror for Magistrates, Wilson went on to contend on biblio-
graphical grounds that Clarence's dream had been added after the rest of
I.iv had been composed, completely forgetting that he had already argued
that Shakespeare had consulted the Mirror on Clarence's dream before he
even began Act I. Wilson defends his basic contentions, however, that
Clarence's dream was inspired by Sackville's Induction, that Clarence's
dream was not written at the same time as the rest of the scene in which
it appears, and that internal evidence shows that Shakespeare read Bald-
win's poem in the Mirror as well as the Induction. Relying heavily upon
Law (Item 18, 1950), Wilson assumes with him that Shakespeare drafted
the last four acts of Richard III before composing the largely invented
Act I.

As usual, Wilson's criticism is solidly grounded in the best tech-
niques of textual analysis, but his speculations take on a (by now)
familiar soaring quality which at times almost seems tongue-in-cheek.
For example, he surmises that Shakespeare left off his composing of

Richard III for awhile because he wanted to re-read the terrible depic-
tion of hell in Sackville's Induction, which he was forced to seek at a
friend's house, since he lacked a copy at hand. At the friend's house
Shakespeare composed the first seventy-six lines of I.iv, but "before
closing the Mirror volume he would inevitably have turned the pages to
see what the dull dog Baldwin had to say" concerning his subject, Clarence
(p. 214). And thereby hangs the tale of how those passages in I.iv
which were derived from Baldwin's poem were written; like Clarence's
dream, they were composed after Shakespeare wrote the murder scene.

1959

77. Baldwin, T. W. On the Literary Genetics of Shakespeare's Plays:
        1592-1594. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1959.

This book is meant to be a continuation of Baldwin's Shakespeare's
Five-Act Structure, 1947 (which does not refer to Richard III), and is a
study of Shakespeare's composition as it relates to the universal methods
of composition characteristics of his time. While Baldwin's statement of
purpose exceeds the book's actual achievement, he does provide a good
summary of the plot of Richard III along with a review of standard analy-
ses of the play as a vehicle for the Tudor Myth. However, Baldwin goes
beyond most prudent acknowledgments of the orthodox Tudor political theme
in his assessment of Richard III as "a sermon on political hell-fire and
damnation, with a pearly gate at the end wherethrough to glimpse the com-
ing glories of the Tudor heaven. . ." (p. 392). And he stands virtually
alone with his theory that Romeo and Juliet was composed before Richard
III. He bases his unique theory upon the notion that the motive force of
avenging stars in Romeo surely suggested the device of God's vengeance
upon the houses of York and Lancaster. He does not cite evidence for

such a chronology, nor does he allow that upon such speculation the reverse chronology may as easily be surmised. Thus Baldwin offers very little to the careful student of Richard III.

78. Bowers, Fredson. "The Copy for the Folio Richard III." Shakespeare Quarterly, 10 (1959), 541-544.

Bowers retracts his earlier wholehearted acceptance of the textual theory advanced by Walton (Item 50, 1955). Bowers now argues that Walton errs in his contention that the Folio text of Richard III was printed throughout from an exemplum of Q3, rather than from a corrected exemplum of Q6 as critics have generally agreed. Finding fault in Walton's reliance upon the traditional assumption of textual critics that agreement of reading alone could prove that Q3 served as copy-text for F, Bowers admits that the evidence of "accidental" reading does exist, i.e., the details of spelling, word-division, and so on, do indicate that some evidence for Q3 exists which cannot be ignored. Bowers leaves the matter as an unsettled impasse. Cairncross (Item 58, 1957) anticipates Bowers somewhat by stating that the copy of Richard III seems to have been based upon a combination of Q1, Q3, and Q6, each of which might have been used in short stints.

79. Evans, Ifor. The Language of Shakespeare's Plays. 2nd ed. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1959.

Evans is certain that the Elizabethan audience who attended productions of plays from the First Tetralogy found the rhetoric stiff and artificial. Not until Richard II, he says, did Shakespeare abandon the violent excesses of rhetoric and gain artistic control of his language. Furthermore, Evans finds that Richard III is not much concerned with conscience, an opinion which places him at odds with the consensus of

critics. Finally, Shakespeare's verse falters, asserts Evans, in Richard's

most crucial moral conflict after the visitation of the ghosts and "inter-

est is maintained solely by the situation" (p. 50). Yet we may look for-

ward to Hobson (Item 167, 1972) for an excellent study of the connection

between Richard's unintegrated inner self and the antitehtical structure

of these lines. As for Shakespeare's control of language, Hill (Item 71,

1958) effectively contends that the rhetoric of the early plays must be

seen as a successful use of a dramatic convention, not to be confused

with the style of Shakespeare's later more naturalistic mode. Evans

takes a breezy approach in his study of Shakespeare's language in Richard

III and tends toward hasty pronouncements upon theme, image, and drama-

turgy.

80.   Gerber, Richard. "Elizabethan Convention and Psychological Realism
         in the Dream and Last Soliloquy of Richard III." English Stud-
         ies, 40 (1959), 294-300.

Gerber's study is a very close analysis of Richard's dream. Essen-

tially Gerber notes that of all Shakespeare's uses of ghosts and dreams,

Richard's is the only instance of dreaming in which "unreal" dream

figures appear. They do not have as simple a relationship to Richard's

consciousness as it might at first seem. Initially, Richard could either

be dreaming or be subject to some sort of sleeping spell, but if he had

awakened after the appearance of the first few ghosts, observes Gerber,

his objective summary of his dream would have been unambiguous and con-

ventionally suitable. However, the ghosts of the princes and Buckingham

appear and as though they were outside Richard's dream, causing him to

dream, rather than playing roles as conventional dream figures. Gerber

reveals subtle complication in the dream sequence as an element of struc-

ture and point of view.

81. Krieger, Murray. "The Dark Generations of Richard III." Criticism,
        1 (1959), 32-48.

Richard is not simply a Marlovian villain, says Krieger; his quest

for power derives from a deeper sense of his role as spoiler, a represen-

tative of chaos opposed to natural order. Richard thus represents a

force of history, becoming the inevitable nemesis of "dark generations"

of his countrymen whose corruption brings its own punishment. Thus far

Krieger reiterates the Tudor Myth, but more original is his view that

rather than merely an alien intruder, Richard is a purified and thus ex-

treme symbol of the worst characteristics of his victims. In what seems

to be a psychological version of the allegorical relationship between

the Vice and his victims (although Krieger does not acknowledge any simi-

larities between his interpretation and Spivack's), we learn that Richard's

victims are not deceived by him. Indeed, they knowingly accede to his

machinations out of a feeling of kinship in evil. With notable acumen,

Krieger states that Richard's victims acquiesce despite their awareness

of his duplicity; because they are pretending to be decent while actually

they are anxious to serve their own interests through him (even poor

Anne, although Krieger argues that she is also a casualty of Richard's

perverse intermingling of political and sexual aggression). On the other

hand, Richard is only pretending to be hypocritical. In a word, he is

only the most adroit villain in a villainous world. Krieger should

credit Palmer (Item 8, 1945) with the idea that Richard's worst charac-

tersitics merely epitomize those of his culture and class, yet Kreiger

expands our understanding of the continuity between Richard, his victims,

and their particular milieu.

82. Levine, Richard M. "Richard III--Usurper or Lawful King?" Specu-
    lum, 34 (1959), 391-401.

Questioning the inferences by which Kendall (item 46, 1955) supports

the thesis that Richard III has been falsely vilified by the Tudors and

their sympathizers as a usurper and a devil incarnate, Levine is more

particularly concerned that if Kendall has made his case that Richard

was legal heir to his father, then the Yorkist claim of Henry VII to the

throne through his marriage to Richard's niece is void, resting merely

upon Henry's questionable descent from a legitimated son of John of Gaunt.

With convincing logic, Levine argues that the validity of Richard's claim

to the throne does not rest only upon whether Edward York's heirs were

illegitimated by a pre-contract with Lady Eleanor Butler before he mar-

ried Elizabeth Woodville, or whether such a pre-contract, as legally

binding as marriage, were invented by Richard and his supporters. For

Levine the more important issue is that since Lady Eleanor died (1468)

before Edward and Elizabeth's sons were born (1470-1472), such a pre-

contract, even if it existed, probably would not legally have affected

the legitimacy of Edward's heirs. Yet the Yorkist claim of the Tudors

rested upon the legitimacy of Henry's queen, Elizabeth York, who was

born (1465) before the death of Lady Eleanor. Levine therefore concludes

that the validity of the Tudor claim rests heavily upon whether Edward

and Eleanor made a legal pre-contract of marriage, but Levine assures us

that they did not make the pre-contract; that it was, as the Yorkist

Croyland Chronicler wrote, simply a "color" for Richard's usurpation.

83. Quinn, Michael. "Providence in Shakespeare's Yorkist Plays." PMLA,
    10 (1959), 45-52.

The complexities of providence versus free will were of particular

concern to Shakespeare and his contemporaries, and Quinn sees in the

Yorkist tetralogy evidence of Shakespeare's progressively deepening insight into the issue. Quinn points to a complex, particular providence beyond that of the Tudor Myth whose presence he confirms in the First Tetralogy. He identifies a second kind of providence at work for which there is no clearly logical system of sin and retribution as explained by Tillyard (Item 7, 1944). In Richard III, for example, Hastings suffers from a variety of causes, some of which he could have controlled. In the scheme of General Providence, says Quinn, Margaret's curses make his death a moral necessity, while the plotting tyrant makes it an unfortuitous political necessity. Yet in the scheme which Quinn calls particular providence, Hastings could have avoided his fate had he been humble enough to escape with Stanley or pious enough to repent with the priest. In a sort of humanistic evaluation, Quinn feels that like others in the play, Hastings made a calculated choice in refusing to do either of these, and in their calculations, Hastings, Buckingham, and finally Richard lack enough foresight, of the sort which Shakespeare ironically provides the audience, to hold the power which they acquire.

Quinn's analysis demonstrates a rich ambiguity of moral cause-effect combined with free will in the Yorkist tetralogy. Rossiter (Item 95, 1961) advances basically the same argument except that, like Krieger (Item 81, 1959) and Palmer (Item 8, 1945), Rossiter recognizes no innocent victims in Richard III, whose world suffers from an absolute and hereditary moral illness which taints everyone except the Tudor outsiders.

84. Roskell, J. S. "William Catesby, Counsellor to Richard III."
     Bulletin of John Rylands Library, 42 (1959), 145-174.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

1960

85. Braun, Erich. <u>Widerstandrecht: Das Legitimatätsprinzip in Shake-speares Königsdramen</u>. Bonn: Bouvier, 1960.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

86. Driver, Tom F. <u>The Sense of History in Greek and Shakespearean Drama</u>. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

Driver examines the cultural assumptions regarding history as found in Greek and Shakespearean drama, with particular emphasis upon Hellenic as opposed to Hebraic conceptions of time. In Part I he sketches the background of relationships between history and drama. In Part II we find a definition of dramatic form, and in Part III he undertakes an examination of four Greek and four Shakespearean plays in light of the material in Part I, comparing and contrasting, among others, <u>The Persians</u> of Aeschylus and <u>Richard III</u>. Driver carefully shows that in <u>Richard III</u> Shakespeare uses time for dramatic effect--being precise or vague where it suits his purposes. And Driver notes that the great variety of time effects in that play exist within a double-time scheme, consisting of a short period of eight to twelve days and a long period during which two reigns pass. Yet the particular importance of time in <u>Richard III</u> lies in the idea of "special times" rather than chronology or compression of time, says Driver. He defines "special times" as "the particular ripeness of certain moments for certain events, and the unique character of particular times because of their past and future" (p. 91). This scheme constitutes a religio-national theme which is timed to conflict with Richard's evil efforts. He cannot win against Richmond, Driver explains, because in his opposition to "God's captain" the conflict of good and evil wills is expressed "in something like the biblical

understanding of a conflict of times" (p. 91). Therefore in contrast to
Spivack (Item 74, 1958), Richard is not "out of time" as a timeless and
universal representative of the evil Vice figure, but he is "out of
joint" for the times of his world.

Especially fine is Driver's analysis of the apocalyptic elements in
the structure and symbolism of Richard III. Deliberately or not, Shake-
speare's play adheres to the pattern of the Book of Revelations: Richard
as the beast, Bosworth as Armageddon, Richmond as the priestly represen-
tative of England atoning for past sins of the realm, and England as the
new Jerusalem. Finally, Krieger (Item 81, 1959) writes that the ritual-
istic lamentations and curses of Richard III carry us to Greek tragedy,
to where Richard III has "its most essential and most intimate connec-
tions" (p. 48), but Driver's comparison of The Persians and Richard III
reveals fundamental differences between Shakespearean and Greek drama.
Greek drama is static, Shakespearean drama develops; Greek choruses never
prophesy, the chorus approximations in Richard III do. Most significant-
ly, the Judeo-Christian concept of time in Richard III offers judgments
which give meaning to history, argues Driver, while Greek nemesis ex-
tracts a meaningful law from history. Perhaps this study distinguishes
too severely between Greek cyclical and Judeo-Christian linear concep-
tions of time as these relate to Richard III, but the merits of the
criticism are undebatable.

87. Law, R. A. "Richard III, IV.iv.201." Shakespeare Quarterly, 9
        (1960), 87-88.

History tells us that Edward IV's eldest daughter, Elizabeth, went
on to marry Henry VII, notes Law, but critics have not mentioned that
the third daughter, Brigit, actually became a praying nun as in the

allusion in the passage which Law cites. More and Holinshed related this fact, and therefore Law thinks that Shakespeare must have had it in mind when he composed the passage.

88. Ribner, Irving. <u>Patterns in Shakespearean Tragedy</u>. New York:
Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1960.

Having surpassed nineteenth-century critics such as A. C. Bradley, modern historical critics such as E. E. Stoll reveal to us a Shakespeare molded by the Christian humanism of his own time as well as by the medieval concepts of <u>theatricus mundi</u> which he inherited--thus Ribner studies Shakespeare's tragedies, looking for evidence that he became increasingly adept as a tragedian in presenting his characters, not as human beings, although realism in his drama is not to be denied, but as dramatic embodiments of philosophical and moral issues.

To Ribner, even as <u>Titus Andronicus</u> was the best tragedy up to its time, <u>Richard III</u> is a significant advancement in Shakespeare's art and in English drama. Yet Ribner does not perceive the unredemptive Richard in his larger role as catalyst to the redemption of England as Driver (Item 86, 1960) and others see him. Ribner offers some valuable distinctions between history and tragedy, but his perception of Richard as a mere <u>de casibus</u> figure lacks critical dimension.

89. Ross, Lawrence J. "The Meaning of Strawberries in Shakespeare."
<u>Studies in the Renaissance</u>, 7 (1960), 225-240.

In this indispensable analysis of the subject, Ross shows that Shakespeare's references to strawberries in <u>Othello</u>, <u>Henry V</u>, and <u>Richard III</u> derive from both the classical and the Christian traditions that the strawberry plant may symbolize either good or evil appearing as good. Rejecting Wilson's interpretation of Richard III, III.iv (Item 68, 1957),

in which Richard sends the Bishop of Ely for strawberries from his gar-
den, Ross contends that in the classical tradition roughly equivalent to
"There is a snake in the grass" the strawberry episode is a warning to
beware of hypocrites, or, more generally, to avoid any sight which is so
pleasurable to man's corrupt nature as to lead him to a spiritually dam-
aging moral choice.

Anticipating Viebrock (Item 173, 1972), Ross cites depictions of
the strawberry as the fruit of the Spirit in emblematic paintings which
are religious illustrations of perfect righteousness, but Ross demon-
strates a superior insight by showing that emblematically the strawberry
itself evokes a complex ambiguity of both good and evil, and that Shake-
speare calls upon not one, but both traditions in Othello and, less di-
rectly, elsewhere in his plays. The strawberries embroidered on Desde-
mona's handkerchief "serve as a symbolic crystallization of ironies
inherent in the dramatic situation" (p. 239). Such rich ambiguities are
pre-figured in the Richard III episode. Viebrock's reading of the
Richard III scene is sensitive to the "felt presence" of evil which the
strawberries connote, but Ross's historical-symbolical reading is superior.

1961

90. Broome, Dorothy M. "Napoleon and Richard III." Notes and Queries,
       1 (1961), 3-6.

Broome presents an absorbing letter written by Lady Charlotte Fitz
Gerald, dated August 11, 1815, describing the transfer of Napoleon from
the Bellerophon to the Northumberland while being transported to St.
Helena in custody of the British. Broome is mainly interested in the
letter's reference to a portrait of Richard III which Lady Charlotte's

family owned, although reference to the picture arises from her state-
ment that Napoleon's physical features and personal bearing reminded her
of Richard III in the portrait. As with so much of the commentary upon
Richard III, the main consideration here is historical rather than criti-
cal.

91. Brockbank, J. P. Early Shakespeare. London: 1961.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

92. Dollarhide, Louis E. "Two Unassimilated Movements of Richard III:
      An Interpretation." The Mississippi Quarterly, 14 (1961), 40-
      46.

Like Rossiter (Item 95, 1961), Dollarhide notes that the two deline-
ating movements of Richard III are centered upon the character of Richard
and the curses of Margaret, an idea also developed by Aycock (Item 174,
1973). Dollarhide contends that Shakespeare created two separate move-
ments in the structure of the play: the curse motif and the witty king
motif. These function harmoniously up to the "second wooing" scene, in
which Richard attempts to convince Queen Elizabeth that he should marry
her daughter. Dollarhide finds that here the two structural devices do
not meet at all. As he sees the problem, Richard's sudden conversion to
a state of uncertainty immediately following his victorious debate with
Queen Elizabeth is dramatically unjustified. Dollarhide notes that the
two basic critical views have either concluded that Richard won the de-
bate, but with an indication that his decline has become apparent; or
that he lost the debate, being deceived by equivocable agreement to his
suit. However, Dollarhide is convinced that Richard absolutely won the
debate, and that therefore his decline in wit and fortune immediately
thereafter lacks sufficient dramatic preparation. Dollarhide would solve

this inadequacy by eliminating the confrontation, since it is merely a set piece of formal rhetorical exercise with only mechanical connections to the action which frames it. This removal would allow the re-assimilation of the witty king motif and the curse motif. The flaw in Dollarhide's thesis seems to be that his case rests mainly upon his view that Richard wins the debate with Elizabeth, although the author recognizes that critics from Hudson to Wilson have argued otherwise. Furthermore, Ornstein (Item 168, 1972) convincingly develops the opposing view that Elizabeth wins the debate unambiguously and that, at the same time, the scene is dramatically effective.

93. Lordi, Robert J. "The Relationship of Richardus Tertius to the Main Richard III Plays." Boston University Studies in English, 5 (1961), 139-153.

In a closely argued source study, Lordi arrives at some definite conclusions concerning the relationships between four Richard III plays: Richardus Tertius, The True Tragedy of Richard III, Richard III, and the Dutch Roode en Witte Roos. First, the author of The True Tragedy probably used Richardus as a source; second, despite the possibility that Shakespeare knew Richardus and despite the many similarities between that play and his, no evidence indicates that he used Richardus as a source; third, the Dutch Richard is very likely an adaptation of Richardus; and fourth, Oscar Campbell needlessly posited a lost Richard-play to explain the correspondences between the four plays. Of the two most important studies to date of the relationship between the plays, G. B. Churchill's Richard Third up to Shakespeare (1900) and Campbell's "The Position of the Roode en Witte Roos in the Saga of Richard III" (1919), Churchill's conclusions need modifying, says Lordi, and Campbell's need complete re-assessment. Lordi's corrective is logical and convincing.

94. Reese, M. M. <u>The Cease of Majesty: A Study of Shakespeare's History Plays</u>. London: Edward Arnold, 1961.

Reese begins with the Greek concept of history, moving to examine the social, cultural, philosophical, and religious elements which contributed to the making of the English historical drama. Like Tillyard (Item 7, 1944), Reese declares the character of Henry Tudor to be properly bland, speaking, like the ghosts at Bosworth, in a style suitable to a character whose significance rises above the accidents of personality. Because God intervenes, says Reese, Tudor is the only rebel excused in Shakespeare, but of more critical interest is Reese's idea that a contradiction exists between the tragic and the comic elements in <u>Richard III</u> amounting to an artistic weakness for the modern reader. But a comic Richard was no problem for the Elizabethans, because they were familiar with the dramatic liberties permitted the Vice and because Shakespeare took great care over the formal structure and the rhetorical patterning of the verse.

Richard is attractive to the audience, says Reese, because he is a consumate impersonator, but Reese assumes that the audience's delight with Richard obviates any pity at all for his victims. Yet surely we feel more for Clarence and the young princes in the tower--and Anne-- than we feel "for gulls who are hoodwinked in a comedy" (p. 216). Reese's overstatements continue with what amounts to a notion that Shakespeare did not take Richard seriously, since he seemed to think that Richard was such a monster that the audience could not take him seriously in either the moral or the political sense. Unfortunately, Reese perceives Richard mainly in negative terms for what he is <u>not</u>: he is not a Macbeth, but a sort of limited Punch figure who rises in worldly power only

to decline as a lesson that ill-gotten gains cannot last. Even Richard's brief moral discomfiture Reese finds mandatory to the unwritten code that the Vice's creed of kindlinesses must be discredited. Reese mistakenly considers Richard's vision also to be the vision of the play. Richard lacks the tragic dimension of Macbeth, asserts Reese, because like Edmund, Cassius, and Iago, he is a pure rationalist, whose vision is confined to what he himself can effect. Thus Reese argues that in the absence of a character with a wider vision (such as Macbeth's?) the play lacks universality. Certainly Richard is no more than a prototype of Macbeth, but as Hill (Item 71, 1958) has shown, early Shakespearean drama such as Richard III was modeled closely upon Senecan closet drama, which emphasized rhetorical abundance over verisimilitude. Reese's book has long been considered an indispensable study of the history plays, but his criticism of Richard III demands cautious acceptance.

95. Rossiter, A. P. "Angel With Horns: The Unity of Richard III."
    Angel With Horns. Ed. Graham Storey. London: Longmans, Green
    & Co. Ltd., 1961.

Rossiter's study is a tour-de-force of compact, multi-dimensional criticism which treats not only the form and structure of Richard III, but also the character of Richard as actor, Devil-king, scourge, comic figure, and artist-in-evil. The play is nothing like a sober history, states Rossiter, but is a contrast between strict Tudor schema of retributive justice and the decidedly unhistorical figure of Richard himself, a monstrous theatricality who is a masterpiece of the old art of rhetorical stage writing.

We can relish fully one-third of the play as a kind of grisly comedy, says Rossiter. At the same time, for the Elizabethan audience Richard

was an avenging angel, an "angel with horns," whose role as a Vice figure
could do no wrong, since the more he plays the Vice, the more he advances
retributive justice. Rossiter produces a brilliant analysis of the
play's structure, which like Tillyard (Item 7, 1944) and Palmer (Item 8,
1945) he sees in terms of music. Richard III is a rhetorical symphony
in five movements, explains Rossiter, with first and second subjects and
some Wagnerian Leit-motifs. With equal insight, Rossiter identifies and
then clarifies the complex elements of Shakespeare's view of history as
presented in Richard III. He traces the conflict between the Tudor Myth
and Richard as Devil-king which results in a display of constant inver-
sions of meaning--the benign Christian principle of history counterbal-
ances the historic irony of pagan nemesis.

Tillyard among others declared Shakespeare to be a writer of moral
histories, but Rossiter envisions a deviation from the Tudor Myth in
Richard III which allowed Shakespeare to write comic history, the only
kind, he says, which could have led to tragedy. Rossiter makes the best
of existing criticism on the play and contributes freshly individual per-
spectives as well.

96. Shaw, George Bernard. "Richard III." Shaw on Shakespeare. Ed.
       Edwin Wilson. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc., 1961.

Wilson edits a collection of Shaw's Shakespeare criticism as it
appeared in The Saturday Review, 1896; in a letter to actor Forbes
Robertson, 1903; and in The Star in 1889. In his introduction, Wilson
analyzes Shaw's critical precepts on Shakespeare and drama in general.
Shaw admitted to a bias against Shakespeare's dramatic matter, but prais-
ed his dramatic form and manner as the greatest of which the human mind
is capable. Shaw himself sums up the credo on which he based most of

his Shakespeare criticism in a twelve-point summary published in the London Daily News, 1905 (see Wilson, pp. 4-5).

Shaw perceived Richard III as a great entertaining version of the Punch and Judy show which should therefore not have a pathetically sublime ending. In a letter to Forbes Robertson, Shaw urged the actor to do a Nietzschean Richard, who spurns conscience as a word which cowards use. Shaw admired Shakespeare's play on the level of Will to Power, but not as historical drama, and he does not carry his Punch analogy anywhere near to the literal comparisons of McLaughlin (Item 208, 1977).

97. Wilkes, G. A. "An Early Allusion to Richard III, and Its Bearing on the Date of the Play." Shakespeare Quarterly, 12 (1961), 464-465.

In the second of three satires in Epigrammes (1594), by Sir John Davies, Wilkes notes an allusion to Richard III which he says must surely derive from Davies' familiarity with Richard's famous opening soliloquy and therefore confirms J. Dover Wilson's assertion that the play was performed in 1594, although the earliest dated reference to its performance is October 20, 1597. However, one must draw his own conclusions as to whether Davies' lines, "I am not fashioned for these amorous times, / To court thy beawtie with lacivious rimes: / I cannot dally, caper, daunce, and sing," are as obviously an allusion to Richard's "I, that am not shaped for sportive tricks" as Wilkes claims.

1962

98. Berkeley, David S. A Guide to Shakespeare's Comedies and Tragedies. Stillwater, Oklahoma, N.P., 1962.

Berkeley published his guide as a supplement to lectures in Shakespeare survey courses. The work provides questions which direct the

students' attention to a wide range of insights from editors, critics, and scholars. The questions on Richard III lead the student to closely examine each act, scene, and significant line. Altogether this is a useful teaching and research tool.

99. Hartsock, Mildred E. "Shakespeare's Richard III, IV.iv.174-179." The Explicator, 20 (1962), Item 71.

Hartsock offers an ingenious interpretation of an obscure passage in Richard III. She believes that editors have overlooked the simple explanation that the lines are based upon an obscene pun which also provides a clue to Richard's bitter motivation. The editorial puzzle centers upon Richard's use of "Humphrey Hour," which Hartsock interprets as a punning reference to the hour of his conception as the only comfortable hour that his mother ever spent in his company. Hartsock's reading has a delightful appeal. However, Foote (Item 108, 1964) shows conclusively that Hartsock's interpretation of the pun is etymologically unsound.

100. Kendall, Paul Murray. The Yorkist Age: Daily Life During the Wars of the Roses. New York: W. W. Norton, 1962.

Kendall is mainly concerned with the reigns of Henry VI and Edward IV, but he provides useful social background for a reading of Shakespeare's Richard III and the First Tetralogy. Kendall definitely takes a Yorkist bias which is reflected in his later work to some degree (item 118, 1965). He pictures Henry VII as weak and incompetent; Edward IV as handsome, competent, and largely benevolent, well thought of even by the Tudors; and Richard III as loyal and able, a supporter of his father and then of his brother.

101. Knights, L. C. <u>William Shakespeare: The Histories: "Richard III."
     "King John." "Richard II." "Henry V."</u> London: Longmans, Green
     & Co., Ltd., 1962.

Knights accepts the definition of Shakespeare's history plays by
Rossiter (Item 95, 1961) as "moral history." For Knights, Shakespeare's
history plays prove his awareness of the educated assumptions of his
time as to the necessity for order in politics and the nature of things
in general, but while Shakespeare wrote history plays as a vehicle for
moral continuity in the commonweal re Tillyard (Item 7, 1944), Knights
considers the histories as political in the sense that they deal with
the relationship between the individual and the conflicts of power within
constituted society. Thus Knights can explain <u>Richard III</u> as more than a
rehearsal of the Tudor Myth of history. Like the other histories, it
looks forward to the great tragedies such as <u>Macbeth</u> which combine polit-
ical themes with universal tragedy. Knight's criticism brings no fresh
ideas, but it adheres to the best established views.

102. Weiner, Albert B. "Two Tents in <u>Richard III?"</u> <u>Shakespeare Quarter-
     ly</u>, 13 (1962), pp. 258-260.

Taking the position that only one tent is called for in the staging
of V.III, Weiner disagrees with the usual interpolations as found in
Kittredge which call for two tents. Nor does Weiner concur with Fusillo
(Item 45, 1955) and Hosley (Item 54, 1956), both of whom contend that
perhaps no tents are called for in this scene, but are to be imagined by
the audience in the spirit of medieval multiple staging. Weiner argues
that because Richard specifically calls for a tent, then one must have
been pitched on the spot, but since Q and F do not say that <u>Richmond</u>
pitches a tent, only that he enters one, then Richmond must have used
the same tent which Richard's men pitched. For Weiner notes that the

text does not indicate that Richard enters into a tent, but since he
calls for wine, ink, and paper which in turn must require a table and
chair, then these items were probably set downstage, away from the tir-
ing house and on the platform. Weiner then speculates that Richard, do-
ing his paper work at the table in his imaginary tent, unintentionally
falls asleep at the table, even as Richmond falls asleep in the pitched
tent. The speculations as to the number of tents, their placement, and
their use all seem plausible in Fusillo and Weiner, except for the fact
that Richard and Richmond dream simultaneously, which casts doubt upon
Weiner's assumption that the audience need not actually see Richmond
sleeping. Fusillo is indirectly supported by Doebler (Item 180, 1974),
who shows that the scene is based upon the iconography of the medieval
ars moriendi which carried very strong emotional connotations for the
Elizabethan audience; such a staging would require that the audience
view Richard the bad king and Richmond the good king lying upon stage
simultaneously as on their death beds.

1963

103. Anderson, Ruth L. "The Pattern of Behavior Culminating in Macbeth."
     Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900, 3 (1963), 151-171.

The purpose of Anderson's study is to discover those patterns of be-
havior which the Renaissance ascribed to ambition and tyranny and to show
how Elizabethan dramatists adhered to these patterns. Anderson estab-
lishes the classical origins of such patterns in the plays of Aeschylus
and Seneca for example. She also examines sixteenth-century commentary
on the pattern as reflected in Richard III. The prince ideally has four
virtues: mercy, piety, justice, and valor; and in the tyrant ambition
usually attacks these. Richard, says Anderson, genuinely possesses only

valor, lacking the nobility of Macbeth, but Richard pretends to the other three virtues through his Machiavellian duplicity. Thus the traditional pattern of tyrannical behavior is evident in both Richard and Macbeth. Richard's ambition rules him, she says, and he resorts to familiar measures such as opportunistically taking advantage of, and often creating, courtly factionalism; manipulating religion; pretending to courtesy; and disgracing those loyal to the crown. Like Macbeth after him, Richard ultimately falls into the pattern of the tyrant ruled by fear and suspicion. Consequently, he attempts to secure his position by eliminating potential opposition. Gone so far in blood that he cannot turn back, the tyrant becomes brutish, yet he fears potential danger more than actual threats, and he is punished by terror in his soul which can only be subdued by his own downfall. Anderson achieves the useful clarification of traditional elements which shaped the similar characterizations of Richard III and Macbeth.

104. Berkeley, David S. "'Determined' in Richard III,I.i.30." Shake-
         speare Quarterly, 14 (1963), 483-484.

Berkeley takes exception to the reading of Richard's motive in Clemen (Item 59), who asserts that "determined" must be read as an active voice verb. Berkeley points out that Clemen neglects the probability that Shakespeare and his audience would have construed the meaning of "determined" within the context of their keen interest in Richard as a predetermined scourge of England's guilt. Since the passive voice of "determined" occurs in other Shakespeare plays and in English translations of the Bible as meaning a decree of God, notes Berkeley, Richard may well be declaring himself unwittingly to be the chosen (i.e., "determined") instrument of God's wrath as well as one who has decided to be

evil. Clemen acknowledges Berkeley's alternative reading in Bonheim's translation (Item 137, 1968).

105. Carnall, Geoffrey. "Shakespeare's Richard III and St. Paul." Shakespeare Quarterly, 14 (1963), 186-188.

Carnall expands upon Knights (Item 101, 1962), who observed that Richard III swears only by Saint Paul. According to Carnall, Richard's Pauline oaths are associated with his hypocritical delight in embarrassing his enemies by playing on those Christian values which he intends to repudiate. Furthermore, Carnall suggests that Shakespeare placed the Pauline oaths in Richard's mouth because of the many similarities between Richard and Paul commonly cited by Renaissance commentators. Finally, Carnall asserts that not only are Richard's Pauline oaths more than mock piety, but also that Richard is "positively impersonating, with mischievous exhilaration, the unscrupulous Apostle of the Gentiles" (p. 188). Whatever Shakespeare's reason for tagging Richard with the Pauline oaths, Carnall's comparisons are too remote to convince us that Richard the regicide, infanticide, fratricide, and general homicide is an impersonation of a saint. Indeed, Fox (Item 220, 1978) views the oaths as an ironic expression of Richard's lack of Pauline charity.

106. More, Thomas. The History of King Richard the Third. The Complete Works of Sir Thomas More. Vol. 2. Ed. Richard S. Sylvester. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Sylvester produces an authoritative dual-language edition of More's History, which is indispensable as a primary source in the study of Shakespeare's Richard III. The edition includes discussions of the various texts, translations, authorship, dating, sources, genesis, and models of More's work. Also included are useful line-by-line commentaries upon both Rastell's English edition (1557) and Louvain's Latin edition (1665-

66), with a thorough index referring to both editions. Sylvester makes it clear that the Richard III of More and Shakespeare are one.

107. Talbert, Ernest William. Elizabethan Drama and Shakespeare's Plays:
     An Essay in Historical Criticism. Chapel Hill: The University
     of North Carolina Press, 1963.

Examining the early plays through Richard II, Talbert focuses upon the controversial subject of the artist's technique as it reveals his intent, especially to the Elizabethan audience. For example, the use of irony in Richard III, he says, is directed only toward the obvious hypocrisy known to the audience as the Machiavellian stereotype. Thus the Elizabethans would have appreciated the rhetorical exuberance throughout the play, but they would have had no trouble shifting any sympathy they might have felt for Richard to a fully satisfactory end of a Vice-like tyrant and the restoration of beneficent English polity. Talbert's ideas counter those of Evans (Item 79, 1959), who, despite the obvious popularity of the play, claims that the Elizabethan audience would have been uncomfortable with its artistic inconsistencies. But while Talbert presents an able defense of the structure of Richard III from the perspective of Shakespeare's audience and his intentions concerning their response, the analysis might have more clearly indicated why the obvious appeal of the play has continued through the centuries despite (or in some senses because of) a number of outmoded conventions.

1964

108. Foote, Dorothy Norris. "Shakespeare's Richard III, IV.iv.174-177."
     The Explicator, 23 (1964), Item 23.

By tracing the etymology of the word "hump" through the NED, the Shorter OED, Webster, and various dictionaries of slang, Foote discovers

that Shakespeare would not have used the verb form of "hump" as an ob-
scene pun in "Humphrey Hour" in IV.iv, since the word was not current
in Shakespeare's day. Therefore Foote rejects that part of Hartsock's
argument (Item 99, 1962) which concludes that Richard's use of the phrase
"Humphrey Hour" is a pun on copulation, meaning that the only time his
mother enjoyed his company was in the act of conceiving him. Foote
speculates that the term may have referred to going without dinner, as
the debtors who enjoyed the sanctuary of Humphrey Walk often did rather
than expose themselves to arrest. Whatever the meaning, the passage re-
mains unexplicated, although Foote recognizes that Hartsock has caught
the spirit of the joke, if not the exact letter.

109. Heilman, Robert B. "Satiety and Conscience: Aspects of Richard
     III." The Antioch Review, 24 (1964), 57-73.

In an excellent psychological analysis of Richard's motives, Heilman
concludes that Richard III is not tragedy, but a melodrama in which the
hero-villain, in a manner analogous to sexual satiety, uses his victims
and then casts them aside. Taking as his illustrations the three wooing
scenes: Richard wooing Anne, the "populace" wooing Richard, and Richard
wooing Elizabeth, Heilman suggests that these scenes give life to later
scenes in a manner unusual to drama, for the process leading to Richard's
triumphs and his consequent ennui is analogous to the animal post coitum
triste. Because he is revulsed by those whom he needs most and has used
in his all-important process of winning, says Heilman, "satiety begets
contempt and indecency" (p. 73). Heilman is preceded by Kreiger (Item
81, 1959) in observing Richard's perverse intermingling of political and
sexual elements, but Heilman's study is more tenable in this respect.

110. Leech, Clifford. "Shakespeare, Cibber, and the Tudor Myth." Shake-
    spearean Essays. Ed. Alwin Thaler and Norman Sanders.
    Tennessee Studies in Literature, Special Number: 2. Ed.
    Richard Beale Davis and Kenneth L. Knickerbocker. Knoxville:
    The University of Tennessee Press, 1964, pp. 79-95.

Leech studies Colley Cibber's adaptation of Richard Third in order to determine changes in dramatic tastes and conventions in the one hundred years following Shakespeare's composition. By contrasting the original and the adaptation, for example, Leech explains the differences between the Elizabethan stage and the eighteenth and nineteenth century stages which prompted adaptations, for in Shakespeare's time the stage represented a more universal setting than the single-locale stages of later centuries. Thus Cibber revises the tent scene on Bosworth Field in which Richard and Richmond appear simultaneously: in Cibber's version the principals appear in sequence, owing to the smaller stage and the fading of the Morality tradition underlying Shakespeare's conception of it as explained by Doebler (Item 180, 1974). Furthermore, Cibber's increased emphasis upon the central character of Richard, even to the exclusion of the Tudor Myth theme, says Leech, is more suitable to the eighteenth-century audience who probably remembered little of the Wars of the Roses and the issues involved. Leech's study joins in the disaffection with Tillyard's restrictive view of the history plays as didactic conveyances of the Tudor political line, although Leech correctly acknowledges Tillyard's important insights (Item 7, 1944). In advance of Sanders (Item 145, 1968), Leech's study views Richard III as a combination of prerogatives of the Tudor Myth and Elizabethan, ultimately Senecan, tragedy which emphasizes the individual hero-villain.

111. Littleton, Taylor D., and Robert R. Rea, Eds. To Prove a Villain:
    The Case of King Richard III. New York: The Macmillan Com-
    pany, 1964.

This work contains excerpts from Shakespeare's play illustrating the portrayal of Richard III as the monster king. Then in roughly chronological order appear selections from authors who firmly state the Tudor Myth, including More's History, the anonymous True Tragedy, Vergil's History, the Croyland Chronicle, Baldwin's A Mirror, Holinshed's Chronicles, Vols. I and II, and Bacon's History. These are followed by excerpts from works which challenge the traditional view of Richard, including Horace Walpole's Historic Doubts, Dickens' A Child's History, Markham's Richard III, J. Dover Wilson's "A Note on Richard III," A. R. Myers' "The Character of Richard III," and Tey's The Daughter of Time. This is a useful collection through which one can attain an overview of an issue which has raged for centuries. The editors prudently invite the reader to draw his own conclusions.

112. Momose, Izumi. "The Temporal Awareness in Richard III." Shakespeare Studies (Shakespeare Society of Japan), 3 (1964), 42-72.

Momose observes that in Richard III Shakespeare combines two historical perspectives which he found in A Mirror for Magistrates--a deterministic, cyclical view in which the past repeats itself and retributive justice prevails; and in Hall's Chronicle--a history as progressive process, allowing for a providential view commonly labeled the Tudor Myth. Strangely, Momose claims that Shakespeare's main concern in Richard III was to "humanize" these historical tendencies in the spectre-like Margaret and the ephemeral Richmond. But Momose is on firmer (and less obscure) ground with his analysis of time in Richard III. In a God-like arrogance, says Momose, Richard checks the normal stream of time which leads to right order; he creates a "pseudo-time" which embodies his destructive will which, along with Margaret's fateful curses, operates to bring about

the downfall of Richard's victims. Margaret's cyclic version of time is based upon retributive justice which ultimately triumphs over Richard's destructive time. However, Momose believes with Driver (Item 86, 1960) that Richard's destruction corresponds to the last judgment and that Richmond represents apocalyptic time, to which the play is ultimately committed.

The unidiomatic English of this translation obscures meaning and the argument digresses from the central thesis of temporal awareness, but Momose sheds some light on the important theme of the past as it bears upon the present and future in Richard III.

113. Sen Gupta, S. C. Shakespeare's Historical Plays. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Sen Gupta admits that Shakespeare's history plays are history only in the Aristotelian sense that the writer shows the historical figures as if they were actually doing the things described. Shakespeare dramatized his historical sources, he states, and his dramatic art transcends their political and moral implications. Sen Gupta therefore considers it not only wrong to emphasize Shakespeare's political and ethical purposes, but also wrong to urge the presence of the Morality tradition in the histories. He argues that Spivack (Item 74, 1958) misses the difference between the Vice of the Moralities and the character of Richard III, for Richard's seduction of his victims, Anne for example, is done as a dramatic display of his super-abundant vitality, his lack of moral inhibitions, and his power of fantastic invention--all of which are combined with his realistic perception of the weaknesses of his opponents. Sen Gupta apparently does not wish to admit that Richard shares this list of qualities with the Vice, but denies that association in order to fortify

his argument that Richard is a plausible product of Shakespeare's artistic genius and not of his supposed political or literary conditioning.

114. Smidt, Kristian. Injurious Imposters and "Richard III." Oslo: Norwegian Universities Press; New York: Humanities Press, 1964.

Smidt attacks the view of D. L. Patrick (The Textual History of Richard III, 1936) which attempts to prove that Q1 was a corrupt memorial transmission. Although a consensus of modern critics are ready to accept Patrick's view on its apparent merits, Smidt nevertheless concludes that Patrick's case is unproven, and very likely wrong. Smidt questions the soundness of Patrick's all-inclusive groupings of textual variants in Q1 and F1 which supposedly show F to be the more reliable text. Yet in his refutation, Smidt finds it necessary (regrettably, he admits) to adopt Patrick's "pedantic" method of accumulation. In an attempt to at least provisionally deal with the problem of the interdependence of the various Richard III texts, Smidt collates errors wich appear in Q1, Q3, Q6, and Folio, with occasional references to other editions. Boldly, Smidt asserts that most of the relationships between F and Q1 have a common origin in Shakespeare's original draft, not in an actor's memorial transmission; but in a later publication he yields somewhat to prevailing theory and admits that some memorial transmission is possible (Item 154, 1970).

1965

115. Brooke, Nicholas. "Reflecting Gems and Dead Bones: Tragedy Versus History in Richard III." Critical Quarterly, 7 (1965), 123-134.

Brooke argues that Richard III is a tragedy, but because recent critical and theatrical historians have emphasized moral history in the

play on the one hand and the centrality of Richard's character on the other, this tendency has obscured the significance of both elements, which are mutually dependent and supportive. The conflict in Richard III, says Brooke, exists between the nontragical weight of history and the impressive wit and force of Richard's character. Through contrasting modes of formal rhetorical structure and language and colloquial style, Shakespeare achieves plausibility and realism in Richard's character. Through Margaret, however, history is a crushing weight of Divine Christian Will through which Richard ironically becomes the agent of retribution and punishment, explains Brooke. But the play is tragic, he insists, because it places the dramatic modes of history and tragedy in conflict. In the wake of Rossiter (Item 95, 1961), Brooke's analysis is a careful study of the play, and while he does not settle the question of tragic mode in Richard III, he presents a strong case for the audience's sympathy for Richard based more upon his humanity than upon his delightfully conscious immorality.

116. Forker, Charles R. "Shakespeare's Chronicle Plays as Historical-Pastroal." Shakespeare Studies, 1 (1965), 85-104.

Forker studies the nature imagery of several Shakespeare histories in order to show how they are enriched by the English pastoral tradition. Through pastoral imagery, he finds, the histories more effectively dramatize some of the ironic contrasts between public and private life and between order and chaos. Forker perceptively notes that such imagery pervasively associates "Holy Harry" VI with the shepherd and his sheep, whose peace, order, and innocence are threatened by the ravenous Richard III and the ruthless powers of civil conflict as preying wolves and foxes. Elizabethans were accustomed to the image of the king as the

shepherd of a flock, of course, but Forker says that even Richard III ex-
presses the pastoral mode in the anti-heroic sense as he parodies the de-
sire of Henry VI for an escapist role of repose and contemplation--
Richard the "plain man" of "simple truth" thanks God for his humility
and plays the part of the contemplative religious figure for the gullible
citizens of London.

With penetrating consistency, Forker goes on to examine the preva-
lence of natural imagery, and he reveals fresh dimensions in the order
of gardens, orchards, and other flora which ironically become associated
with impending chaos, evil forces, destruction, and "the annihilation of
all that's made with green thoughts in a green shade" (p. 97). Like
Ross (Item 89, 1961), Forker notes that the strawberry is a traditional
emblem of either good or evil deception, and in Richard III, says Forker,
the strawberry garden outside the Tower contrasts with Richard's arm in-
side, "like a blasted sapling" (III.iv.68). Thus Forker presents an ex-
cellent study of a neglected theme in the history plays, showing that
Shakespeare utilized the indigenous pastoral tradition as one means of
creating a system of ironic contrasts and parallels by which all the
great Elizabethan plays are ordered.

117. Honigmann, E. A. J. "The Text of Richard III." Theatre Research, 7
      (1965), 48-55.

Honigmann argues that where the Richard III Q repeats the source
exactly, and F deviates, the Q reading should be more authoritative.
While he admits that all the variations in Q which were derived from
Holinshed may not be correct, he contends that they have been too hastily
banished from the accepted text by such notable editors as Wilson, Evans,
Alexander, and Sisson, all of whom usually preferred the F over Q where

Q agreed with Holinshed. Honigmann would not follow Smidt (Item 114,

1964) in saying that Q is memorially uncontaminated and is as good an

authority as F, but Honigmann agrees with Smidt's view that, as with

King Lear, two holographs possibly existed for Richard III, Q1 being set

from the author's foul papers or from a revision very close to them; and

F being set from an intermediate autograph showing signs of revision and

being further revised by Heminge and Condell or their agent. Honigmann

shows that such tests as Greg's variants in number do not reliably indi-

cate the authority of F, and he thus contends with Walker (Item 35,

1953) that recent editors have too conveniently accepted F as authorita-

tive.

118. Kendall, Paul Murray, Ed. "Richard III": The Great Debate.

The "great debate" between traditionalists and revisionists over the

historical disposition of Richard III has continued from the late fif-

teenth century to the present, says Kendall, and remains unresolved.

Kendall's purpose is to bring together the key works of the original

antagonists of the debate, Sir Thomas More's Richard III and Horace

Walpole's Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard III. The

traditional concept of Richard as monster king was established by More's

work and Richard as scourge of God and the Tudor Myth evolved through the

histories of Hall, Holinshed, Vergil and, especially, Shakespeare. The

most notable challenger to the traditionalist view was Walpole, since his

work provoked the international controversy which prevails. Kendall

notes the extremes of both sides: the scholars who define the tradition-

al view--seemingly reluctant to accept strong contrary evidence--and the

"amateurs" who advocate the revisionist view--sometimes eager to give

undue credence to flimsy evidence of Richard's benignity. Kendall cites the often-noted fact that More's History adheres to the Renaissance humanist mode which seeks artistic effect and psychological verisimilitude rather than factual accuracy. However, Kendall's own revisionist bias does not prevent him from recognizing More as a superior dramatic writer who molded bits and pieces of hearsay into a narrative of exceptional irony, bold innovation, and compelling characterizations. Unfortunately, says Kendall, More's historical inaccuracies have withstood centuries of attempts to set the record straight, but Kendall would be more accurate to say that Shakespeare's portrayal of Richard III, largely derived from More though it be, established Richard in the seemingly permanent posture of Devil-king, tyrant, and scourge which even the indomitable Richard III society (Item 225, 1978) cannot seem to alter.

119. Whitaker, Virgil K. The Mirror up to Nature: The Technique of
        Shakespeare's Tragedies. San Marino, California: The Hunting-
        ton Library, 1965.

Whitaker studies Shakespeare's tragedies as they reflect contemporary habits of workmanship, in order to discovery why, and in what ways, his drama differs from and surpasses that of his contemporaries. Shakespeare's early plays, Whitaker says, differ in kind from his middle and later plays. The early tragedies are much more similar to contemporary plays than those following Julius Caesar, especially in structure, although his early works are superior to contemporary plays both structurally and philosophically. Whitaker takes the position that Shakespeare's Richard III is not only more unified than his supposed sources, but also that it is closer to Marlowe's Tamburlaine in style and structure than to any of the other Richard III plays. This leads Whitaker to

conclude that Shakespeare inconsistently gives his hero a conscience,
thus sacrificing the integrity of Richard as Marlovian villain-hero.
However, this common charge of inconsistency is best considered today in
light of Hobson (Item 167, 1972), who convincingly argues that Richard's
conscience is both dramatically and psychologically relevant, not be-
cause he has a conscience, but because he denies having it. Another
weak point in Whitaker's argument is that first he declares the early
plays to be different in kind from the later ones, then he scores Richard
for his lack of intellectual depth in comparison to the later Shake-
spearean tragic heroes. Here Whitaker would have benefited from a close
reading of Hill (Item 71, 1958), who explains that criticism of Shake-
speare's early histories should recognize his adherence to rhetorical
tragic methods rather than to the verisimilitude so often characteristic
of the mature plays. Whitaker goes on to the usual explanation of
Richard III and the Tudor Myth, but his study offers little, if any,
fresh insight.

1966

120. Ferguson, Ann D. "A Brief Comparison of Supernatural Elements in
     Richard III and Macbeth." The Gordon Review (Wenham, Mass.),
     9 (1966), 184-192.

Ferguson contends that in Richard III dreams and curses operate on
separate, but parallel, levels to create the sense of a supernatural
will carried out by human agents. Indeed, one of her main points is that
both Richard III and Macbeth center upon human action--especially that of
Richard and Macbeth--which seems necessary to fulfill the supernatural
design. However, Ferguson's illustration of this point is puzzling when
she says that Queen Margaret's curse is levelled against Edward, Prince

of Wales, her late son, and that she executes her curse when Richard orders Edward's death. However, Ferguson alertly notices that the function of the supernatural elements shifts from the predominance of dreams and curses in Richard III to the more spectacular, but fully believable, witches and ghosts in Macbeth, where their function is dramatically interwoven with human volition.

121. Haeffner, Paul. A Critical Commentary on Shakespeare's Richard III. Macmillan Critical Commentaries Series. London: Macmillan, 1966.

Haeffner begins with a background of the Elizabethan theory of history and some customs and conventions of Elizabethan theatre. Then he treats various interpretations of Richard III's character: as motiveless villain, Crookback, Merry Devil, and scourge of God. Finally, the play as a whole: characters other than Richard, structure, irony, imagery, language, and style. This is a supplemental text suitable for the undergraduate studying the play for the first time.

122. Hoeniger, F. D. "New Harvey Marginalia on Hamlet and Richard III." Shakespeare Quarterly, 17 (1966), 151-154.

Hoeniger credits the late Harold S. Wilson with the discovery of these previously unpublished references to Hamlet and Richard III in the margins of Gabriel Harvey's copy of Guicardini's Detti, et fatti piacevolo. . . (Venice, 1571). Although Wilson found them in 1946, he did not include the Shakespeare references in publishing his discovery in 1948. But Harvey's marginalia may have been written as late as 1620 or even 1630, and therefore it is of no help in dating or interpreting either Hamlet or Richard III.

123. Hughes, Daniel. "The 'Worm of Conscience' in Richard III and Macbeth." English Journal, 55 (1966), 845-852.

Hughes proposes to look at Richard III and Macbeth as men rather than as "freaks" in order to determine their relative tragic stature and to discover how both plays contributed to Shakespeare's growth as an artist. Not surprisingly, Hughes finds the presence of conscience in both characters, but more diffusely in Richard. Second, Hughes finds both plays to be based upon the Great Chain of Being, with a break in the order of things and with violent upheaval in the moral sphere paralleled by disorder in the physical world where order is reestablished violently. Third, and again not surprisingly, both heroes are not only victims and agents of providential moral necessity, but possess intelligence and free will. Not only is Hughes' commmentary bland, but he ventures the dubious assessment that Richard's character is "incredible" and that his tragedy is "enigmatic" because Shakespeare confines himself to a "simplistic vision of history" (p. 852). Simplistic to say so, especially after Rossiter (Item 95, 1961) had already decisively shown the complexity of Shakespeare's historical perspective.

124. Korniger, Siegfried. "Die Geisterszene im Elisabethanischen Drama." Shakespeare-Jahrbuch (Heidelberg), 102 (1966), 124-145.

Korniger traces the artistic development of the revenge tragedy ghost scene in Elizabethan drama, especially in Shakespeare's work. Shakespeare, his contemporaries, and his immediate followers established a standard of form and function in their artistic development of the ghost scene which was never again attained by later dramatists, says Korniger, and the Shakespearean ghost scene lived even in post-Restoration drama, remaining an influence despite the many changes. Shakespeare's ghosts become increasingly realistic in later plays, not as intellectual

concepts as in the earlier Senecan drama, but as characters involved in the plot. With careful documentation, Korniger follows the development of the ghost scene in a number of Elizabethan tragedies, but one of his more interesting observations is that from Shakespeare's ghost scenes derive many of the later beliefs about ghosts. In earlier works such as The Spanish Tragedy, for example, neither the time nor the place of the ghost's appearance is indicated, while Hamlet's ghost appears each time shortly after midnight, and in Julius Caesar, Richard III, and other Elizabethan ghost scenes midnight is the appointed hour. Korniger notes other conventions of the ghost scene refined by Shakespeare, such as the bluish color of the candle's flame upon the appearance of the ghosts in Richard III. Despite his bardolatry, Kroniger presents an interesting and learned history of the development of a significant convention.

125. Lander, J. R. The Wars of the Roses. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1966.

This is an edition of various historical works which are very familiar to those who have researched Shakespeare's Yorkist tetralogy. Nevertheless, the format, which allows the works of such early historians as Mancini and More to form a running account of the life and times of the principals involved in the Wars, is both interesting and useful.

126. Palter, Lewis. "Shakespeare's Richard III Now." Carnegie Magazine, 40 (1966), 42-44.

Palter believes that Richard III is "dead" for modern audiences if interpreted and produced according to prevailing critical issues such as the factional dispute between the Lancasters and the Yorks, the religion of the play, and the fulfilling of supernatural curses and omens. He calls for a more topical approach, since monsters are in fashion and the

psychology of evil is particularly compelling in an age which has prac-

ticed genocide as a fine art. What strikes Palter as particularly mod-

ern in Richard III, however, also concern competent critics of the play

to some degree: the bloody times, peace as only an interlude between

wars, Richard as the worst product of a guilty society, the victim's

self-betrayal through moral weakness, ambition, naiveté, sexual desires,

gullibility, ingratiation to power. More credit to Palter for recogniz-

ing the dynamic elements of the play, but he is clearly out of line in

accusing critics of being unaware of these as well.

127. Rogers, William Hudson. Shakespeare and English History. Totowa,
     N.J.: Littlefield, Adams, 1966.

Rogers believes that Shakespeare may have consciously chosen his

chronicle plays to develop three themes evident throughout: the fortunes

of the Plantagenets; the decline and fall of feudalism; and the rise of

the common people. According to Rogers' interpretation, if King John is

the prologue to the history plays, Henry VIII is the epilogue. Shake-

speare's political bias is as extreme as any during England's age of

emerging greatness, asserts Rogers, although Knights (Item 101, 1962) ex-

presses the prevailing view that Shakespeare was biased toward the "polit-

ical right wing" Tudor line, but was not by any means uncritical of over-

simplified issues and theories. Rogers would also draw fire with his

absolute judgment of the dramatic portrait of Richard as "far and ahead

the finest in Shakespeare's entire gallery, drawn with unqualified deft-

ness, every detail clear" (p. 106). And after explaining that much of

the history of Richard has been biased, Rogers makes the puzzling state-

ment that "even the devil should have his due" (p. 122). The Richard III

chapter is useful reading for anyone needing a plot summary.

128. Rowse, A. L. Bosworth Field: From Medieval to Tudor England. The
     Crossroads of World History Series. New York: Doubleday &
     Company, Inc., 1966.

Taking the basic thesis that the rightful line of English monarchy

was Lancastrian rather than Yorkist, Rowse's work centers on Bolingbroke's

"revolution" of 1399 and the defeat of the "tyrannical" Richard III in

1485. These events he designates as parallel turning points in the his-

tory of the English nation. Had it not been for the crime of Richard III

against his own house, says Rowse, the Yorkists would have been in for

good and the historical surface of England, unimaginable without Henry

VIII and Elizabeth I, would have been quite different. Rowse's senti-

ments are best measured against Kendall's (Item 46, 1955). Where Kendall

fleshes out available historical materials with psychological acuity and

narrative skill, Rowse summarizes tersely (perhaps somewhat owing to the

vast scope of his plan) and often gives way to invective rather than

interpretation and cool surmise. For example, Kendall depicts Richard's

calling up of his Yorkshiremen to aid him against Hastings and the Wood-

villes as a wise precaution; when Richard clearly did not need them for

that purpose, he merely busied them in a formal role in his coronation.

Analyzing the same incident, Rowse claims that no evidence whatever of a

Woodville conspiracy exists, and that Richard's actions are understand-

able in the context of "our own disgraceful century" during which the

outrages of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia were based upon similar ex-

cuses (p. 90). Rowse's vehement anti-Yorkist bias is an interesting con-

trast to the sober and mildly sympathetic treatment of Richard III by

Kendall as well as another sane critic, Myers (Item 39, 1954).

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

This work was unavailable for annotation.

1967

130. Berman, Ronald. "Anarchy and Order in Richard III and King John."
     Shakespeare Survey, 20 (1967), 51-59.

Berman finds that Richard III is one of Shakespeare's representa-

tives of the "new" rationalists of the Renaissance, who has a Machiavel-

lian disregard for the universal moral law which traditionally evokes

and sustains order in human affairs. Other such new men are Faulcon-

bridge the Bastard and Edmund. Although he does not credit them, Berman

follows Driver (Item 86, 1960) and Momose (Item 112, 1964), among others,

in his view that Richard does not comprehend time as a continuum of the

past resolving itself into the future with moral inevitability, with the

force of nemesis. Nor is Berman's idea new that, like several later

Shakespeare villains, Richard believes in the ammoral rationality of in-

dividual action and will, leading to an order of his own making outside

the effects of past and future time. However, Berman's more sensitive

awareness comes through when he reveals the manner in which Richard III

and King John differ from the other history plays in their emphasis upon

the tough, cynical, and realistic wit of heroes who have the responsibil-

ity of preserving the ideal image of kingship. Richard and Faulconbridge

assume a skeptical and ironical attitude toward themes which the other

histories take very seriously, he notes, such as honor, legitimacy, and

sacredness of blood relationships. Berman closely examines the text of

Richard III to show the life and death conflict between great opposites:

representatives of the will to power (Richard and Buckingham) and the

adherents of the tradition of universal design (Margaret and Elizabeth).

Berman reiterates the familiar reading of the villain who, ignoring the

moral inevitability which the past brings to bear upon the future, in-

vites the destruction which Margaret and Elizabeth prophesy. Thus

Berman's analysis expands the too-common perception of Richard III as

Shakespeare's rather slavish depiction of the Tudor Myth, although Berman

offsets that impression with his excellent insights into that world of

order in Richard III which is attacked by the anarchy of the self.

131. Gaudy, Rene. "Une Interpretation de Richard III." La Nouvell
       critique, 182 (1967), 54-57.

This work was not available for annotation.

132. Hamilton, A. C. The Early Shakespeare. San Marino: The Huntington
       Library, 1967.

Hamilton asserts that the early plays of the period concluding with

Richard III, Romeo and Juliet, and A Midsummer Night's Dream indicate a

Shakespeare of accomplished craftsmanship, and since this is the only

period of his career during which he practiced all of his genres simul-

taneously, says Hamilton, a study of the early plays sheds light upon

the entire canon. Offering several standard interpretations of Richard

III, Hamilton says that it culminates the historical pattern of the First

Tetralogy and expands it to a greater unity. Furthermore, Richard is

the epitome of all the vices of his vice-ridden age, but a few of Hamil-

ton's assertions are somewhat confusing. Is Richard's "secret intent"

(I.ii) to bring on the death of Clarence? Perhaps, but oddly Hamilton

is surprised that Richard says he will marry Anne in order to prove his

villainy by proving a lover, although Hamilton has already noted that

the wooing of Anne was invented to reveal Richard's diabolical powers.

Nor does Hamilton enlighten us with his analysis of Anne's capitulation. She yields not out of fear or desire for Richard as many critics have asserted, says Hamilton, nor out of pretending to be deceived as clever- ly explained by Krieger (Item 81, 1959), but out of her fascination by an element of evil in the form of love which Hamilton finds to be univer- sal in humankind. Yet Hamilton's interpretation of Clarence's dream is reasonably astute. In the dream he identifies three stages of hell which correspond to the mental hells of each character of the play and in doing so establishes a convincing structural anlaysis which unifies image, ac- tion, and character. Another noteworthy structural pattern which he dis- covers is the fall of Richard in two stages which first center upon the curses of his mother and his wooing of Elizabeth and then upon his Bos- worth dream. The general quality of Hamilton's study is quite average and sometimes questionable in its interpretations, but several astute readings demand our considered attention.

133. Narkin, Anthony P. "Day-Residue and Christian Reference in Clarence's Dream." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 9 (1967), 147-150.

Drawing upon Freud's theory that dreams originate from the correla- tion of infantile experience and the experience of the dreamer on the day before the dream, i.e., dream as "day-residue," Narkin proposes that Clarence's nightmare in Richard III, I.iv.9-12 corresponds exactly to the processes expounded in the Freudian concept. Narkin's general conclusion is sound: Clarence's dream reveals to the audience his unconscious feel- ings about Edward and especially about Richard. The dream reveals that Clarence feels condemned by God, the "King of Kings," whom he associates with Edward, the king as father figure. Obviously, the dream also shows Richard to be a tempter, a devil figure, who carries out the judgment of

God and the king. Yet Narkin employs a somewhat strained analysis in his attempts to prove the effect of day-residue upon the content of Clarence's dream. For example, in I.i.56, Richard's line that the king "plucks from the cross-row [the alphabet] the letter G" is translated, hours later in Clarence's dream, to their "rowing" across the North Sea to Burgundy. Narkin justifiably protests that the occasional misuse of psychoanalysis in interpreting Shakespeare's characters should not be grounds for holding the field of psychoanalytical criticism suspect, but his study does little to improve the credibility of the field. Among the many critics who have studied Clarence's dream are Brooks (Item 235, 1979), Webster (Item 198, 1975), Brooke (Item 115, 1965), Arnold (Item 43, 1955), Wilson (Item 76, 1958), Zuk (Item 69, 1957), and Thompson (Item 56, 1956).

134. Strauss, Jennifer. "Determined to Prove a Villain: Character, Action, & Irony in Richard III." Komos, 1 (1967), 115-120.

Strauss' article is a gathering of well established criticism of Richard III. Unfortunately, she offers no credit for her sources (of course she is not alone in this practice, but she is somewhat unique in not only using other people's ideas with documentation, but also in not offering some variation of her own, however tenuous). For example, she is safe in her general statement of the critical commonplace that the full realization of the irony of the play itself depends more upon the structural and verbal texture than upon the audience's historical and moral foreknowledge, but she goes on to a painfully close and unacknowl-edged restatement of Berkeley's thesis (Item 104, 1963): the line "I am determined to prove a villain" (I.1.30), she explains, epitomizes the irony and particular direction given to it in the play. The word

"determined" is syntactically ambivalent; the verb can be read either as passive or active, she says, and whether to interpret Richard as actively choosing to be a villain depends upon our interpretation of character and action in the play. Noticing the similarities between Richard and the Vice, she sums up Spivack (Item 74, 1958) without mentioning that author or his work. In a loud echo, she says that the key to understanding the wooing of Anne is its dependence upon the Morality tradition of mankind's sudden conversion from good to evil under the influence of the Vice. Strauss' article provokes a problem of ethics rather than of criticism.

1968

135. Brooke, Nicolas. Shakespeare's Early Tragedies. London: Methuen, 1968.

Brooke assumes that Shakespeare had no fixed theory of tragedy, but deliberately experimented with plays which "end aptly in death" (p. 4). His chapter on Richard III is presented in an abbreviated form elsewhere (Item 115, 1965), but the book includes significant material in addition to the earlier article, including close analysis of the form and function of structural patterns in Richard III. Having established that Richard is isolated from the patterned speech of the play, and therefore from the patterned structure, Brooke examines the deceptively complex symmetry of the tent scene in Act V. Although the curses of Margaret and their fulfillment provide the main pattern of events, the structural shape, and the major theme of guilt and conscience, the structure of Richard III Brooke finds difficult to grasp in total because it is based upon a multiplicity of patterns. Rossiter (Item 95, 1961) remains one of the more successful commentators on the structure of Richard III.

136. Brooks, Harold F. "Marlowe and Early Shakespeare." <u>Christopher Marlowe</u>. Ed. Brian Morris. London: Benn, 1968.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

137. Clemen, Wolfgang H. <u>A Commentary on Shakespeare's "Richard III."</u> Trans. Jean Bonheim. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1968. First published as <u>Kommentar zu Shakespeares "Richard III."</u> Gottingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1957.

Perhaps the most accomplished student of Shakespeare's <u>Richard III</u>, Clemen notes that "there is hardly a formal or stylistic convention on the drama of Shakespeare's time which we do not also find in his works" (p. 237). Such all-inclusiveness might be said to apply in Clemen's "interpretive commentary" as well, for this work concentrates upon an act-scene-line analysis of style, language, theme, dramatic technique, sources, influences, and almost any other aspect of <u>Richard III</u> which should concern critics except textual and bibliographical study. One of Clemen's especially fruitful methods is his comparison of dramatic features and conventions in <u>Richard III</u> with those of earlier drama, showing where <u>Richard III</u> adheres or innovates. This method seems to be a determining factor in many of Clemen's interpretations. Perhaps inevitably in a work of this kind, the commentator's point of view is difficult to synthesize, for while the density of Clemen's minute analysis is very impressive, the method of wide-ranging commentary requires some focus, however limiting, upon some more centralized organizational plan.

Richard's motivation has been a persistent question which remains unresolved. Clemen interprets Richard's determination to prove a villain as an Elizabethan convention; despite parallels in his character with modern psychological theory, says Clemen, Richard does not attempt to compensate for his physical deformity and lack of love by deciding to be

evil (although we wonder then why in the first soliloquy he stated this to be his reason for becoming a villain). Clemen apparently would have us to understand that Richard's villainy arises from his realistic political ambitions, although Clemen recognizes the alternative possibility of predeterminism advanced by Berkeley (Item 104, 1963). Clemen treats other issues of widely diverse critical interpretations such as the wooing of Anne, the dramatic and psychological intent of which he clarifies by reference to the conventional "conversion speech" of pre-Shakespearean drama; in Richard III these take the form of long speeches of logical, rational persuasion. Clemen analyzes many other conventions as Shakespeare converted them to a new dramatic effect, his mind obviously playing upon an astonishing range of form, content, and function, but as might be expected, not every critic will agree with Clemen. For example, like Tillyard (Item 7, 1944) and Dollarhide (Item 92, 1961), Clemen considers the second wooing scene, in which Richard pleads with Elizabeth for the hand of his niece, to be unsatisfactory both psychologically and dramatically. But Goddard (Item 21, 1951) and many others are convinced that Elizabeth only pretends to acquiesce and that the scene is a key dramatic contrast between Richard's earlier powers in wooing Anne and his failing powers in the first stages of his impending fall. The consensus of modern critics probably would not agree with Clemen that the wooing of Elizabeth is best interpreted as an accurate, objective statement of Elizabeth's fickle character. Yet controversy is inevitably provoked by a study as detailed as Clemen's.

138. Cutts, J. P. The Shattered Glass: A Dramatic Pattern in Shake-speare's Early Plays. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1968.

Cutts discovers in Richard III Shakespeare's fully realized imagaic device of combining fragments of motive and theme into one character. In the First Tetralogy he finds an intricate interweaving of mirror and shadow imagery, for example, by which in Richard III the "three-fold distress'd" Duchess of York (III.ii) is a clever parody of the merging of the "three suns" of York into the "one sun" of Richard, who is also a "false glass" (p. 131). Cutts reveals carefully laid parallels between the plays of the First Tetralogy; however, many of these elements have been thoroughly treated by Clemen (Item 59, 1957), often with more consistency. For Cutts seems to vacillate between parallels in plot, theme, and character--and between shadow imagery and mirror imagery--without finally bringing them into a clear relationship to each other. Richard's kingdom stands "on brittle glass" (IV.ii.62), as Cutts observes, but the careful reader must puzzle as to how a mirror can be brought "full circle" without mixing the metaphors beyond logic (p. 132). In an effort to finally validate his thesis, Cutts asserts that the resolution of the struggle between Lancaster and York can occur only when the brittle image of power, which Richard has constructed from the shattered fragments of his opponents, and "the deliberately unseeing person he has chosen to be" are shattered. Cutts attempts to master a difficult subject, but much remains to be clarified.

139. French, A. L. "The World of Richard III." Shakespeare Studies, 4 (1968), 25-39.

Opposing Tillyard and his disciples, French questions the interpretations of Richard III as the climactic lesson taught by the Tudor Myth. He aims to identify those aspects of the play which prove that is is not "a simple piece of Tudor propaganda" (p. 25). This is a rather overly-

simplistic description of the conclusions of Tillyard (Item 7, 1944), a work which made valuable contributions to our understanding of the histories. However, French argues effectively that Richmond's character is so perfunctory as to indicate Shakespeare's lack of imaginative engagement with the Tudor Myth. Instead, says French, Stanley is a key connection between the reigns of Richard III and Henry VII. In a careful reading of the text, French proves that Shakespeare emphasizes Stanley's historical reputation as a "trimmer," a temporizer who cannily maintains his ties with both sides of the York-Lancaster conflict. Perhaps French takes his clue from Kendall (Item 46, 1955), who affirms precisely this tendency in the slippery Stanley. Nevertheless, French's main point is literary, and his own: because Stanley is the one person remaining at the end of <u>Richard III</u> who has survived all the vicissitudes since the wars of Henry VI's reign, he must have been a time-serving, clever political vacillator. And since Stanley hands Henry the crown of England, both literally and through his attack upon Richard's forces only when he was certain that Tudor could win, then Shakespeare probably intended for some of Stanley's baseness to rub off on Henry's regime. French thus determines that while the less complex-minded of the Elizabethans might have accepted the outward show of Tudor glorification at face value, in actuality Shakespeare "managed to satisfy his artistic (and perhaps political) conscience while at the same time offering nothing that was explicitly unorthodox or offensive" (p. 31). French's conclusions are independently paralleled by Sanders (Item 145, 1968), especially the notions that Shakespeare was anti-Tudor at heart and that Richard is the precursor of the more artistically and philosophically integrated Macbeth.

140. Heilman, Robert Bechtold. <u>Tragedy and Melodrama: Versions of Experience</u>. Seattle and London: The University of Washington Press, 1968.

Heilman's study adds very little to the existing criticism on <u>Richard III</u>. His general purpose is to show that the identifying mark of the tragic character is his divided self, torn between different imperatives, while the melodramatic character is essentially undivided, taking the part for the whole. <u>Richard III</u> is therefore melodrama, he says, although it moves toward tragedy at least in the ghost scene of Act V, where Richard demonstrates Shakespeare's tendency in his early plays to interpose a tragic perspective even for such a brilliantly melodramatic character as Richard.

141. Hosley, Richard, Ed. <u>Shakespeare's Holinshed</u>. New York: Putnam, 1968.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

142. Lamb, V. B. <u>The Betrayal of Richard III</u>. 3rd ed. London: The Mitre Press, 1968.

Lamb attempts once again to show that the traditional image of Richard III as portrayed by Shakespeare and his Tudor sources is false. Lamb's Yorkist leanings are too pronounced to allow his reader to accept the terms of his arguments, even while sharing his bias.

143. Marcotte, Paul J. "Richard the Third: Aphrodite's Master." <u>Inscape</u>, 7 (1968), 1-25.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

144. Myers, A. R. "Richard III and the Historical Tradition." <u>History: The Journal of the Historical Association</u>, 53 (1968), 181-202.

Myers formulates the development of Richard III's image from More's <u>History</u> to such present-day historians as Kendall (Item 46, 1955). After

More, Polydore Vergil was Richard's most influential historian, says Myers; Vergil exaggerated the negative aspects and established the pattern of fifteenth-century history which required an utter villain whose death would not be a crime, but a welcome end to evil and a signal for a fresh start. As other commentators embellished this perspective, by the end of the sixteenth century Richard III was lost to myth. According to Myers, "He had become the archetypal tyrant-king, incarnated evil enthroned" (p. 184). With some justification, perhaps, Myers feels that the twentieth century has seen so much evil in established government that certain elements in society seek a hero in Richard III as a counter to a suspect Tudor establishment and its own fallible leadership.

Myers draws the reasonable conclusion that historians through the centuries have been influenced by the climate of opinion in their own times, perhaps even conditioned enough by it to impose it fashionably upon Shakespeare's play.

145. Sanders, Wilbur. The Dramatist and the Received Idea: Studies in the Plays of Marlowe & Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Sander's book does much to lay to rest the Tillyardian view that Shakespeare's history plays are calculated mainly to reflect the official Tudor line that the Wars of the Roses was a divine punishment imposed on England for the deposing of the divinely annointed Richard II. From this follows the triumph of Henry Tudor at Bosworth Field as an act of divine Providence which redeemed England. If such platitudes were the dramatic and philosophical center of the history plays, argues Sanders, then they would hardly justify our deference to so simplistic a dramatist as Shakespeare must have been. Sanders' point is well taken, but one quickly

adds that when Tillyard formulated the Tudor Myth pattern which he found in the plays (Item 7, 1944) he was breaking new ground. Indeed, some critics such as Jump (Item 195, 1975) are re-discovering a validity in many parts of Tillyard's theories. Yet one agrees with Sanders' idea that the central concern in Richard III is the complex mechanism of power, greed, and self-deception, themes which set forth a kind of human/ critical awareness in the audience which renders the platitudinous speech of Richmond dramatically secondary. Perhaps it is even an indication of Shakespeare's artistic limitations at this early phase in his career as Sanders claims.

Indeed, Sanders considers the scheme of Divine Providence in the play to be obtrusive, incompatible with a more organic and complex system of retribution which he calls "pessimistic naturalism" (p. 92). This is a sort of "natural providence" by which "the diseased soul distintegrates under the weight of its own evil, and the diseased society purges itself" (p. 95). Finally, the individual committed to evil self-destructs under the strain of moral and cultural pressures for peace and order. Sanders disagrees with Rossiter (Item 95, 1961), whose perception of a highly unified structure does not account for the two patterns which Sanders considers central but incompatible: Divine Providence and natural providence.

1969

146. Armstrong, C. A. J., Trans. The Usurpation of Richard the Third: Dominicus Mancinus Ad Angelum Catonem De Occupatione Regni Anglie Per Riccardum Tercium Libellus. 2nd Ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Armstrong discovered the Mancini work in the Lille archives in 1936

and first published it that year. His second edition proposes to take
account of the many advances in historical research since the 1930's:
he discusses the biographical data available on Mancini and his patron
Angelo Cato and accompanying the dual language text are discussions of
the manuscript and its language, a bibliography and index, illustrative
plates, and an account of Nicolas von Poppelau, a German who visited
Richard III. Williamson (Item 233, 1978) raises serious questions about
Mancini's credibility as an historian; and Armstrong himself doubts
whether he readily understood English, if at all; yet the Mancini account
is a valuable piece of background reading for those who would understand
the historical perspective of the fifteenth century as Shakespeare re-
ceived it from his sources.

147. Auchincloss, Louis. Motiveless Malignity. Boston: Houghton
        Mifflin Company, 1969.

Auchincloss presents a series of essays on the apparent inconsisten-
cy of motivation in some of Shakespeare's principal characters. In Chap-
ter Four he traces Richard III's sudden shift of motive in 3 Henry IV
from loyal son to the diabolical schemer whom we come to know in Richard
III. Treating the familiar theme of Richard as actor, Auchincloss ad-
vances the theory that Richard need not play his roles convincingly, for
his victims are corrupt enought to require only a formal show of virtue.
Yet Auchincloss further implies that Richard deliberately plays his roles
unconvincingly so that his victims could discover his true intentions,
and thereby he consciously creates a greater challenge to his acting
abilities. The author is on firmer ground when he points out that Shake-
speare's historical subject finally requires a change from the mood of
Richard's Punch-like comedy to the serious theme of a tyrant and usurper's

fate. Rather arbitrarily, however, Auchincloss wishes that the play had
ended more abruptly with Richard's commupance after he ascended the
throne, since Richard as the scourge of England and Richmond as its re-
deemer are both dull; furthermore, the second wooing scene is a tedious
parallel to the first, and Richard's fit of conscience and fear at Bos-
worth Field is unconvincing--inconsistent with the character who could
mock his own hunchback after wooing Anne. Auchincloss therefore touches
upon many of the familiar issues which critics have identified and treat-
ed, but his casual format is not for the scholarly reader.

148. Dean, Leonard F. "Shakespeare's Richard III." Studies in Language,
    Literature, and Culture of the Middle Ages and Later. Eds.
    Eds. E. Bagby Atwood and Archibald A. Hill. Austin: The Uni-
    versity of Texas Press, 1969, pp. 347-351.

Dean brings a fresh perspective to Richard III's character as well
as to the issue of whether the play is tragedy or "mere" history. He
studies the "parts" which Richard plays, finding in them more than simple
dissimulation. Richard is able to play his roles, says Dean, because the
other characters recognize them as such and acquiesce in them. Auchin-
closs (Item 147, 1969) offers a similar, but much less convincing, ver-
sion of this idea. Dean says that theatricality for Richard is never a
way of insisting upon the emotional meaning of a role, as it is with
Richard II, but is always a means of using ritual for personal ambitions
or perverse self-indulgence. Dean's most significant (not original)
point is his analysis of the world of the play as filled by guilty hench-
men. He will not go so far as to say that all are guilty, as does
Rossiter (Item 95, 1961), but he declares that all except the children
conspire with Richard and therefore deserve their fates. Like Sanders
(Item 145, 1968) Dean recognizes that sometimes the play's contrasting

modes hide the fact that they are not always cooperative and are even sometimes out of control; he nevertheless finds that the often successful juxtaposition of contrasting modes prefigure the richness of the composition in Lear and Winter's Tale. Dean's close reading and clear focus upon the unifying effect of Richard's role playing provide excellent insights.

149. Lloyd Evans, Gareth. Shakespeare I: 1564-1592. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1969.

Lloyd Evans stresses the idea that modern audiences are fascinated by the theatrically robust and realistic character of Richard III, rather than by formalized historical themes. The choric effect of the curse motif renders the evil of Richard less believable, says Lloyd Evans, although it gives his evil a stark isolation. The formalized themes and structural elements in Richard III are of little interest, at least analytically, to most modern viewers of the play, but once Lloyd Evans makes this point he simply belabors the familiar conception of Richard as actor and role-player.

150. Smidt, Kristian, Ed. The Tragedy of "King Richard the Third": Parallel Texts of the First Quarto and the First Folio With Variants of the Early Quartos. New York: Humanities Press, 1969.

Smidt edits parallel texts of the eight extant quartos of Richard III and the First Folio edition. He says that on the basis of bibliographical evidence one can easily ascertain that the extant quartos of the play are substantially identical except for a few readings. Furthermore, he argues that each quarto edition was printed from its immediate predecessor, except for Q5, where only sheets A, B, and D derive from Q4, while the others were set from Q3. As in his earlier work (Item 114,

1964), he opposes the bad quarto theory, i.e., that the Q should be re-
garded as reported text and F as based in effect upon an authoritative
manuscript, if not directly printed from it. Finally, Smidt proposes to
improve upon the only previously published parallel texts of the Richard
III Q1 and F1 texts, the Bankside edition of 1891. His later work (Item
154, 1970) further discusses the relationship between Richard III Q and
F.

1970

151. Burton, Phillip. The Sole Voice: Character Portraits From Shake-
        speare. New York: Dial Press, 1970.

    Burton offers the perspective of the non-academic critic, providing
a well-informed summary of fifty years of reading on such topics as
Richard's origins in classical and English drama, but he seeks the human
element in Richard's character, rather than the man-made monster. Burton
sympathetically stresses Richard's valor and prowess on the field of bat-
tle as proof that his physical deformity could not have been so great as
Shakespeare's play indicates. Nor is Richard's motive to compensate for
his physical defects through evil deeds, says Burton. Richard only be-
comes a villain at the end of 3 Henry VI, as was pointed out by others
such as Palmer (Item 8, 1945), when Edward betrays the ideal for which
Richard had fought so earnestly. He is a murderer, but mostly out of
the logical necessity of politics and war, Burton asserts. Indeed,
Burton offers some easy answers to questions which critics and histori-
ans continue to struggle over, such as the reason for Anne's capitula-
tion. Burton's reasoning that Richard exudes such charm that no woman
could have resisted him under the circumstances circumvents a wide range

of subtle historical, psychological, and dramatic factors which contribute to Richard's particular tactics and Anne's responses. However, Burton draws an excellent parallel in picturing Richard III as the Garden of Eden in reverse: Richard as blissfully happy in the Garden of Evil until banished by guilt.

152. Faure, François. "Langage Religieux et langage pétrarquiste dan Richard III de Shakespeare." Études Anglaises, 27 (1970), 23-37.

Faure contends that the young Shakespeare wrote his history plays with the intention of improving upon the dramatic quality of the language of his sources. He does this noticeably, says Faure, through a new economy of words and suggestive concentration, especially through religious allusions such as Richard's oath by Saint Paul and the Petrarchan language of love in the wooing of Anne. Faure adds very little to the commentary of previous critics, although his analysis of Richard's use of Petrarchan language is a useful complement to Whitaker (Item 36, 1953), who shows that Petrarchan parody in the wooing of Anne not only indicates Shakespeare's growing acquaintance with the contemporary literature of courtly love tradition, but also that his use of that tradition explains the cause of Anne's capitulation.

153. Kelly, Henry Ansgar. Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare's Histories. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.

After examining the sources of myth and history from the fifteenth century to Shakespeare, Kelly declares that neither tetralogy of Shakespeare's history plays indicates that the author had such models before him. Kelly cites his debt to Tillyard (Item 7, 1944), but he claims that the providential aspect of the Tudor Myth which Tillyard devised is "an

expost facto Platonic Form, made up of many fragments that were never fitted together into a mental pattern" until Tillyard himself synthesized them (p. 298). Kelly notes that Shakespeare completely dramatized the historical characters and thus put the supposedly objective providential judgments of the chronicle histories in the mouths of the characters, where these judgments belonged and where many of them originated. Thus Kelly absolutely rejects the theory that the history plays adhere to the Tudor Myth--or that such a myth even existed. He says, for example, that "there is no indication in this play or in the whole of this tetralogy that Henry VI or his family was divinely punished because of the sins of his grandfather" (p. 295). Kelly's conclusions are well supported by close analysis of Shakespeare's historical sources and the prevailing contemporary opinions, and, more importantly, by close scrutiny of Shakespeare's history plays. This work is eminently more thorough than that of Mroz (Item 2, 1941) and serves as a very effective rebuttal although Jump (Item 195, 1975) offers a much more balanced view than either of them.

154. Smidt, Kristian. Memorial Transmission and Quarto Copy in "Richard III": A Reassessment. New York: Humanities Press, 1970.

Previously Smidt (Item 114, 1964) had disagreed with D. L. Patrick's theory (still current) that Shakespeare's Richard III quarto (1597) was memorially reproduced by people involved in its production. Now Smidt modifies his past argument and is willing to concede memorial transmission of Q, with the reservation that Patrick's memorial theory can be reconciled with his own theory of written transmission. Indeed, Smidt maintains that the text can be explained in no other way. Nor does Smidt feel that Q was ever used for stage production, as Patrick and Walker

(Item 35, 1953) do (although Smidt apparently does not even consider
Walker's very important study). Following Walker, Honigman (Item 117,
1965) established an astounding number of errors transmitted from Q to F
which, along with the uneven abilities of compositors A and B, make it
doubtful that the memorial elements of Q can ever be distinguished from
the text. Oddly, Smidt seems unaware that Walker, not Honigmann, origin-
ated this insight and called for a more eclectic choice of readings.
Curiously, too, Smidt omits reference to Walker's explanation of how Q3
as well as Q6 passages got into F, although his theory is similar to hers
and he arrives at essentially the same conclusions. But whereas Smidt
feels that Shakespeare's autograph, being incomplete or otherwise defec-
tive, was newly transcribed and the missing elements gleaned from Qq 1-6,
Walker contends that the defective autograph was patched up by incorpo-
rating leaves from the playhouse-marked Q3, and that Jaggard's prefer-
ence for printed copy led to collation of this composite copy with the
more defective Q6. Smidt's speculations are finally less convincing than
the consensus view expressed by Patrick and Walker.

155. Steig, Michael. "The Grotesque and the Aesthetic Response in Shake-
        Speare, Dickens, and Günter Grass." Comparative Literature
        Studies, 6 (1970), 167-181.

    Combining depth psychology with the qualities of aesthetic response,
Steig compares Shakespeare's Richard III, Dickens' Daniel Guilp, and
Grass' Oskar Matzerath in order to define the grotesque in literature and
to provide a critical approach to the grotesque in its realistic, or
satirical, form. Steig makes use of Wolfgang Kayser's definition of the
grotesque as a basis of his study: the grotesque in art and literature
is "an attempt to invoke and subdue the demonic aspects of the world."
Richard, Quilp, and Matzerath, says Steiger, are "at once villainous and

comic, and . . . thus provoke that ambivalence and that uneasiness which seem characteristic of the grotesque" (p. 170). These characters have much in common, including physical deformities, a delight in mischief, seemingly magical powers, and a defiance of the established order which at once attracts and repels the audience. The ambiguous response of the audience results as much from the cultural context of the characters as from the authors' genius, says Steig, who is thoroughly convincing in his analysis of Richard III. Noting that critics have provided a wide variety of explanations for the ambiguity of Richard, such as the scourge theory of Rossiter (Item 95, 1961), and the anti-ritualistic theory of Brooke (Item 115, 1965) among many others, Steig contends that Richard is ambiguous because he fulfills the standard requirements of the gro-tesque in several ways: in his physical deformity, in his mechanical puppet-like stage presence, and in his sexual perverseness. Krieger (Item 81, 1959) points out Richard's perverse mingling of sex and polit-ics, but Steig rejects Krieger's assertion that Anne submits to Richard's sexual advances merely out of calculating opportunism. In her own abnor-mal lust, says Steig, Anne genuinely responds to "the perversely erotic force of the gargoylelike Duke" (p. 171). Steig detects a tragic element of catharsis in Richard III as a result of the demonic forces which are released in Richard's character, forces which the audience both identi-fies with and abhors. Thus Steig concludes that the audience which finds most relief from the resulting anxieties is one which believes in some formal power which can subdue the demonic--whether that power be the Tudor Myth or some other force of a divinely or rationally ordered uni-verse. Steig's further comparisons of Richard, Quilp, and Metzarath lead him to conclude that each is more grotesque than the other as society

becomes less capable of subduing the demonic power which their charac-
ters release. Grass' work, he says, is much closer than either Shake-
speare or Dickens to what we today think of as exterior reality, which
is the ultimate milieu of the grotesque. But the elements of the ex-
terior world of Richard III should not be underestimated, says Steig;
for at least the first two acts, it is a world ruled by values as chaotic
as those of the nazi Germany of Grass' work.

1971

156. Bromley, John C. The Shakespearean Kings. Boulder: Colorado Asso-
      ciated University Press, 1971.

In contrast to Ribner (Item 64, 1957), Bromley does not attempt a
specific definition of the history play, but he studies Shakespeare's
political thought, including that which he finds in Julius Caesar, Hamlet,
King Lear, Macbeth, and Richard III. He demonstrates a moral as well as
a political bias in favor of Richard which he assimilates basically from
Kendall (Item 46, 1955), and he argues cogently that Shakespeare himself
presents less than an attractive image of Richmond and the Tudor cause at
Bosworth Field. Taking issue with Tillyard (Item 7, 1944), Bromley argues
that Richard III is not Shakespeare's tribute to the Tudor Myth, however
amiably he may have accepted such historical distortions. Like Palmer
(Item 8, 1945) and Sen Gupta (Item 113, 1964), Bromley concentrates upon
the dramatic construct of Richard III which produces the unique character
of Richard. Unlike Palmer, Bromley feels that Richard's character does
not depend upon its development in the Henry VI plays, but that Richard
is his own man; nor is he the scourge of God as described in Tillyard and
Rossiter (Item 95, 1961). Bromley's assessment carries an unhealthy bur-
den of Yorkist bias, but he argues effectively that Richard III goes as

far as Shakespeare could safely go in expressing a sardonic version of
the Tudor doctrine.

157. Leas, Susan E. "Richard III, Shakespeare and History." English
        Journal, 60 (1971), 1214-1216, 1296.

Leas would offer advanced high school students an historical over-
view of the great debate which has long raged over the true image of
Richard III. The point of her lesson: historical facts matter--people
must learn that historians and men of literature are biased and alter
facts. She provides a handy bibliography for background reading about
Richard III in history and fiction.

158. Long, John H. Shakespeare's Use of Music: The Histories and Trage-
        dies. Gainesville: The University of Florida Press, 1971.

This is a study of the dramatic functions served by the performed
music in those productions of Shakespeare's plays occurring between 1590
and 1645. Long effectively shows that the pageantry, ceremony, and color
characteristic of the Elizabethan age influence the types and uses of
music in Shakespeare's history plays. More specifically, three elements
dictate music in the histories: military feats, ceremony, and rhetoric.
And three consistent patterns govern musical usage in the First Tetra-
logy, Long explains: music to increase color and pageantry (the most
frequent); music to move large groups of actors onto and off of the stage
or to suggest offstage action; and music for rhetorical effect. Although
Richard III has less music than the Henry VI plays, Long reveals the
dramatic significance of such musical elements as the flourish of trum-
pet and drums (IV.iv.148) which once more demonstrates Richard's unnatur-
al self as he uses the flourish to drown out the curses of his mother.
Long does well to remind editors that they could improve their texts by

recognizing that Shakespeare linked scenes through his use of trumpet flourishes and other music.

159. McNeir, Waldo F. "The Masks of Richard the Third." Studies in English Literature: 1500-1900, 11 (1971), 167-186.

In 3 Henry VI, says McNeir, the Richard who murders Henry and his son and announces that his own family will be his next victims is the Richard who emerges in Richard III: "The enemy of mankind has been unleashed, the Roscius of rue," says McNeir; "he is guided henceforth by solitary self-absorption in acting many roles for his and our amusement" (p. 173). McNeir's study is chiefly a reaction to several critics on familiar issues concerning Richard III. For example, in asserting that Richard misconstrues Elizabeth's answer to his suit for his niece's hand, McNeir disagrees with Clemen (Item 8, 1945). However, McNeir offers interesting psychological perspectives in his analysis of Richard as the ultimate schizophrenic. There is subtlety in McNeir's argument that on Bosworth eve Richard's personality fragments into three persons: his outer defending self, his inner accusing conscience, and a third personality who comments on the other two. In all, McNeir offers a fresh look at the familiar theme of Richard's role playing.

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

Drawing upon an essential idea first advanced by Campbell (Item 11, 1947), Pierce attempts to show that public man stands at the center of the history plays, and that the plays are not didactic, but essentially political drama whose central theme is order and wise government versus disorder and war. He studies the "analogic" relationship between family and state in order to prove his thesis. Pierce agrees with Palmer (Item

8, 1945) that Richard III's evil is motivated by his relationship with his strong-willed father. Richard becomes the most powerful force in his world once the filial tie with York is gone, and he becomes representative of an entire generation bred to rebellion which progressively becomes more demonic. As in the Henry VI trilogy, in Richard III the destruction of the family, corruption of inheritance, and tainting of marriage pervade the language and action. In his Vice-like glee Richard attains a comic detachment, says Pierce, which allows him to manipulate the clichés of family duty, but Pierce feels that Rossiter (Item 95, 1961) mistakenly implies that Richard's comic detachment merits him our moral approval. Furthermore, Pierce argues convincingly that Rossiter errs in depicting Providence in the play as inhumane, for Margaret's vengeful nemesis gives way to Richmond and Elizabeth's embodiment in the Providence of a redeemed land. Thus Pierce makes an important point: the traditional morality of the family shares in the ultimate triumph of justice and order over the demonic forces released by guilt and civil war. This is similar to Steig (Item 155, 1970), who explains that only a culture such as the Elizabethans', which believes in an ultimate power of divine or rational order (in this case the family and the state), can subdue the grotesque demonic powers released by creatures such as Richard. Indeed, says Pierce, Richard's chief foe is not Richmond, but the women, who in the lamentation scenes represent the values of family which Richard opposes. The analogy between family structure and the Elizabethan body politic has long been established, but Pierce's study of this connection within and between the history plays needed to be done.

161. Riggs, David. Shakespeare's Heroical Histories: "Henry VI" and
        Its Literary Tradition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press,
        1971.

Although Richard III introduces himself in 3 <u>Henry VI</u> as a Machia-
vel, the imagery and tone of his exposition are controlled by the conven-
tions of Marlovian conqueror-drama, suggests Riggs. He contends that
Machiavelli would not have recognized Henry V, Henry VI, and finally
Richard III as they tried to conform outwardly to majesty, for tradition
no longer tells them who they are, since Richard III on Bosworth Eve,
like Henry V at Agincourt, learns that the identity which ceremony con-
fers runs counter to what he feels intuitively about his deepest self.
Like Schneider (Item 65, 1957), Riggs shows that Shakespeare explores
the dilemmas of the ruler whose power derives from outward form rather
than from inherent quality as a ruler. Here Riggs probes a very signifi-
cant theme in the histories: if a professed villain such as Richard can
master the proper style of kingship, then what is to prevent an endless
succession of rogues from occupying the throne? Shakespeare's Richard
III shows once for all that outward forms of virtue and nobility are no
longer reliable, says Riggs, who sees Richard in a socio-political frame,
as a reflection of Shakespeare's concern with the "new man" of Elizabeth-
an times who corrupts the traditional outward proof of virtue. Riggs
largely agrees with, but enhances, the views of Kelly (Item 153, 1970).

162. Smith, Denzell S. "The Credibility of the Wooing of Anne in <u>Richard
     III</u>." <u>Papers on Language & Literature</u>, 7 (1971), 199-202.

Richard III woos Anne, the sole mourner of the man he murdered, her
father-in-law, and moves her from hatred to compliance in 193 lines.
This is a process which many critics have found incredible, but Smith
attempts to show that the scene becomes credible through the obvious
rhetorical device of forceful and emotional argument. Shakespeare's
greatest challenge, he says, was to convince the audience that Richard

succeeds, and since the scene is played in the length of time actually required, the compression of time is not justification for Anne's capitulation. Thus the burden of credibility falls heavily upon Richard's masterful role playing, shifting through seven phases which correspond to the natural progression of Anne's emotions. Smith does not probe the psychological nuances of Anne's capitulation, but emphasizes a rather simplified external scheme of role playing combined with rhetorical argument. Shupe (Item 227, 1978) follows with a similar argument, but he offers a more psychologically satisfying motive for Anne.

163. Wheeler, Richard P. "History, Character and Conscience in Richard III." Comparative Drama, 5 (1971-72), 301-321.

The First Tetralogy shows Shakespeare unresolved in dealing with two historical concepts, says Wheeler: "sacred" history with its myths and rituals which imply the possibility of redeeming the past; and "profane" history, which does away with the limitations of ritual and myth and frees man to shape history as his powers allow. Thus in Richard III Shakespeare was caught in a contradiction between the need for traditional order, as exemplified in the Tudor Myth, and the newer, non-religious view of history, as explained, for example by Riggs (Item 161, 1971). Wheeler thus sees Richard III as a dramatization of the historical pressures experienced by the Elizabethans anxious about the impending conclusion of the Tudor line, and of course such an interpretation is as valid as any in the absence of direct testimony from Shakespeare, but surely Wheeler strains his point by saying that in Freudian terms Richard represented to Elizabethan audiences "the chance to indulge through the vicarious medium of theater egoistic drives striving for liberation" (p. 319).

1972

164. Faure, François. "Richard III de Shakespeare: Mélodrame Ou Trage-
        die?" Études Anglo-Americaines, 25 (1972), 17-31.

Faure argues convincingly that Richard III is a Christian tragedy
rather than a melodrama. Reviewing critical commentary on Richard III
since Johnson, Faure points out that, while the play has always been a
public favorite, only since WWII have critics assumed a favorable posi-
tion toward it, including Tillyard, Campbell, Ribner, and especially
Clemen, to whom Faure attributes the "rehabilitation" of Richard III.
However, Faure disagrees with the large number of modern critics who con-
tinue to treat Richard III as melodrama rather than as tragedy. Rossiter
(Item 95, 1961), for example, treats the play as comic melodrama designed
to redicule the moral and religious interpretation of history. They also
err, he says, who attempt to find traces of immaturity in the form, style,
and plot of the play, failing to notice the revolution of language which
takes place between the composition of the Henry VI plays and Richard III,
particularly the replacement of explicit comparison with the metaphorical
technique characteristic of the great tragedies. While Faure does not
quite convince us that Richard III is Shakespeare's first great tragedy,
he argues convincingly that, rather than consider the play as an imita-
tion classical drama of Shakespeare's apprenticeship, we could more pro-
fitably attend its thematic development, its skillful dramatic technique,
and its subtle theology--through which Shakespeare justifies the voice
of Providence without sinking into didacticism or sacrificing the right
of human liberty.

165. Hanham, Alison. "Richard III, Lord Hastings and the Historians."
        English Historical Review (April, 1972), pp. 233-248.

Hanham rejects the view of most modern historians that Hastings died
on June 13 and that the Duke of York was removed from sanctuary on June 20
as related in the Croyland Chronicle. She accepts the account of Mancini
(Item 146, 1969), which offers no dates for these events and reverses the
sequence of the Croyland Chronicler. Hanham contends that Hastings died
on June 20, after the princes were removed from sanctuary, and that
Richard falsified the date on official documents as justification for
Hastings' execution for treason. These arguments are essentially includ-
ed in Hanham's Richard III (Item 192, 1975).

166. Hart, Evalee. "Comparative Study: Macbeth and Richard III."
      English Journal, 61 (1972), 824-830.

Hart considers Macbeth the best choice of Shakespeare's plays for
high school study, but she finds Richard III to be an excellent parallel
study. The article nicely summarizes well established concepts for those
reading Richard III for the first time.

167. Hobson, Alan. Full Circle: Shakespeare and Moral Development.
      New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1972.

With bold acumen, Hobson traces the character flaws of Henry VI and
Richard III to the same psychological source: lack of maternal nurturing
as infants. Richard was a monstrous child despised by his mother from
birth. Henry was a nine-month-old king surrounded constantly by power-
hungry and ruthless courtiers. As a result, says Hobson, both lack
development of a mature conscience, although they are opposites in person-
ality. Henry dreams of an ideal world of love and harmony which his weak
will cannot effect. On the other hand, Richard has a life-dream rooted
in himself, rather than in an ideal. He perpetuates evil by denying the
ideal--and conscience. Like Henry, Richard cannot love because he has

been deprived of the organizing function of a mother's nurturing love in
his first few years. Thus despite their polar characteristics, they are
in their deepest souls alike, isolated and despised, says Hobson, and
his analysis is seductive especially if one is familiar with the histori-
cal facts concerning the two men. If one can accept.psychoanalysis of a
dramatic character based upon his hypothetical or assumed dramatical
childhood, then Hobson's theories say much about the characters. One of
his best literary insights comes through his comparison of Richard and
Lady Macbeth, both of whom deny their humanity.

168. Ornstein, Robert. A Kingdom for a Stage: The Achievement of Shake-
speare's History Plays. Cambridge: Harvard University Press,
1972.

As Sen Gupta (Item 113, 1964) argued, Ornstein declares that a mean-
ingful study of Shakespeare's history plays must seek aesthetic insight
into his art, and that the overemphasis of Shakespeare's political ortho-
doxy by such critics as Tillyard (Item 7, 1944) and Ribner (Item 64, 1957)
only leads to oversimplification, not only of Shakespeare's complex and
varied art in the histories, but of the not-so-simple Elizabethan mind
and culture. Accordingly, Ornstein views Richard III not only as a prin-
cipal in the Tudor Myth, which he says Shakespeare believed in as Ameri-
cans believe in the myth of their deliverance from the tyranny of George
III, but also as an attractively honest villain worthy of Shakespeare's
rapidly maturing artistic powers. Perhaps Ornstein too readily dismisses
the influence of the Morality Vice upon Richard's characterization as ex-
plained by Spivack (Item 74, 1958), but certainly Ornstein is correct in
perceiving Richard to be much more credible and convincingly human than
Henry Tudor. Unlike Clemen (Item 59, 1957), who asserts that for the

Elizabethan, at least, Richard's deformity manifested a corrupt spirit, Ornstein takes the more psychological view that Richard's deformity is not integrally related to his evil, but that he is evil simply because he lacks emotional sympathies or moral sensibility. This is much like the thesis of Hobson (Item 167, 1972). Ornstein presents a nicely structured cause-effect analysis of Richard's decline and fall, which results basically because he is finally too self-confident and overestimates the power of an outward show of piety and popular support, a point developed also by Riggs (Item 161, 1971). Ornstein takes a fresh look at the familiar fact that a plausible Richard is the central focus in the play, which is not merely a sort of Morality combat between the forces of darkness and light.

169. Sahel, Pierre. "Les Voies des hommes dans Richard III." Études Anglaises, 25 (1972), 91-103.

Recognizing that a providential scheme is visible in Richard III, Sahel also argues that a system of natural explanations are possible, according to which men act upon their human motivations. The voices of men, rather than God, are particularly, but not exclusively, the medium through which we belatedly understand the actions of Richard III. Sahel takes the anti-providential position that Bosworth is the result of Richard's criminal government and the obstacles provided by his human enemies. Like Riggs (Item 161, 1971), Sahel argues that sometimes the turn of fortune in Shakespeare's histories is attributed to God, when it is due to man's intelligence and cunning. Sahel concludes that in the conflict between moral duty and political necessity in Richard III, the resolution does not particularly favor the moral side. His contention is similar to that of Gurr (Item 182, 1974), who asserts that Stanley's

"democratic" choice of supporting Richmond brings about Richard's fall, although Sahel's thesis is more tenable than Gurr's. Sahel is much more in agreement with Ornstein (Item 168, 1972).

170. Saner, Reginald A. "Shakespeare and the Shape of Civil Strife: 'Myself Upon Myself.'" Western Humanities Review, 25 (1972), 243-251.

Saner's thesis is that Shakespeare's plays clarify the circularity in that ancient theme of western literature: retributive justice. He finds that much of the power of Shakespearean tragedy comes from the evildoer's awareness of the true shape of his deeds which return to destroy him. However, this article offers no fresh insight into the study of Richard III. Beginning in the Henry VI plays, Saner records instances in which political violence returns upon itself. Citing two retributive agents at work in Richard III, the providential and the natural, he says that these lead in the later tragedies to the insight that the center of the body politic is man himself, whose irrational but conscious atrocities and their inevitable consequences cannot be warded off by the knowledge which the audience gains from Shakespeare's dramas. Saner thus seems to think that Shakespeare's plays could save the world if we would only let them.

171. Sheriff, William E. "The Grotesque Comedy of Richard III." Studies in the Literary Imagination, 5 (1972), 51-64.

This entire volume is devoted to Shakespeare's history plays, although Sheriff's study is the only one which deals specifically with Richard III. Through Act III, says Sheriff, Richard displays a grotesque sense of humor; then in Act IV he drops his twisted comedy and changes to a tyrant, whose character and actions lack the comic overtones provided

by dramatic irony and punning wordplay in the earlier acts. Sheriff decides that Shakespeare chose the comic mode for Richard III to emphasize Richard's demonic characteristics. Thus Sheriff reinforces Spivack (Item 74, 1958), identifying Richard's comic villainy with the Vice tradition in which the Vice is not only evil, but grotesquely comical. In an interesting and apt comparison, Sheriff likens Richard to the gothic gargoyle, a picture of the perversion of good into evil. Sheriff argues that Richard himself is conscious that his character develops from a confident doer of evil to a confused and unsuccessful Machieval without hope. Sheriff examines the key incidents of Richard III for their comic qualities, but his analysis does not fully clarify his meaning of the term "grotesque comedy." For example, he notes that the strawberry incident in the Tower has comic irony and that Richard and Buckingham produce a comedy of double meanings, mock innocence, and false piety in the prayerbook scene, but the grotesqueness of such examples lacks a precise definition here such as Steig (Item 155, 1970) gives it. Compared to Sheriff, McLaughlin (Item 208, 1977) achieves a more interesting, if not more profound, analysis of Richard III as a comic villain.

172. Velz, John W. "Episodic Structure in Four Tudor Plays: A Virtue of Necessity." Comparative Drama, 6 (1972), 87-102.

In this comparative study of Everyman, Tamburlaine Part I, Richard III, and Julius Caesar, Velz effectively demonstrates that the episodic structure which such plays inherited from medieval and early Tudor drama not only allows artistic quality in the right hands, but also is conducive to thematic virtue. Velz shows that the structure of Everyman, in which the protagonist's worldly goods and friends desert him systematically (thus freeing the actors for new parts) is synonymous with its theme

of the transitoriness of earthly values. Similarly, in Tamburlaine I,
successive deaths and conquests build in an episodic structure towards
the ironic discovery that earthly glory is finite and Tamburlaine is
mortal. And Richard III is heavily indebted to the Morality tradition
of an episodic structure which permits extensive doubling of roles and
thus provides for enriched tone and theme--consequently, the necessity
of doubling roles in early English drama becomes a virtue in the later
drama which inherited the system. Velz argues that in Richard III and
Julius Caesar Shakespeare enriches the traditional Tudor episodic struc-
ture by couching it in the de casibus theme and extending its signifi-
cance beyond the rise and fall of a single man to the families involved
and to English society itself. The episodic structure thus makes a
memento mori of these plays both for the audience and for the characters,
who, pathetically, do not recognize it as such. Velz' main point is
firmly established, that the tragedy of the protagonists of these plays
is expressed in the episodic structure which emphasizes the historical
truth of impermanence; for a Caesar, or an Antony, or a Richard III do
not realize that their falls are inevitably mirrored in the falls of
others, as a fact of the rhythm of dynamic history.

173. Viebrock, Helmut. "Die Erdbeeren im Garten des Bischofs von Ely."
     Shakespeare-Jahrbuch (Heidelburg) 108 (1972), 14-33.

Viebrock offers an historical-symbolical reading of Richard III,
III.iv as to the significance of Richard's ordering of strawberries from
Bishop Ely's garden. In this wide-ranging study, Viebrock digresses con-
siderably in his pursuit of aesthetic versus historical perception in
Shakespeare's histories, but the reading is sensitive and scholarly, es-
pecially as compared to the doubtful treatment of the strawberry question

posed by J. Dover Wilson (Item 68, 1957). Ignoring Wilson's conjecture
that Richard ate the strawberries deliberately to induce an urticarial
rash, Viebrock follows Clemen (Item 59, 1957) in conjecturing that
Richard asks for the strawberries to create a distraction in order to
speak privately with Buckingham. More significantly, Viebrock explains
that in an emblematic manner, the strawberry episode suddenly distracts
the attention which the council has hopefully but tensely directed to-
ward the sinisterly cheerful behavior of Richard. The oppressive room
thus opens itself up for a moment, says Viebrock, to an inner prospect
and lets in a vision of a shielded fecundity and enchanting brightness,
as in a painting of "The Garden of Paradise" of the year 1410 hanging in
Frankfurt. For an instant shakespeare's strawberry scene resembles the
scene in the picture with its paradisical vision, but with Satan looking
towards the tempting fullness of the fantasy. Similarly, the council
scene opens up for an instant the whole depth between the beautiful
fecundity suggested by the strawberries and the ugly will to destroy.

But an even more basic reason that Richard invents the strawberry
distraction, says Viebrock, is to get Ely out of the way while he effects
his diabolic scheme to dispatch Hastings, for Shakespeare's historical-
anecdotal sources indicate that Ely, John Morton, was a man of great
power who later proved himself to be a deadly enemy to Richard and the
Yorkist cause. Thus Viebrock contends that the scene is not only bril-
liantly emblematic, but that it is also founded in historical reality.
Viebrock's basic premise that the strawberries are emblematic is develop-
ed in much more detail by Ross (Item 89, 1960), although Viebrock was
apparently unaware of Ross's study.

1973

174. Aycock, Roy. "Dual Progression in Richard III." South Atlantic
     Bulletin, 38 (1973), 70-78.

Aycock determines that Richard's destruction progresses through his

own actions as well as through the vendetta and curses of Queen Margaret.

Many critics have preceded Aycock in this observation; Dollarhide (Item

92, 1961) even declared the two movements incompatible. However, Aycock

surmises that because Richard is such a self-destructive villain, Shake-

speare added Margaret and her curses to complement his tendencies. Her

curses therefore serve to emphasize Richard's sins and to provide exposi-

tion which establishes connections between Richard III and the Henry VI

plays. Aycock mainly reiterates the familiar view that Margaret is an

agent of divine retribution, with the twist that Richmond is an agent of

Margaret's curses, rather than himself being God's agent. Deserving of

serious consideration, however, is Aycock's point that Margaret is not

necessary to the plot and theme and is present mainly as a supplement to

the self-destructive tendencies of Richard.

175. Birney, Alice Lotvin. Satiric Catharsis in Shakespeare: A Theory
     of Dramatic Structure. Berkeley: University of California
     Press, 1973.

Generally, Birney examines the question of Aristotelian satiric

catharsis. After defining the unifying satiric character as a dramatic

force, she applies her criteria to Margaret in Shakespeare's First Tetra-

log, to As You Like It and Timon of Athens which show how satiric cathar-

sis works in a comic and tragic structure, respectively, and to Falstaff

and Thersites, in whom non-cathartic satiric structures exist. As her

basis for an aesthetic approach to the Aristotelian theory of cathartic

effect, Birney applies the theory to the satirical voice of characters

who expect to effect some kind of societal change through their speech.

More particularly, she takes as her basic premise that the force of satirical expression is rooted in the primitive and archetypal curse. This being her starting place, one is not surprised that she finds Margaret d'Anjou in the First Tetralogy to be a full-fledged satirist. In examining the effect which the satirical character has upon his world and the effect which that world has upon the audience's emotions of hatred and censure, Birney finds, for example, that Margaret persistently speaks a primitive sort of satire--the plain curse. While her curses affect the outcome of the plot of Richard III very little, says Birney, she offers the audience an outlet for rejecting and censuring the evil Richard. However, Birney also concludes that the audience finally rejects both the satirist and her subject, for in Shakespeare's interpretation of the Wars of the Roses, there is no clear separation between catharsis and the multiplicity of evil and fault. Finally, Birney argues that Margaret can infuse her voice with the full power of satire only in Richard III, after she has relinquished the power of action which she exercised in the Henry VI trilogy. However, from this point in the analysis, Birney's indiscriminate application of the terms "curse" and "satire" to the same utterances tends to blur the distinction between what we already know to be curses and Birney's interpretation of them as satirical expressions. Granting Birney's premise that Margaret's curses represent the satirist in a primitive stage, and that in tracing her curses we are identifying the "essence of satire used in drama" (p. 43), we nevertheless remain uncertain as to the distinctions which Birney urges. One excellent observation, however, is her depiction of the women's laments in Act IV as magical incantations. This reminds us of the witches in Macbeth and the interpretation counters the arguments of some critics

that the strictly balanced and mechanically repetitious structure of these lamentations is evidence merely of Shakespeare's immature style.

176. Brown, Morton A. "Two-and-a-Half Secrets About Richard the Third."
     The Georgia Review, 27 (1973), 367-392.

After assessing the historical perspectives on Richard III, Brown reasonably concludes that we must accept the probability that there is no final truth as to Richard's historical self. Brown's title refers to the proverbial notion that "the first secret is what we keep from others, the second is what we keep from ourselves, and the third is the truth" (p. 367). In Brown's judgment, neither historical nor fictional accounts of Richard III have balanced fact with probability, often changing from extremes of the monstrous king to the misunderstood Galahad figure. In a satisfyingly objective review of the more significant works on Richard's historical self from contemporary to the present, Brown provides the reader with a summary of the main issues of what Kendall termed "the great debate" (Item 118, 1965), and he places the treatment of the issues in a sound perspective.

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

Prior studies eight of Shakespeare's history plays, excluding *King John* and *Henry VIII*. Perceiving an epic design in the sequence from *Richard II* to *Richard III*, he writes chapters on sixteenth-century historical concepts and political theory as these relate to Shakespeare's history plays. Prior agrees with the many critics who have concluded that *Richard III* is far more complex than the main outlines of the Tudor Myth would imply. In fact, he claims that the play is a critical

exploration and, to a degree, a rejection of orthodox Tudor political doctrine. Prior touches upon most of the major considerations of theme, character, and history, tracing Richard's origins from the tradition of the tyrant in an informative manner, but his most useful and innovative analysis centers on Richard as a character of mythic proportions.

178. Tanner, Stephen L. "Richard III Versus Elizabeth: An Interpretation." Shakespeare Quarterly, 24 (1973), 468-472.

Ignoring the fact that the same conclusion had been reached by many writers, and as lately as Sheriff (Item 171, 1972), Tanner asserts that Queen Elizabeth defeats Richard III in their battle of stichomythian wit (IV.iv). Tanner specifically opposes Dollarhide (Item 92, 1961), who finds that Richard defeats Elizabeth mainly because in the end she agrees to let him know her daughter's mind later. Through a lengthy review of criticism (perhaps necessary for those unfamiliar with it) on the rhetorical structure of the curses in Richard III, Tanner proves that Dollarhide mistakenly dismisses any unity between the "curse motif" and the "witty king" motif; Dollarhide declares the two motifs incompatible after a certain harmonious phase, and he would simply omit lines 199-432 of the scene in order to maintain smoothness and continuity in Richard's change from witty villain to ignominious tyrant, since Richard becomes fearful, superstitious, and ineffective too abruptly in Act IV after allegedly defeating Anne in verbal wit combat. Like Goddard (Item 21, 1951) and many others, however, Tanner observes that the second wooing scene is not anti-climactic, but is rather a modulation of the wooing of Anne, the result being a graceful alteration of the play's action from ascending to descending.

1974

179. Burkhart, Robert E. "Obedience and Rebellion in Shakepeare's Early
History Plays." English Studies, 55 (1974), 108-117.

In a three-part study, Burkhart concludes that the consensus of
critics have wrongly emphasized the political orthodoxy of Shakespeare's
history plays over their poetic value. Burkhart examines the doctrinal
background of obedience and rebellion, briefly surveying the more impor-
tant criticism of the histories on that theme and studying the concepts
of obedience and rebellion as found in the First Tetralogy and King John.
Contrary to the standard view, Burkhart argues that Shakespeare's pre-
Tudor kings are portrayed as deserving rebellion rather than as meriting
obedience, for rebellion is a means to the desirable rise of the Tudor
dynasty, although as rebellion occurs it may seem undesirable. Since
Richmond rebels in essentially the same way that other Shakespeare kings
do, only with impunity, Brukhart concludes that the doctrine of rebellion
in the plays does not follow the orthodox Tudor doctrine against rebel-
lion, but is inconsistent. There is some merit in his notion that since
Shakespeare found such significant exceptions to the inviolable doctrine
of obedience and non-resistance, therefore rebellions in the plays occur-
red against kings who deserved it; the Tudors, however, who founded their
dynasty upon rebellion, did not deserve to be rebelled against because
they were acting on God's behalf. Burkhart would have benefited consid-
erably from a close reading of Mroz (Item 2, 1941), Danby (Item 16, 1949),
and especially Armstrong (Item 10, 1946).

180. Doebler, Bettie Anne. "'Dispaire and Dye': The Ultimate Temptation
of Richard III." Shakespeare Studies, 7 (1974), 75-85.

In a perceptive study, Doebler concentrates upon the medieval

convention of ars moriendi which for the Elizabethan audience informed

the dream scene of Richard III and Richmond (V.iii). She says that the

scene, with its iconic structure based upon the Temptation to Despair,

is striking in the psychological implications which it held for Shake-

speare's audience, who saw life as a "Pauline battle." The visitation

of the ghosts would have reminded them of the ars moriendi such as in

the fifteenth-century woodcut series depicting the battle for the soul

between the Good Angel and the Bad Angel. For the Elizabethans, says

Doebler, Richard and Richmond in this scene are emblematic of the Good

King and the Bad King lying upon their death beds. However, she contin-

ues, Shakespeare typically extends the moral allegory further by imbuing

Richard III with tragic implications by personalizing Richard's struggle

as a resistance against internal judgment, or conscience. To despair

was to commit the ultimate sin of losing faith in the unstinting mercy

of God for the repentant. Finally, as the ghosts bid him to do, Richard

does despair, turning his back on conscience and taking up the sword in-

stead. Although modern audiences tend to see his bravery in battle as a

redeeming, or at least a sympathetic, quality, Doebler reminds us that

the overwhelming force of Richard's speech has been prepared for by the

temptation to despair which leads him to a desperation of soul and re-

veals him to be lost utterly. Doebler's findings have a bearing upon the

question of the staging of this scene as argued by Fusillo (Item 45, 1955)

and others and is also a companion study to Spivack (Item 74, 1958).

181. French, A. L. "The Mills of God and Shakespeare's Early History
        Plays." English Studies, 55 (1974), 313-324.

French questions the prominence of the retribution theme which so

many critics have found in the First Tetralogy. He reasons, for example,

that since the murder of Richard II is mentioned only perfunctorily and
in legalistic terms, and then only five times in some 12,000 lines, then
the four plays can just as easily be read as crime and punishment, or
hubris and nemesis, beginning with the sins committed after the plays
start rather than with antecedent action. He dismisses as somewhat sen-
timental the notion that Shakespeare would only create plays with order,
justice, and moral equity. French supports his ideas with solid evidence
from the plays, pointing out the many unjust deaths in the Henry VI tri-
logy and the inequity of the guilty Edward's easy death contrasted with
Clarence's guilty suffering, though he is not as guilty as Richard. Nor
do all of Margaret's curses take effect, he notices. French's conten-
tions reflect a tendency by many critics, for example Burkhart (Item 179,
1974), to reject the theme of orthodox sin and retribution in the history
plays. French thinks that Rossiter (Item 95, 1961) is closer than most
critics to the spirit of the plays, yet even Rossiter's notion of "retri-
butive reaction" rather than nemesis must be modified to account for
arbitrary deaths with no stimulus to react to, argues French. If Justice
reigns in these plays, if the "mills of God grind slow but exceeding
fine," then "that Justice--and that God--are incomprehensible to human
minds," says French (p. 323). Just so, but can we be certain that Shake-
speare ever perceived of justice as mathematically equitable?

182. Gurr, Andrew. "Richard III and the Democratic Process." Essays in
        Criticism, 24 (1974), 39-47.

Gurr takes a strictly practical view of politics in Richard III
rather than a literary stance. In a somewhat startling announcement, he
declares that the agent of Richard's defeat is neither God nor conscience,
but Stanley. Yet in this view he echoes French (Item 139, 1968). Stanley

defects to Richmond and in Shakespeare's play is more emphatically the crucial factor in Richard's defeat than in the chronicles. But here Gurr leaves French, who considers Stanley an odious "trimmer," for Gurr says that even at the risk of sacrificing his son-in-law (actually his stepson), Stanley exercises the subject's option not to serve a bad ruler in office, but to choose a good one. According to Gurr, "Shakespeare says" that Stanley represents the subjects of the realm in choosing a good ruler over a bad. Jones (Item 193, 1975) properly scolds Gurr for oversimplifying the political views of both Shakespeare's play and of Elizabethans in general, especially since the very term "democratic" (as Gurr describes Stanley's choice) sounds strange in an Elizabethan context.

183. Harcourt, John B. "'Odde Old Ends, Stolne. . .': King Richard and Saint Paul." Shakespeare Studies, 7 (1974), 87-100.

Reminding us that Shakespeare was the first to repeat Richard III's oath so insistently that we come to see the expression as characteristic of Richard, Harcourt adds very little to Carnall (Item 105, 1963). Harcourt's most significant contribution to the subject is his observation that Richard's oath by Saint John in I.i.149 of the Folio is more appropriate than the "Saint Paul" in the same place in the quartos, since Richard is in this instance about to "baptize" Clarence and also plays the John-like role as the voice of conscience who rebukes the king, Edward IV (although one would have expected Harcourt to cite this allusion as ironic, even grotesque).

184. Higdon, David L. "Shakespeare's King Richard III, V.ii.7-11." The Explicator, 33 (1974), Item 2.

Like many allusions in Shakespeare's plays, the ones in Richmond's

battle oration function simultaneously on several levels and in several

contexts. For example, Higdon notices that the image of Richard as a

"wretched, bloody, and usurping boar" combines references to heraldry,

theology, and classical mythology, thereby compressing three of the

play's central motifs into a space of five lines. In addition, Higdon

discovers a classical allusion to the Calydonian boar behind the puns

and quibbling of Margaret and the others on the boar in the York herald.

Higdon's parallels are indeed striking, but whether Shakespeare or his

characters were aware of an actual allusion to the Calydonian boar has

not been ascertained.

185. McNeir, Waldo F. "Comedy in Shakespeare's Yorkist Tetralogy."
     Pacific Coast Philology, 9 (1974), 48-55.

McNeir suggests that we tend to take the history plays of the First

Tetralogy much too seriously, for "the pattern of English history from

Richard II to Richard III is comic in the sense that it includes usurpa-

tion, troubles, respite, suffering, expiation, deliverance" (p. 48).

Many of the numerous incidents which McNeir notes are inherently comic,

such as the Parliament House scene in which the servants of bitter ene-

mies battle each other with ludicrous enthusiasm (1 Henry VI, III.i),

but he also views the Tetralogy as a whole to be essentially comic, even

in the apparently most deadly serious elements. For example, in 1 Henry

VI "La Pucelle was a comic witch; Margaret is a comic bitch" (p. 49).

Clever rime, but McNeir mainly settles for the established view of Richard

III as comic in the Vice tradition. Still, even this comic analysis

wants clarification, when Richard the comic actor, by the time the ghosts

appear at Bosworth Field, is "in deep schizophrenia, the occupational

neurosis of actors" (p. 55). Even so, while McNeir's sense of the comic

may not be as acute as that of McLaughlin (Item 208, 1977) or Sheriff (Item 171, 1972), he provides an overview of the comic spirit in the First Tetralogy and a superior analysis of the comic mode in the Henry VI plays.

186. Philipox, Vladimir. "Richard III and Macbeth: A Comparative Study." Annuaire de l'Universite de Sophia, Faculte des Lettres, 68 (1974), 117-203.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

187. Toole, William B. "The Motif of Psychic Division in Richard III." Shakespeare Survey, 27 (1974), 21-32.

Toole states that the division motif in Shakespeare's history plays progresses from the division of the two great houses of York and Lancaster to the division within Richard III himself. At first, Richard III controls his public and private selves, Toole says, but like the greater split between the families which causes England to suffer, his divided selves finally turn upon each other and destroy him, inversely saving England. McNeir (Item 159, 1971) offers a similar, but more strictly psychological, view of Richard's split personality. Furthermore, like Cutts (Item 138, 1968), McNeir contends that other characters represent parts of Richard's personality. The most obvious example, and one most often cited, is that of the two murderers of Clarence, representing two sides of Richard's personality in their ironic and grotesquely comic bickering over the merits of conscience. Toole's study is an unusually cogent psychological approach to literature.

188. Weiss, Theodore. The Breath of Clowns and Kings: Shakespeare's Early Comedies and Histories. College Ed. New York: Atheneum, 1974.

As a poet, Weiss approaches selected plays through the perspective

of practicing writers such as Coleridge, Keats, Yeats, Eliot, and Auden.
He views Richard as a wicked superman who holds renewed meaning for the
twentieth century, conditioned as it is by Hitler and preponderant world
atrocities. Unlike Jones (Item 205, 1977) Weiss perhaps assumes too
readily that Shakespeare's early plays are inferior forerunners of his
later, more artistic drama, but Weiss is at his best in comparing the
early histories with the comedies contemporary with them. He speaks with
the authority of a poet when he says that Richard III is the artist, how-
ever perverted, who dreams of imposing a giant will on all his subject
matter. Weiss also recognizes the poetic concept of the Dionysian life
force as it operates in Richard's final elusiveness. In its flagrancy
the force breaks through the customary forms and conventions of society
or morality, he says, and flouts them, exposing their inadequacy and
hypocrisy. Thus like Rossiter (Item 95, 1961), Weiss finds that Richard's
moral abandonment is attractive to the audience, even refreshing. Weiss's
commentary is informal and subjective, although the issues which he
chooses to examine are critically well established and he does them jus-
tice.

1975

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

Like Driver (Item 86, 1960), Berry stresses that, unlike the sources,
Shakespeare's Richard III continually brings the pressure of the past to
bear upon the present, and this is a profound alteration of the sources
to a de casibus genre in which the past overtakes all the characters,
even the young princes who must pay for the sins of their fathers.

Ornstein (Item 168, 1972) has advanced an argument similar to Berry's

assertion that Richard III's system of justice, however grim, does not

belong essentially to the chronicles or to the so-called Tudor Myth.

Shakespeare creates a humanly plausible Richard and adheres to a retrib-

utive scheme of justice based upon the mutability of time and, ultimate-

ly, upon the grim justice of apocalyptic time, argues Berry. He con-

vinces us, as Driver had done earlier, that the Apocalypse informs

Richard III, not as allegory, but as an underlying cultural myth which

joins the play's conception of time with the larger structures of Chris-

tian history, to be found in the Old and New Testament scheme of retrib-

utive justice. Berry expands admirably upon existing criticism dealing

with the theme of retribution and the concept of time.

190. Craven, Babette. "Derby Figures of Richard III." Theatre Notebook,
        29 (1975), 17-18.

Craven discusses the three porcelain heads of Richard III produced

by the potters of Derby. This is not criticism so much as an interesting

insight into the continuing significance of Richard III not only in the

artistic sense, but also in the cultural-economic life of England.

191. Hanham, Alison. "Renaissance Historians and the 'Tudor Myth' of
        Richard III." Parergon, 2 (1975), 33-40.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

192. Hanham, Alison. Richard III and His Early Historians: 1483-1535.
        London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Hanham recognizes the many distortions of Richard III's historical

self which may derive from sources almost exclusively literary rather

than historical, but she argues that there is a good deal of truth in

the negative image of Richard which cannot be attributed simply to the

desire of the Tudors to blacken his name. Hanham deplores the easy dismissal of dramatic sources as historically invalid, and reasonably asserts that the historian may make some allowance for a dramatic element in narrative accounts, but cannot dismiss them as entirely false. Indeed, Hanham takes the hard line that works such as Kendall's biography (Item 46, 1955) which reject the evidence of the dramatic works such as More's and Shakespeare's belong themselves in "the realm of fiction" (p. 197).

193. Jones, Emrys. "Bosworth Eve." Essays in Criticism, 25 (1975), 38-54.

Anticipating his larger work (Item 205, 1977), Jones here responds to Gurr (Item 182, 1974), who argues that the fall of Richard III is brought about, not by Divine Providence or by conscience, but by the democratic choice which Stanley exercised in going over to Richmond (committing his troops, however, only when he clearly could insure a victory) and thus effecting Richard's defeat. Jones complains with some justice that Gurr's thesis leaves Richard III a smaller plan than Shakespeare wrote. In a devastating rebuttal, Jones defends Shakespeare's broad adherence to the orthodox Tudor scheme of history and politics, while recognizing the uniqueness of Shakespeare's interpretation within established bounds, within which democracy, of course, had no place.

194. Jorgensen, Paul A. "A Formative Shakespearean Legacy: Elizabethan Views of God, Fortune, and War." PMLA, 90 (1975), 222-233.

Despite opposing views in Berry (Item 189, 1975) and Ornstein (Item 168, 1972), Jorgensen contends that the Henry VI trilogy begins with a strong notion of Fortune, but that the perspective moves steadily toward a Fortune dominated by God, until in Richard III God dominates totally, with no mention of Fortune. Jorgensen claims that Richard III is based

upon the most uninteresting Elizabethan theory of war: that in which
God is the sole dispenser of victory, a theory which held sway for de-
cades. He further argues that while the legacy of God, Fortune, and War
was, on the whole, successful in the First Tetralogy, the Second Tetra-
logy benefits dramatically from the growth of the legacy toward increas-
ing emphasis upon man's responsibility and resourcefulness. Thus ortho-
dox Tudor political doctrine becomes less certain in the 1590's and by
1595 Shakespeare could leave the "simple doctrinal basis" of Richard III
and begin the intellectually taxing and wary dramatic treatment of such
major Tudor staples as the divine appointment of monarchy and the divine
intervention of God, bringing miraculous aid to a threatened king. Such
dramatically disturbing actions, says Jorgensen, seem to be disapproved
of in Richard III. Jorgensen's analysis of Richard III's orthodoxy is
somewhat outdated and overly formulistic, but his treatment of Shake-
speare's political ideas as they are variously reflected in successive
plays is enlightening, especially in respect to Henry VI as the culmina-
tion of a growing general acceptance of Machiavellian strategems, which
are "concealed like little steel beneath the velvet, and are thus the
more effective though not engaging" (p. 232).

195. Jump, John. "Shakespeare and History." Critical Quarterly, 17
        (1975), 223-244.

Jump speculates that Shakespeare wrote Julius Caesar as a history
play, with the characters of Caesar, Brutus, Antony, and Cassius sepa-
rately embodying the characteristics which he had combined in the earlier
creation of Henry V. As a patriotic, and prudent, man Shakespeare had no
good reason to flout orthodox Tudor political myth, although he utilized
not only the standard providential theory, but the humanist perspectives

of Machiavelli as well in his history plays, says Jump. Richard III, for example, was clearly intended as a ruthless monster who falls to the Deliverer chosen by God Himself as the only means of healing the division and restoring the peace and prosperity of England, but Jump thinks that the fate of Richard III also results from a natural revulsion which caused humanity to rise up and destroy Richard. Nevertheless, Jump argues that in spite of the increasing liberties which Shakespeare evidently took with prevailing doctrine from Richard III to Henry V, he was particularly obliged in these plays to bow to Tudor myth, although many critics have attempted to read satire or irony in his depiction of a lively and perversely attractive Richard III and the ruthless and smooth warrior Henry V as a perfect national hero. But Jump takes an even bolder approach: he speculates that after completing Henry V, Shakespeare decided that he had a "beautifully integrated assembly of external attitudes rather than a man moving and speaking from a single independent center of vitality" (pp. 242-243). Consequently, he chose the subject of Julius Caesar next, a subject remote from the political exigencies of Tudor "history," but a history play nonetheless, and one in which he could create characters displaying individualized traits found in Henry V, but "unburdened by providential interpretation in favor of the Tudors" (p. 243). While Jump offers no concrete evidence that Shakespeare actually had the combined traits of Henry V in mind when he created the idealistic Brutus, the deliberate, cool politician Octavius, or the popular but opportunistic Antony, the parallels are clearly discernible thanks to Jump's unique insights.

196. Neill, Michael. "Shakespeare's Halle of Mirrors: Play, Politics, and Psychology in Richard III." Shakespeare Studies, 8 (1975), 99-129.

The main contribution of Neill's article is its summarization of a variety of significant criticsim (without sufficiently acknowledging the sources, however). One of Neill's more interesting and refreshing observations is his comparison of Richard III and Hamlet, which he feels may be more appropriate than the usual study of Richard as Shakespeare's immature anticipation of Macbeth. One agrees. Both Hamlet and Richard III are concerned with action as a means of realizing what they are and with role playing as a means of realizing what they are not, says Neill. Hamlet recognizes the unviable existential distinction between action and acting, and finding significant action impossible, he gains self-knowledge through a larger faith which makes intellectual questions irrelevant. Interestingly, Neill interprets Richard III as a sort of inverse Hamlet, for Richard's similar declaration of integral self-hood is rooted in despair: "I am myself alone." Unlike Hamlet, Richard can validate his self only through action, says Neill, yet paradoxically because Richard's self exists only in action, lacking an integral core, his actions take the form of acting, a means of concealing his self rather than validating it. Thus, "when Richard's external motives for action are removed, 'Richard,' literally, disappears" (p. 100). Neill offers many interpretations of Richard's character, from psychological to imagaic; yet he manages to discover a consistency of character, theme, and form which happily relates the play's psychological and moral complexities while clarifying its dramatical perspective.

197. Riddell, J. A. "Hastings' 'foot-cloth horse' in Richard III." English Studies, 56 (1975), 29-31.

Riddell shows that Hastings' reference to his "foot-cloth horse" (III.iv.86-88) may not be as casual a remark as editors have thought.

Generally they have followed the New Variorum in glossing the term accord-
ing to the O.E.D.,.1, as the decorative covering of the horse "consider-
ed as a mark of dignity and state," but the meaning of the phrase is
probably closer to the O.E.D.,.3, which has the significant difference
that "foot-cloth" probably refers "not so much to the dignity that ad-
heres in such a decoration as to the quality of the horse" (p. 29). This
definition would add significance to the reference and would clarify the
editors' somewhat misleading gloss, says Riddell, for whether Hastings
refers to his horse or to its decoration, we are concerned with Hastings'
state of mind. If "foot-cloth" means something like "noble steed," this
reveals Hastings' sentimentality. Much as deposed Richard II reflects
upon the nobility of his beast rather than upon the quality of the horse's
ornament, Hastings in this passage is feeling betrayed by man and looks
to the inherent nobility of his horse as a representative of innocence
and honor. Riddell's interpretation reveals the significance of a seem-
ingly casual reference by Hastings and thus adds to our appreciation of
the subtlety of the phrase.

198. Webster, Richard. "Two Hells: Comparison and Contrast Between
        Dante and Shakespeare with Particular Reference to Inferno, X,
        and Richard III, I.iv." Nottingham Mediaeval Studies, 19
        (1975), 35-47.

Webster proposes to show an "ontological" relationship between pas-
sages in Shakespeare and Dante. Similar in theme and equal in stature,
the passages which Webster cites are otherwise disconnected, but he sug-
gests that Shakespeare may have turned contrapuntally to Dante for an
ideological reference to a basically psychological problem in Clarence's
dream. Dante's account of Farinata degli Uberti in Canto X of the Infer-
no and the scene before the murder of Clarence are similar in many

specific respects, and Shakespeare may owe a debt to Dante, among others, for the dream of hell, says Webster. Since tragedy cannot be merely psychological and yet be fully significant, Webster suggests, then Shakespeare's tragedy of Clarence draws upon a certain ideological quality in Dante's image of hell, and thus Clarence's tragedy turns on his appeal to the spiritual world (I.iv.197-201) in the midst of the materialistic power struggle. Webster finally intimates that Clarence's dream is symbolic of the guilt versus innocence in the real world of the Wars of the Roses.

1976

199. Frey, David L. The First Tetralogy: Shakespeare's Scrutiny of the Tudor Myth; A Dramatic Exploration of Divine Providence. Studies in English Literature, Vol. 95. The Hague--Paris: Mouton, 1976.

In a useful summary, Frey begins by identifying three prevailing theories on the question of divine providence in the First Tetralogy. First, Whitaker (Item 36, 1953) suggests that there is no overriding theme in Shakespeare's chronicle plays. Second, in the central-most widely accepted work on the First Tetralogy, Tillyard (Item 7, 1945) contends that the plays exhibit and support the Tudor line that England was under a curse because of the deposing of the annointed King Richard II and that the Wars of the Roses was a punishment which ended only with the ascension of Henry Tudor to the throne. Third, Rossiter (Item 95, 1961) and Sanders (Item 145, 1968) argue that Shakespeare did not fully subscribe to the Tudor theory of history found in the sources, and that the First Tetralogy causes us to doubt the authenticity of the Tudor Myth. Frey develops a case in support of the third position, but he

adequately makes his point long before he completes his argument, his

contention being that Shakespeare created in Richard III, not a scourge

to punish England, but a Machiavel to define the limits of unadulterated

power-seeking, however unsuccessful Richard is.

200. Pederson, Lise B. "From Shakespearean Villain to Shavian Original
      Moralist: Shaw's Transformation of Shakespeare's Richard III
      and Edmund the Bastard." McNeese Review (McNeese State Col-
      lege, La.), 22 (1975-76), 36-50.

Pederson considers Shaw's Andrew Undershaft in Major Barbara to be

a notable adaptation of Shakespearean character and theme. The similari-

ties which she draws between Undershaft, Richard III, and Edmund include

the following: (1) born victims of unfortunate circumstances; (2) firmly

resolved to improve circumstances; (3) ruthless in achieving improved

circumstances; (4) cynically realistic about emotionalism of others; (5)

immune from emotional appeals; (6) scornful of naivete and conventional

morality and piety. Undershaft differs from Richard III and Edmund in

the following details: (1) not presented as a villain; (2) disbelieves

in received morality and substitutes his own. The differences, says

Pederson, reveal Shaw's two major criticisms of Shakespeare: the Bard

made romantic distinctions between the hero and villain rather than cre-

ating realistic characterization; and character in Shakespeare's plays

is based upon received religion and morality rather than upon original

religion and morality. Therefore Pederson concludes that Undershaft

represents a repudiation of Shakespeare's Richard III, deliberately or

not, but her parallels are based mainly upon very general similarities

such as the overcoming of social handicaps, a process which seems to be

distinctly different in Richard the politically powerful, though deform-

ed, nobleman and Undershaft the orphaned, though able-bodied, commoner.

201. More, St. Thomas. <u>St. Thomas More: The History of King Richard</u>
<u>III and Selections from the English and Latin Poems.</u> Ed.
Richard S. Sylvester. New Haven and London: Yale University
Press, 1976.

Based upon the Yale edition of the <u>Complete Works of Sir Thomas</u>

<u>More</u>, Vol. 2, 1963, with additional poems, the English version of More's

<u>History</u> is here made available to the general reader. Sylvester's intro-

duction adds little new information or interpretation to his previous

edition (Item 106, 1963).

1977

202. Becker, George. <u>Shakespeare's Histories</u>. World Dramatists Series.
Ed. Lina Mainiero. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.,
1977.

Becker's chapter on <u>Richard III</u> is a very good plot summary of the

play, with references to well known, but significant, themes. Becker's

is a useful work for the high school or an undergraduate survey course

in Shakespeare.

203. Brownlow, F. W. <u>Two Shakespearean Sequences: Henry VI to Richard</u>
<u>II and Pericles to Timon of Athens.</u> Pittsburg: University of
Pittsburg Press, 1977.

Brownlow deals with two groups of plays, one from the beginning, the

other from the end, of Shakespeare's career. The first group consists of

the early histories, taken apparently in order of composition. The

second sequence, beginning with <u>Pericles</u> as the prologue play to the

later comedies, is more entirely chronological. Brownlow's purpose is to

show that in his last plays Shakespeare returned again to ponder "the

tragic conflict between capacity and imagination of which Richard II, in

prison, is so eloquent an expression" (pp. 8-9). Taking the depiction

of Clarence's dream as the central dramatic scene in <u>Richard III</u>,

Brownlow says that Clarence's first dream vision is a "lyrical epitome
of the strongest themes of 2 and 3 Henry VI: loss of life in the quest
of delusive treasures and the portrayal of ambition as the pursuit of
death" (p. 71). His analysis of the dream as a unifying element in
Richard III is soundly done, but his notion that in the play art triumphs
at the expense of human truth seems to be refuted not only by his own
analysis, but by a significant body of critical commentary.

204. Gross, Mary J. H. "Some Puzzling Speech Prefixes in Richard III."
        Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 71 (1977),
        73-75.

Gross wonders why editors have not questioned the logicality of
speech prefixes which have Richard, the professed court intriguer, ask-
ing Hastings, newly released from prison, about the news abroad and about
the king's health and whereabouts. Furthermore, here Richard swears by
St. John, rather than by St. Paul, the oath which had been associated
with Richard since Holinshed's time. These and other inconsistencies in
the lines Gross would eliminate by adjusting the prefixes so that Hastings
asks what news abroad, Richard relates the news of the king's illness and
his whereabouts in bed, and Hastings swears by St. John; all seem to be
reasonable adjustments.

205. Jones, Emrys. The Origins of Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon Press,
        1977.

Shakespeare biographies have not properly concentrated upon Shake-
speare's mind, says Jones, and his study attempts to show that the Bard
was not a late-blooming natural genius; nor greatly indebted to his intel-
lectual inferiors, the University Wits (except for Marlowe, and, in
Richard III, Kyd). Jones feels that early Shakespearean drama has not

received as much sensitive critical attention as it deserves. Tracing

the origins of the history plays, Jones turns first to the mystery cycles,

which he considers the first historical dramas in their fidelity to

Scriptural history and in which he notices close resemblances to Shake-

speare's histories. Primarily an influence study, Jones' chapter on

Richard III adds greatly to the value of existing criticism with its es-

pecially insightful comparisons between Kyd's Spanish Tragedy and Richard

III. Kyd's play offered two very innovative structural features which

Shakespeare apparently utilized: the presence on stage of Andrea's ghost

and Revenge, whose comments frame the main action into a play-within-a-

play; and the role of Hieronimo as "rememberer" who constantly reminds

the audience of the murderer. Shakespeare adapts the play-within-a-play

concept in Richard himself, while the outer, spiritual frame of the play

becomes more prominent as Richard's egosim meets increasing resistance

from Margaret. In an especially sensitive interpretation of Clarence's

dream, Jones establishes its origins in a number of sources, including

Virgil, the Book of Matthew, and Spenser's Cave of Mammon. Furthermore,

Jones demonstrates his independence of mind by declaring that the wooing

of Elizabeth is not only significant, contrary to important critics such

as Tillyard (Item 7, 1944) and Clemen (Item 59, 1957), but that the scene

is central to the final movement of the play; it is emblematic, frozen

in time in contrast to Richard's hurrying to deal with the rebellious

Buckingham; yet the scene looks to the future when Richard's niece is to

be the wife of Henry VII and the grandmother of the great Elizabeth I.

These and other excellent insights, such as the significance of Bucking-

ham's death on All Soul's Day, make Jones' literary biography standard

reading for those who desire an in-depth view of Shakespeare's sources, and their influence upon the form and theme of his early plays.

206. Kusunoki, Akiko. "A Study of Richard III." Kyoyobu Kiyo (Kitazato University), 11 (1977), 1-17.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

207. Lalu, Iolanda. "Balance and Game in the Study of Theatre." Poetics, 6 (1977), 339-350.

This article analyzes Richard III in terms of game, or play. In Part 1, the dynamic balance in the play is expressed as the dichotomy between appearance and reality. What the audience knows beforehand to be true about richard's motives becomes clear to the players within the play (Richard's opponents) only after Richard has perpetrated his hidden designs. Lalu's digraphs for the drama (a) and for the audience (b) show in mathematical terms how Richard manipulates the balance of positive and negative relationships between players while the audience discerns the true dynamics not only of Richard's motives, but also of the plot structure. In Part 2, Lalu analyzes the theatrical play as a strategic game. Assuming that the characters are players in the sense of a "match" which pits Richard against a collective opponent made up of several nobles, the "Opposition," the analysis focuses upon the deviation of dramatic characters from the optimal strategy (to their best interests) which one would expect from rational players in real life. By first identifying the character's motivation for deviating from the optimal strategy, we should be able then to discover how this deviation (often not in the player's best interest) is the optimal strategy for the playwright, and within the framework of the drama as a work of art. Lalu finds that Richard III contains many of the weaknesses often identified

in his earlier plays (plot over psychology; preaching tone over subtle analysis of moral complexities; fixed characters over developing characters). Nevertheless, she finds Richard III to be connotatively rich enough to provide for several alternative readings. For purposes of her analysis, Lalu chooses the traditional reading of political conflict, which begins with Richard's ambition for the throne and his plans to eliminate the noble obstacles to his goal. Her study is a clear-minded analysis of the character-plot dynamics of the play, and while many critics would no doubt consider her methods too formulated to be valid, most of her conclusions confirm more traditional criticism and could be useful to the openminded (and mathematically inclined) dramatic theoretician.

208. McLaughlin, John J. "Richard III as Punch." The South Carolina
     Review, 10 (1977), 79-86.

Typical of McLaughlin's overly extended analogies in this article is his assertion that Richard's attractiveness to the audience is much like "a child's joy at watching Punch's victim lose his blockhead" (p. 79). Surely there is a happier point somewhere between such a reaction and Aristotle's theories on comedy and tragedy. Both Punch and Richard III have long been crowd-pleasing assassins who have proved endurance upon the stage, but in a sweeping generalization, McLaughlin asserts that recent critical favor toward Richard III derives from the modern sympathy for violence, psychological pathology, and theatricality--all of which Samuel Johnson deems flaws in the play and none of which McLaughlin explains as comic features. Noting the extensive commentary upon the wooing of Anne, McLaughlin offers the paradoxical interpretation that the wooing of Anne is credible as "high comedy," in which Anne submits to the

brute power of Richard's will, analogous to Punch's clubbing his victims

into submission. Shupe (Item 227, 1978) provides a more tenable and sub-

tle criticism of the scene. Especially dubious is McLaughlin's state-

ment that Richard experiences a "bubbling, narcissistic self-love" upon

Anne's strange capitulation. More convincingly, Palmer (Item 8, 1945)

interprets the line "I'll be at charges for a looking glass" as ironic-

ally spoken, in cynical self-loathing, even as Richard is disgusted by

Anne and all his victims for their moral frailty. If the wooing of Anne

is high comedy, says McLaughlin, the wooing of Richard by the citizens

is farce; both scenes are outrageous examples of how "the comic rogue

attains mastery through role," but to return to the analogy of McLaugh-

lin's title, we are left to wonder how Richard's feigned reluctance in

allowing the crown to be pressed upon him, a passive role for all its

contrivance, is analogous to Punch-like "naked aggression." Like Sheriff

(Item 171, 1972) and others, McLaughlin treats Richard's development

from attractive comic rogue to petulant tyrant, but the Punch analogy,

which Shaw (Item 96, 1961) made rather off-handedly, McLaughlin seems to

belabor. Richard's origins in the traditions of the Senecan tyrant, the

Machiavellian Devil-king, and especially the comic Vice figure--all these

remain of more critical interest than Punch.

209. Murph, Roxane C. Richard III: The Making of a Legend. Metuchen,
     N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1977.

This book summarizes the origin and growth of the Tudor Myth and its

shaping influence upon the image of Richard III in history and fiction.

Murph analyzes the trends of historical opinion through a chronological

presentation of works on the subject from 1471 to 1974. Thus she pro-

vides an update of Kendall (Item 46, 1955), whose work she cites as the

most complete and authoritative biography on Richard III. One of her
more valuable contributions is the attempt to distinguish between histo-
rical accounts of the life and death of Richard III and the uncritical
acceptance of those accounts in order to serve a particular bias. Murph
reaffirms the impression that whether biographical, historical, or fic-
tional, most works on the subject of Richard's life tend to take a stand
either for the traditional view of his life and reign as a murderous ty-
rant or for the revisionist view that he is a maligned prince whose
short reign did not allow him to sway history in his favor.

210. "Richard III Society's Richardian Register." Shakespeare Newslet-
       ter, 27 (1977), 27.

The Register covers all aspects of fifteenth-century English life,
and later. The July-August, 1977, edition contains discussions on such
subjects as whether the standard portrait of Richard wearing a hat was
actually painted after his death; included also is a teaching unit on
Richard III tracing his roots and dealing with various aspects of his
life and times. The Society traditionally publishes an "obituary" for
Richard in the New York Times (August 27, 1977). For a list of the wide
variety of books and boar-emblem jewelry provided by the Society, one
can write to the editor, Box 217, Sea Cliff, New York. This is an organ-
ization with which the Richard III scholar should be familiar (Item 225,
1978), if for no other reason than to add the spice of humanity to his
studies.

211. Ross, Charles. "Shakespeare and Richard III." The Listener, 98
       (1977), 110-111.

Ross attempts a thumbnail prosecution of the historical Richard III
as being essentially the unmitigated villain which Shakespeare portrays

in Richard III. Terming Shakespeare a "prisoner of his historical sources" (p. 110), Ross admits that More's History, which later writers took over almost verbatim, was essentially a didactic piece illustrating the evils of tyranny, perhaps as More saw them practiced by Henry VIII, and not history at all in the strictly modern sense. And Vergil's Anglica Historia, written under the patronage of the Tudors, Ross characterizes as an embellishment of hostile Tudor propaganda against Richard. Finally, Ross admits that modern defenders of Richard--and Miner (Item 243, 1980) no doubt knows that most have been women--have found "some things" easy to refute, such as Richard's supposed physical deformity, his alleged involvement in the early murders (Ross avoids mentioning the young princes in the Tower), and various other atrocities which happen to be the foundation of the Tudor image of Richard. One feels that Ross bows to the charges of written sources, however, rather than adhering to the logic of his own refutation of the Tudor image, for he insists that we accept the Tudor picture of Richard as essentially accurate; first, he asserts, because early Tudor commentators on the subject were not "deliberately" writing Tudor propaganda, but were merely interested in writing a good story. Is a good story more accurate because it was not intended as propaganda, even if its effect is to be propagandistic? Like Hanham (Item 194, 1975), Ross seems to think so. Second, Ross offers "pretty well unimpeachable" sources such as Mancini (Item 146, 1969), Richard's contemporary who wrote hostile accounts of his reign to prove the human reality behind the inhuman monstrosity who has stalked the theatrical boards for centuries. But one need only turn to reputable biographers such as Kendall (Item 46, 1955) and to common-sense scholars such as Champion (Item 242, 1980) to discover that to align oneself with

either extreme of the debate, say with Rowse (Item 128, 1966) on the one hand or with Lamb (Item 142, 1968) on the other, is to ignore, or be ignorant of, the balanced perspective long established on the issue.

212. Saccio, Peter. Shakespeare's English Kings: History, Chronicle, and Drama. London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

In a survey which he proposes for students, general readers, and playgoers, Saccio discusses the reigns of eight English kings in Shakespeare's history plays. He attempts to clarify interrelationships between the confusing array of historical characters and events of Shakespeare's histories with historical background rather than with criticism or source studies. His chapter on King Richard III notes the mythical-historical sources of Richard's image as arch-villain from More's History through Holinshed's Chronicles to Shakespeare. Saccio achieves his stated purpose, which is to provide the non-specialist with clarification of historical persons, places, and events as they relate to the kings in Shakespeare's history plays.

213. Silber, Patricia. "The Unnatural Woman and the Disordered State in Shakespeare's Histories." Proceedings of the PMR Conference: Annual Publication of the Patristic, Mediaeval and Renaissance Conference, Villanova, Penn., 2 (1977), 87-96.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

214. Tudor-Craig, Pamela. Richard III. 2nd Ed. Totowa, N.J.: The Boydell Press, Rowman & Littlefield, 1977.

Tudor-Craig catalogues a Richard III exhibition held at the National Portrait Gallery, from June 27 through October 7, 1973. Given the variety of items and their apparent authenticity, she feels that the exhibition not only vividly portrays a moment in time, but also sheds light on the central mystery of Richard's life and reign. For example, she was

understandably moved by the discovery of eight of Richard's nine personal books, which "so faithfully reflect his interests"; these include his Wycliffe New Testament (rediscovered in New York after being lost for one hundred years); then there is his prayer book with the personal plea against his detractors. The exhibition is well represented by the publishers, with key items graphically described and vividly illustrated. The publication also includes a handy index and bibliography.

215. Wentersdorf, Karl P. "The Repertory and Size of Pembroke's Company." The Theatre Annual, 33 (1977), 71-85.

By analyzing the reported texts now believed to have formed part of the Pembroke repertory, including Richard III, Wentersdorf shows that the provincial troupe of Pembroke's men consisted of eleven adult actors, four boy-actors, and about five supernumeraries. To accommodate such a small acting company, he says, they evidently shortened the quarto version of Richard III from forty-three to thirty-three characters. The company could thus perform the play with doubling of roles and a shortened text to allow for off-stage costume changes. Wentersdorf's note is an interesting sidelight to Velz (Item 172, 1972), who presents a sophisticated study of the cause-effect relationship between the necessity of doubling roles and the structure of Tudor plays.

216. Wentersdorf, Karl P. "Richard III (Q1) and the Pembroke 'Bad' Quartos." English Language Notes, 14 (1977), 257-264.

Wentersdorf shows that Q1 of Richard III is indeed a memorial transmission, as scholars have long agreed, except for some serious doubt expressed by Smidt (Item 114, 1964) but later modified (Item 154, 1970). Furthermore, Wentersdorf believes that Q1 was constructed by Pembroke's company while they were in the provinces in 1592-94, the same period

during which related bad texts from that company came into existence.

In this conjecture, he convincingly opposes the assumption that Q1 dates

from shortly before it was registered for publication on October 20,

1597.   Wentersdorf also notes that Smidt (Item 114, 1964) fails to con-

vince that Q1 is a good text and that Smidt (Item 154, 1970) fails in

his modified argument that Q1 represents a Shakespearean revision of a

memorial text.

1978

217. Bacquet, Paul. Les Pièces historiques de Shakespeare. I. La pre-
          mière tetralogie et Le Roi Jean (Le monde anglophone). Paris:
          Presses Université de France, 1978.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

218. Boris, Edna Zwick. Shakespeare's English Kings, the People, and the
          Law: A Study in the Relationship Between the Tudor Constitu-
          tion and the English History Plays. Cranbury, N.J.: Associ-
          ated University Presses, Inc., 1978.

Boris organizes each chapter on the plays into four sections: The

Commons; The Lords; The Crown; and The Law. She emphasizes the impor-

tance of Henry VI in the First Tetralogy from the standpoint of social

custom and legal considerations, and treating Richard III throughout the

book, she thoroughly analyzes the political-legal milieu which finally

produced the historical Richard. In doing so, she indicates Shakespeare's

deep understanding of, and appreciation for, the intricacies of feudal

law and custom. She also makes the important point that the rise and

fall of Richard III marks the end of rule by military conquest in England,

freeing the state for domestic reform.

219. Damian, Grace. "More's Richard III: A Satirical Drama." Moreana,
          57 (1978), 31-37.

In a negative criticism of Hanham (Item 192, 1975), Damian objects that Hanham inappropriately treats More's History of Richard III as satirical drama, rather than as a source of information about Richard. Damian thus feels that Hanham errs in her conclusion that the History contains historical deficiencies because it is "literary" rather than "historical" in form; Damian insists that More intended to write history, not drama, and that Hanham mistakenly evaluates More literarily because his work does not conform to modern historical conventions. Damian thoroughly discredits Hanham's argument, citing inconsistencies and equivocations, anachronisms, and inconsistent terms of analysis among other flaws; but if Hanham shows too little awareness of the historical merits of More's work, Damian neglects the significance of its artistic merits. Jones (Item 205, 1977) offers some clues as to how Shakespeare might have understood More's intentions and of course one can decide for himself by reading More's text (Item 106, 1963).

220. Fox, Alistair. "Richard III's Pauline Oath: Shakespeare's Response to Thomas More." Moreana, 12 (1978), 13-23.

Fox analyzes Shakespeare's response to the single instance in More's History where Richard swears by St. Paul. More perceived Richard as a type of unregenerate soul, says Fox, the anti-Christian scourge of the church. More ironically inverts the Biblical analogy by relating Richard to the Jews who tried to destroy Paul. Thus More used Richard's oath by St. Paul to add an ironic perspective to Richard's character and actions, concludes Fox. Shakespeare's six Pauline oaths indicate Richard's active refusal to emulate Pauline charity and his persistence in a Saul-like defiance of the Divine Will, a major concern which Fox discovers in More. If Fox overstates More's influence on Shakespeare's development of the

Pauline oath, he is substantially more convincing than Carnall (Item 105, 1963) and Harcourt (Item 183, 1974), both of whom claim that Richard is impersonating the unscrupulous St. Paul of medieval tradition.

221. Handelsaltz, Michael. "On History and Politics in Richard III." De'var ha-Savuah (Davar Daily, Tel Aviv), June 23, 1978, pp. pp. 14-15.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

222. Jenkins, Elizabeth. The Princes in the Tower. New York: Coward, McCann & Geroghegan, 1978.

This is another attempt to set the historical record straight, as well as to present a more balanced conception of the historical Richard than that portrayed by writers on either side of the great debate over Richard's true character. Jenkins describes Richard as an able ruler of excellent character who murdered the princes in the Tower, not out of evil intent, but out of what he perceived as necessity dictated by the pressures of the moment and the circumstances of the past. If this is a defense of Richard, it is oblique indeed.

223. Kaiser, Herbert. "Geschichtliches Handeln zwischen Friedensidee und Gewalt in Shakespeare Richard der Dritte, Goethe Iphigenie auf Tauris, Schiller Wallenstein, Gillparzer Einbrüderzwist Habsburg, Dürrenmatt Romulus der Grosse, Eine didaktische Reihe." Literature für Leser. Zeitschrift für Interpretationspraxis und geschichtliche Texterkenntis, 1 (1978), 35-74.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

224. Lyons, Bridget Gellert. "'King's Games': Stage Imagery and Political Symbolism in Richard III." Criticism, 20 (1978), 17-30.

Because as early as 3 Henry VI and from the start of Richard III Richard heeds Machiavelli's credo that the public perceives its leaders by appearance more than reality, Lyons argues that stage imagery is

therefore an extremely important feature of Richard III, because it shows
Richard's success and subsequent failure as a Machiavellian manipulator
of such imagery. Lyons traces the historical sources of the imagery of
a Christian king, showing how Richard exploits it and thus overcomes any
scepticism of the audience in accepting him as legitimate, but his de-
cline and fall is marked by the signs and portents which he had previous-
ly used advantageously, she says. This is an excellent article which re-
veals the growing awareness of Holinshed and Shakespeare that emblems of
kingship were no longer unquestioned symbols of the virtue and goodness
of the monarch to whom they referred, but Lyons is preceded in her analy-
sis by Riggs (Item 161, 1971).

225. Mickel, Maxine, and Joseph McLellan. "The Tudor Conspiracy: Argu-
        ing for the Defense, The Richard III Society." The Washington
        Post, July 13, 1978, pp. D1, D6.

The Richard III Society is dedicated to defending Richard III from
the damning image which history, but particularly Shakespeare's play,
has established. The American branch has 650 members (over 2000 world-
wide), the very existence of which indicates the significance which his-
torical considerations have for the study of Richard III. This group
presents a lively defense of Richard, publishing a newsletter, marketing
souvenir Richard III items, and publishing Richard's "obituary" annually
in the New York Times (Item 210, 1977).

226. Schaper, Eva. "Fiction and the Suspension of Disbelief." British
        Journal of Aesthetics, 18 (1978), 31-44.

In an aesthetic study, Schaper questions the validity of Coleridge's
theory that we can be moved by fiction only if we suspend our disbelief.
Schaper defines "fiction" as a work of art in which a story is told,

presented, or represented. But the suspension theory does not coherent-
ly explain the paradox of our response to characters and events which do
not actually take place, she argues, nor is the theory even a necessary
solution to the paradox. She concludes that the emotions that we feel
when viewing fiction result not despite our knowledge that it is not fac-
tual, but because we know that it is not factual. We respond to it as a
recognizable work of art and can genuinely do so only if we retain our
beliefs about the objects of our emotions. Thus Schaper argues that we
experience "first-order" beliefs of the sort by which we know that the
Richard III on stage is an actor in a play, which is a human artifact;
this makes possible the "second-order" belief through which we respond
to fiction with genuine affection. Schaper's study is a corrective to
the paradox inherent in strict adherence to the theory that belief in
fiction entails a suspension of other, pre-existing, beliefs about life.
The article seems particularly relevant to criticism of Shakespeare's
history plays, criticism which sometimes does not properly distinguish
between art and fact.

227. Shupe, Donald R. "The Wooing of Lady Anne: A Psychological In-
quiry." Shakespeare Quarterly, 29 (1978), 28-36.

Shupe contends that the wooing of Anne is plausible by modern psy-
chological standards, although many critics, including Clemen (Item 59,
1955) have declared it implausible by any standard. Basing his analysis
on the findings of Christie and Geis, who developed a "Mach" scale in
reference to Machiavelli's credo, Shupe determines that Richard is a
"high Mach" character while Anne is a "low Mach." The high Mach prevails
over the low Mach when three conditions are met: a face-to-face interac-
tion; latitude for improvisation; and high stakes. Like Richard, the

high Mach is successful due to his objective adherence to a singular pur-
pose, while a low Mach's belief in fair play and reciprocity allow dis-
traction from willful purpose and leads to defeat. Like most skillfully
applied psychological formulas, Shupe's is satisfying, but the drawback
to psychoanalyzing literary characters are many if in doing so one ig-
nores the audience and the question of validity based upon nonpsychologi-
cal criteria such as dramatic and other artistic conventions. Shupe
wisely makes his study an "inquiry" rather than an inflexible argument.

228. Seigel, Paul N. "Monarchy, Aristocracy and Bourgeoisie in Shake-
        speare's History Plays." Science and Sociology, 42 (1978-79),
        478-482.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

229. Siegel, Paul N. "Richard III as Businessman." Shakespeare-Jahrbuch,
        114 (1978), 101-106.

Siegel characterizes Richard III as the incarnation of the monstrous
bourgeois spirit as it was beginning to evolve in England, anticipating
in Richard the bourgeois behavior when they gained world domination.
Siegel cites copious references to Richard's use of business terminology
and declares him to be very much of the new capitalistic world. However,
Siegel's obvious distaste for bourgeois commercialism seems to have led
him to re-create Richard III into a personality more suitable to Wall
Street than to Medieval castles.

230. Tobin, J. J. M. "Shakespeare and Apuleius." Notes and Queries, 25
        (1978), 120-121.

Tobin contends that Shakespeare turns to Apuleius as a source for
Tyrell's description of the deaths of the young princes in Richard III,
IV.iii.1-2. With parallels between the two works, Tobin makes a

believable case. Indeed, he speculates that Shakespeare may have gone
to the Latin rather than Aldington's translation for his description of
the boy's lips as red roses on a stalk, since Apuleius, but not Alding-
ton, exactly describes the rosy color of Psyche's blood when she acciden-
tally pricks her finger on one of Cupid's arrows.

231. Wenke, John. "A Note on Melville and Shakespeare; Two Moments of
        Truth." Melville Society Extracts, 36 (November, 1978), 7.

Wenke notes that Melville's debt to Shakespeare's plays has been rela-
tively neglected. For example, Ahab's struggle with conscience in the
chapter entitled "The Symphony" is similar to Richard III's single moment
of moral insight in Act V. Ahab rejects his own human limitations, says
Wenke, in the chase for the great white whale. Like Richard on Bosworth
eve, Ahab's struggle with conscience "defines the moral dimensions of
his character while attempting to probe its ambiguity." This is a use-
ful comparison, suggesting that the central question of Richard as a
tragic figure rests in his insight into his own guilt.

232. Wilders, John. The Lost Garden: A View of Shakespeare's English
        and Roman History Plays. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Little-
        field, 1978.

Wilders examines assumptions about human nature which governed
Shakespeare's historical perceptions, no matter which period of history
he wrote about. Reacting against the views and influence of Tillyard
(Item 7, 1944), Wilders rejects the theory that Shakespeare held to the
orthodox Tudor line and wrote the histories uncritically. Typically,
says Wilders, the history plays center upon individuals caught up in
dilemmas which offer no satisfactory course of action, and they call upon
a God who usually does not hear their prayers for aid. Therefore they

often ponder "The Lost Garden" of Wilders' title, which represents the tendency of Shakespeare's historical characters, overwhelmed by present crisis, to look back with regret on an ideal period in the past. Wilders implies that Richard III and Richmond are different mainly because Richmond is successful in his pleas for divine succor--a grossly oversimplified assessment of their relative functions in history as well as drama. Furthermore, like so many critics of the sixties and seventies, Wilders uses Tillyard as a strawman, sometimes attacking his views with merely negative counter-assertions which lack firm argumentative support. Wilders calls vaguely upon "challenges" to Tillyard's views from such critics as Sanders (Item 145, 1968) and Ornstein (Item 168, 1972); Wilders scores some points against the more vulnerable tenets of Tillyard and Campbell (Item 11, 1947), but his argument that Richard is not an agent of Providence is unconvincing. Of course, Shakespeare was aware of many contradictory theories of his time, but Wilders simply makes this awareness a basis for his argument that Shakespeare did not choose a providential theme. Sanders presents a cogent argument for Shakespeare's unorthodoxy in this history plays; Wilders does not.

233. Williamson, Audrey. The Mystery of the Princes: An Investigation Into a Supposed Murder. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1978.

Williamson thoroughly discredits Mancini (Item 146, 1969) as a historical source who has been too readily accepted by such traditionalists as Hanham (Item 194, 1975). Like most latter day commentators on the subject of Richard's true self, Williamson expresses her doubts as to Richard's unmitigated guilt, but she raises more questions than she answers--as is usual in studies founded upon a strong bias.

234. Young, David. "'Myself Myself Confound': The Doctrine of Self in
       Richard III." The Shakespeare Newsletter, 28 (1978), 35.

Young maintains that Richard is successful largely because he is
able to maintain a fictitious "monolithic self," avoiding division be-
tween his self and the world until the other characters expose his weak-
ness and his self is shattered. In light of Richard's open self-analysis
and close rapport with the audience as to his motives (which Young notes),
the statement that Richard "fooled himself as well as us about what he
was really like" wants elaboration. Young presents a hodge-podge of
critical commonplaces without a convincing synthesis. Toole (Item 187,
1974) and McNeir (Item 159, 1971) present unusually fine analyses on the
subject, while Cutts (Item 138, 1968) is less tenable.

1979

235. Brooks, Harold F. "Richard III: Antecedents of Clarence's Dream."
       Shakespeare's Survey, 32 (1979), 145-150.

A long line of commentary upon Clarence's dream anticipates Brooks,
including Clemen (Item 59, 1957), Brooke (Item 115, 1965), Hamilton (Item
132, 1967), Jones (Item 205, 1977), and many others. Brooks cites myriad
parallels between Clarence's dream and episodes in Spenser, Seneca, and
Ovid. However, while he compares phrases and situations in Shakespeare's
version of the Hades dream-vision with many possible sources, none of the
similarities is corroborated by convincing evidence, since the correla-
tions are general and possibly accidental. Later Brooks (Item 240,
1980) argues more effectively for the influence of Seneca in Richard III.

236. Duckworth, Colin. "Louis XVI and English History: A French Reac-
       tion to Walpole, Hume and Gibbon on Richard III." Studies on
       Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century, 176 (1979), 385-401.

Duckworth is concerned whether Louis XVI translated Horace Walpole's
Historic doubts on the life and reign of king Richard III, rather than
Louis's brother. Just as Walpole "rectified" the image of Richard III
the monster-king by casting doubts upon the credibility of Richard's de-
tractors, Duckworth hopes to rectify the image of Louis XVI as an "idiot,"
the reasoning being that if Louis had the intellectual and linguistic
capacity to translate Walpole's Doubts, then he was not the "dunderhead"
of prevailing biographical accounts. Whether Duckworth vindicates Louis
XVI remains open to speculation.

237. Kobayashi, Seiei. "An Essay on Richard III." Collected Essays by
        Members of the Faculty (Kyoritsu Women's Jr. College), 22
        (1979), 1-12.

This work was unavailable for annotation.

238. Lewis, Peter. "Chrononhotonthologos and Richard III." Notes and
        Queries, 26 (December, 1979), 115-116.

Lewis finds an interesting echo of Richard's famous plea for a horse
at Bosworth. At the end of Bombardinion's desperate speech after killing
Chrononhotonthologos, he says, ". . . and in his calling, let him nothing
call, / But Coach! Coach! Coach! Oh! for a coach, ye Gods." Lewis
does not consider this a burlesque of Shakespeare, but finds that the
echo gives added point to the lines suggesting a rhetorical style which
was once powerful and meaningful, but which became overworked so much as
to be completely predictable and empty. We can but agree with Lewis.

239. Mallett, Phillip. "Shakespeare's Trickster-Kings: Richard III and
        Henry V." The Fool and the Trickster: Studies in Honour of
        Enid Welsford. Cambridge, England: D. S. Brewer; Totowa,
        N.J.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1979, pp. 64-82.

Unlike the many critics who say that Richard is a providential

catalyst rather than an impediment to it, Mallett argues that he is not

merely a temporary frustration of Providence; nor is Henry V merely an

elaborate extension of the rather perfunctorily patriotic Richmond.

Henry is a trickster, a Machiavel, says Mallett, like Richard III, and

Henry's image as a golden hero on the side of Right is tarnished by the

realization that the moral order of his world is equivocable. Indeed,

Mallett thinks that Henry V is more of a sham than Richard III himself.

Mallett describes Richard as a jester-king, whom Providence employs,

mocks, and, in the end, imitates. With considerable insight, Mallett

argues that while critics have found it easy to characterize Henry V as

a bright world of honor and heroism emerging from the nightmare world of

Richard III, the accomplishments of Henry are based upon his willingness

to manipulate established moral and legal statutes to bring about his

quest for personal power and to eclipse his father's success. As with

Richard III, Mallett argues, "the trickster has taken over the world of

the play, and the trick has taken over the trickster" (p. 82). Mallett's

assessment of Henry V as a Machiavel is far from original, and his paral-

lels with Richard as a trickster seem a bit forced in places, but

Mallett makes a useful contribution to comparison of two apparently dis-

parate plays.

240. Taylor, Gary. "Copy-Text and Collation (with special reference to
        Richard III)." The Shakespeare Newsletter, 29 (1979), 36.

Taylor advises modern editors to use not one copy-text, but two.

The Oxford Shakespeare Richard III will utilize Q1 for copy-text (for

accidentals) and F1 for a "control-text" (for substantives), he says,

because exclusive use of the good F text would result in a heavier,

literary punctuation less likely to be authorial, while exclusive use of Q would necessitate a large number of emendations from F.

1980

241. Brooks, Harold F. "Richard III, Unhistorical Amplifications: The Women's Scenes and Seneca." The Modern Language Review, 75 (1980), 721-737.

Brooks traces the influence of Seneca in Shakespeare's Richard III, showing particular similarities between the four women of Troades and the four women of Richard III. Basing his argument upon the Duchess of York's emphatic position in the structural pattern, and the structural pattern itself, Brooks finds that Shakespeare's unhistorical amplifications of women prove that he did not depend solely upon Engish dramatical and historical sources, but relied upon a wide range of neoclassical as well as popular dramatic works. The inclusion of the Duchess of York in Richard III was neither obvious nor inevitable for Shakespeare, says Brooks, since, unlike his other women characters, scant reference to her exists in the contemporary sources available to him, but the many parallels between the Duchess and Hecuba in Seneca's Troades, combined with the obvious similarities between Elizabeth and Andromache; between Anne and Polyxena; and between Margaret and Helen of Seneca's play compels Brooks to admit the influence of the Troades in Richard III. Brooks concludes that Richard III successfully combined neoclassical and popular native traditions. Brooks' work is a scholarly and tenable addition to Richard III influence studies.

242. Champion, Larry S. "Myth and Counter-Myth: The Many Faces of Richard III." A Fair Day in the Affections: Literary Essays in Honor of Robert B. White, Jr. Ed. Jack D. Durant and M. Thomas Hester. Raleigh: Winston, 1980, pp. 37-53.

Champion summarizes the historical works which since the late Middle
Ages have contributed to the image of Richard III. In particular, Cham-
pion examines the contexts of More's History of Richard III (1513) and
Tey's The Daughter of Time (1951), because these two works most persua-
sively represent the polarized view of Richard as monster on the one hand
and as an unjustly maligned prince on the other, a point of controversy
best summed up by Kendall (Item 118, 1965). Champion offers a masterful
analysis of More's History as a representative of the intermediate stage
in the use of the biographical or historical example. More's work em-
ploys the medieval technique of allegory, notes Champion, but it also has
many of the qualities of the new realism as in Machiavelli. With equal
skill, Champion analyzes Tey's Daughter as the most cogent defense of
Richard III among the many fictional works on the subject. But a far
more valuable component of Champion's study is his commentary on two
sides of Richard III criticism related to the Great Debate, namely the
schism between the Tillyardian school which gives preeminence to the
moral and political structure of Richard III, an approach which reduces
Richard's character to a kind of symbolic value; and the revisionist
school, which, to the opposite extreme, is totally obsessed, says Cham-
pion, with Richard's dominant personality and uninhibited vitality.
Champion himself opts for a balanced perspective. Rossiter (Item 95,
1961) he finds to the point; and, like Jump (Item 195, 1975), Champion
decides that while Shakespeare was bound by the restraints of the Tudor
Myth, he also exercised his option to create dramatic tension by oppos-
ing Richard's "towering ambition" to "the historical fate that dooms him
to ignominious defeat, the macrocosmic divine control and the microcosmic
spiritual energy" (p. 52). One dare not hope, however, that Champion's

reasonable assessment will be the last word on the centuries-old contro-

versy over Shakespeare's orthodoxy in Richard III.

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

Champion provides a detailed and useful account of criticism signi-

ficant to the study of Shakespeare's history plays from Tillyard (Item

7, 1944) to the present. Recent studies have been characterized by their

break with the traditional interpretation of Tillyard's providential

frame and thus have provided renewed interest in Shakespeare's history

plays, says Champion; furthermore, the willingness of later critics to

view the history plays on their individual merits, rather than as merely

parts of a double tetralogical pattern, enhances the study of Shakespeare's

development as an artist as well as an historical interpreter. In sup-

port of his thesis that Shakespeare's dramatic skills progressively im-

proved as he changes from a fundamentally historic perspective in the

Henry VI plays to a fundamentally tragic perspective in Richard III and

Richard II, Champion argues that in the two Richard plays Shakespeare

clearly intersects the panorama of Tudor retributive history with a focus

upon a central figure, and that these plays mark a point from which

Shakespeare's maturation as a tragic playwright definitely may be traced.

Consequently, Champion analyzes the structural devices which indicate its

broadened perspective over earlier plays, such as the curses, the multi-

ple falls, and the choric scenes, the foil relationships, but with impres-

sive statistical evidence, he shows how Richard III dominates the panorama

and the stage. With Berry (Item 189, 1975), Champion makes the point

that Richard is the first of Shakespeare's characters to be imbued with

an inner life sustained throughout a drama, and in this innovation

189

Shakespeare not only looks forward to tragic heroes of his later plays, but also deviates significantly from his sources. A work such as Champion's is timely in 1980, looking back over some forty years as it does and clarifying the perspective on history play criticism since World War II.

244. Miner, Madonne M. "Neither mother, wife, nor England's queen: The Roles of Women in Richard III." The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare. Eds. Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gayle Greene, and Carol Thomas Neely. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1980, pp. 35-55.

Miner complains that the general trend of criticism, with few exceptions, perceives Richard III as the only rounded character in the play, while the women a priori are treated as lacking in such human characteristics. Furthermore, says Miner, the play itself portrays women as victims for Richard's attempts to interact with women as scapegoats to men, as currency of exchange between men, and as ciphers without men—all unattractive roles, of course. Yet Miner brilliantly proves that critics' general acceptance of such roles has been short-sighted, as she charts a progressive interaction between the women which gradually leads to their assertion of their common humanity. She specifies four key scenes: I.iii, in which the women of different Houses are hostile to each other; II.ii, in which the women of the same House are hostile to each other; IV.i, in which the women's tendency away from commiseration and toward self-indulgence reverses itself; and IV.iv, in which the women of York join Margaret in cursing Richard. Finally, Miner considers birth metaphor as a clarification of the double role of women in the play. She concludes that the perversion of such metaphors suggests the negative condition of women as ciphers deprived of human identity and dignity;

while the persistence and importance of these metaphors emphasize the positive condition of women as individuals with considerable power and human value. Miner's criticism adds significant insight to Richard III criticism. She is not content to simply grind the axe of the women's movement, but goes to the heart of Shakespeare's complex portrayal of women characters as pawns in Richard's obsessive game of power, pawns whose humanity rises up in mutual sympathy, giving these female characters an emotional solidity which critics (but not Shakespeare) have denied them.

245. Weber, Karl. "Shakespeare's Richard III, I.iv.24-33." The Explicator, 38 (1980), 24-26.

Weber adds interpretation of specific imagery to the many commentaries upon Clarence's dream. Like Brooke (Item 115, 1965) and Clemen (Item 59, 1957), Weber notes the undersea vision as a foreshadowing of later elements in the play, but he examines such specific details of imagery as the shipwrecks (the ship of state under Richard); the corpses of drowned men gnawed upon by fishes (the ravenous Richard feeding upon the body of England--his own misshapen body, pre-natal teeth, and the biting imagery associated with him throughout); and the vast wealth in gold and gems replacing the eyes in skulls (the spilled wealth of England under Richard III and the contrast of mortality and eternity). Weber further examines the connection between the details of Clarence's undersea vision and the scornful, gem-like eyes of Richard which mock every thing good or sacred. Weber makes good use of established criticism of the passage.

VITA

James Alton Moore

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: A SELECTIVE AND CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SHAKESPEARE'S RICHARD
      III: 1945 TO 1980

Major Field: English

Biographical:

    Personal Data: Born in Elkhart, Texas, October 16, 1937, the son
        of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Moore. After death of father, stepson
        of Mr. H. L. Main.

    Education: Graduated from Grapeland High School, Grapeland, Texas,
        in May, 1956; received the Bachelor of Science in Education de-
        gree from North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, in 1965;
        received the Master of Arts degree from North Texas State Uni-
        versity, Denton, Texas, in 1967; enrolled in the doctoral pro-
        gram at the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, 1969-73;
        completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at
        Oklahoma State University in May, 1982.

    Professional Experience: Graduate teaching assistant, North Texas
        State University, 1965-67; English instructor, East Central
        State University, 1967-69; Assistant Professor of English,
        East Central State University, 1970-82; graduate teaching asso-
        ciate, University of Oklahoma, 1971-72; graduate teaching asso-
        ciate, Oklahoma State University, Spring, 1980; Associate Pro-
        fessor of English, East Central State University, 1982.

    Professional Organizations: Member, OCTE, SCMLA, Kappa Delta Pi,
        and Sigma Tau Delta.