REFLECTIONS OF THE BIBLE IN SHAKESPEARE'S RICHARD III

By

FLEUR FULLER

Bachelor of Arts

Texas Technological College

Lubbock, Texas

1960

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
August, 1962

REFLECTIONS OF THE BIBLE IN SHAKESPEARE'S RICHARD III

Thesis Approved:

David S. Berkeley
Thesis Adviser

Daniel R. Kroll

Roscoe Thaxton
Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Dr. David S. Berkeley for the idea which led to this study and for numerous contributions while the investigation was being made. I am also indebted to Dr. Daniel Kroll for several valuable suggestions, to Mr. Joe F. Watson for help in Biblical interpretation, and to Miss Helen Donart for assistance in procuring books through inter-library loan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

That Shakespeare's works are saturated with Biblical allusions is indisputable. Even the most casual reader of Shakespeare cannot fail to recognize many direct Scriptural references; and, through the years, Shakespearean scholars have brought to light numerous other allusions which, even though less obvious, are certainly highly probable. Richmond Noble finds that "Shakespeare definitely made identifiable quotations from or allusions to at least forty-two books of the Bible,"[1] and Noble lists such allusions in each of the thirty-six plays attributed to Shakespeare. Burgess says:

> His Biblical allusions are found in every page of his greater plays and his poems constantly reveal some spiritual thought. One cannot read any of his works, with an open mind, without being frequently surprised with a gem, hitherto undiscovered, and the Bible is very frequently its source.[2]

And Kenneth Muir comments, "The Bible has left its mark on every play in the canon."[3] Throughout the plays Shakespeare's reliance upon the Bible can be noted in references to Biblical facts and characters, in scriptural phrasing, and in passages related in thought to Biblical principles. Although many of these allusions probably escape most readers of Shakespeare today, it is probably safe to assume that

these allusions were recognized by the Elizabethan audience, which heard the Scripture read daily in church. The value of a study of Shakespeare's use of the Bible lies in the fact that since Shakespeare made such extensive use of this source, he doubtless employed such Scriptural references to fulfill some artistic purpose. Surely it was to the advantage of the play that these allusions be recognized; there seems no other logical explanation for Shakespeare's extensive use of them.

Although there is a great deal of scholarship concerned with Shakespeare's use of the Bible, many facets of this study remain largely uninvestigated. Bishop Wordsworth's comment in 1864 that the study of Shakespeare's reliance on the Bible is "far from being exhausted" remains true even today.[4] As well as I can ascertain, there are five full-length works devoted to a study of Shakespeare's use of the Bible. None of these, however, deals with the artistic function of the Biblical allusions within the single plays. Hamilton Coleman's Shakespeare and the Bible is but a brief study which deals cursorily with parallels which are chiefly thematic, and many of which cannot be shown to have been derived from the Bible.[5] The other four works, which are of decidedly more value than Coleman's, are about equal to one another in worth and quite similar in purpose and method. Bishop Charles Wordsworth's Shakspeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible is the earliest full-length study in this area. Although later studies

have relied heavily upon his work, Wordsworth's approach is more suited to the Biblical scholar than to the Shakespearean scholar: this approach is indicated in the preface in which Wordsworth states that the purpose of the study is to enable the reader to understand better the Bible and Shakespeare, "but especially the former."[6] The chief contributions of Wordsworth's work are his lengthy cataloguing of allusions and his strong argument for the contention that Shakespeare had an extraordinary knowledge of the Bible. Chronologically, the next major work in this area is that of William Burgess. This study, too, is composed primarily of a cataloguing of allusions, only a few of which were not found by Wordsworth. Thomas Carter's Shakespeare and Holy Scriptures establishes the fact that Shakespeare's version of the Bible was, for the most part, the Genevan translation of 1560; and Carter includes several allusions not found by either Wordsworth or Burgess.[7] Richmond Noble's study contains essentially the same allusions presented by his predecessors, although he rejects some of their allusions and introduces several of his own findings. Since each of these studies deals either with all of the plays or with a majority of them, these treatments are, of necessity, superficial ones which approach Shakespeare's art critically only occasionally.

Too, there are numerous brief studies which deal with certain isolated allusions occurring in the various plays, likeness of certain characters to Biblical characters, and

general Biblical themes. However, there are no detailed critical studies in this category which examine Shakespeare's use of the Bible in relation to the over-all effect produced by this source in Richard III, the play selected for this study.

The purpose of this thesis is to examine minutely the allusions occurring in Richard III and to study the function which they serve in relation to theme, characterization, and plotting of the play. Rather than to endeavor to do a cursory study of all of the plays, a study which seems to be almost exhausted, this thesis will present a detailed analysis of the artistic function of Biblical allusions in only one play. A limitation of this type of study is the fact that no generalizations can be drawn from this one play which extend to Shakespeare's other plays. However, a study of the entire canon would be necessary before generalizations could be made concerning the pattern which these allusions might form.

This study attempts to avoid any ideas based largely on conjecture. Therefore, it will not attempt to determine whether or not Shakespeare himself was a Christian, the amount of home or school instruction which he received in the Bible, or even whether or not Shakespeare, through his characters, was trying to propound any certain philosophy in relation to Biblical principles. Studies such as these would be largely unfounded and, therefore, would be of little value. By the same token, this study will not deal

with doubtful allusions which have been the subject of controversy. And the possible references which are not direct ones should be considered as Biblical parallels rather than allusions since we have no conceivable way of determining whether or not they were intended by the playwright. However, the fact that Shakespeare's works are so steeped in obvious allusions indicates that possible Biblical references, although not indisputable ones, should be mentioned in this study.

In order that the influence of the Bible in Richard III may be fully analyzed, this study has been divided into four sections: considerations of theme, characterization, plotting, and style. Since an understanding of the relation of the Bible to theme is necessary to any insight into other areas, theme will be dealt with first.

CHAPTER I

THEME

While divine vengeance is the major theme of Richard III, there are other Biblical refractions of this theme which appear in various portions of the play and which serve to illustrate, elaborate, and generally support this primary theme. In order to provide a basis for this general theme of divine punishment, the Biblical sub-themes which are integral to the major theme will be treated first.

Minor Themes

The several minor Biblical themes occurring in the play which support the major theme do so in that these sub-themes consist of either virtues which one must cultivate in order to escape God's wrath, or pitfalls which, if not avoided, lead to eternal punishment.

The Biblical virtue which is most elaborated upon in the play is that of charity, of returning good for evil. Rivers says, "A virtuous and a Christian-like conclusion, / To pray for them that have done scathe to us,"[1] Margaret says to Buckingham, "Uncharitably with me have you dealt" (I, iii, 274), and the Duchess expresses the wish that God give Richard the virtue of charity (II, i, 107-108). Richard,

in gloating over his hypocrisy, says, "But then I sigh; and with a piece of scripture / Tell them that God bids us do good for evil" (I, iii, 334-335). Biblical analogues to this virtue are found throughout the New Testament in such passages as "Recompense to no man evil for evil,"[2] "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good" (Romans 12:4), "See that none render evil for evil unto any man..." (I Thessalonians 5:15), "...above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness" (Colossians 3:14), and "...Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you" (Matthew 5:44). (This last passage seems to be a direct source for Rivers' allusion to the virtue of charity.) It is on charity, which demands peacemaking, that King Edward bases his hope of redemption; for he has made a feeble attempt to satisfy Paul's commandment to "...be at peace among yourselves" (I Thessalonians 5:13) by trying to reconcile the members of his family and court. Edward says (II, i, 49-51):

> ...We have done deeds of charity;
> Made peace of enmity, fair love of hate,
> Between those swelling wrong-incensed peers.

Another Biblical virtue given recognition in Richard III is that of humility or meekness. The Duchess says to Richard, "God bless thee; and put meekness in thy mind" (II, ii, 107). And Richard, in a speech which epitomizes hypocrisy, says, "I thank God for my humility" (II, i, 72).

Biblical passages among others which laud humility are "Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering" (Colossians 3:12). "Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 18:4), and Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth" (Matthew 5:5). In relation to this last passage, Richmond does, in effect, inherit the earth; and his humility is seen in his recognition of God's hand in his victory over Richard, who feels complete self-sufficiency.

A pitfall which is warned against in the Scriptures and which is an implicit sub-theme of Richard III is that of human certainty.[3] As Masefield notes, this foolish assurance is possessed by all who die and is a major contributing factor to the downfall of each.[4] Richard feels his state secure until the last act of the play. Clarence, Buckingham, Grey, Ratliff, and Vaughan are certain of Richard's friendship until it is too late. Hastings explicitly says that his life is secure: "Thank you, but that I know our state secure, / I would be so triumphant as I am?" (III, ii, 83-84). There is extreme irony in his reply to Catesby's doubts as to their security (II, ii, 57-59):

> But I shall laugh at this a twelve-month hence,
> That they who brought me in my master's hate,
> I'll live to look upon their tragedy.

Even the young princes go to sleep unaware that they will

not awake. And Anne doubtless would not have identified herself with Richard's treachery by marrying him had she suspected how soon she would have to answer for her sins. These politically ambitious characters, as the rich man in Christ's parable who stored up food and grain to last for many years so he could "eat, drink, and be merry" (Luke 12:16-20), compounded their sins, so certain were they of life; and, like the rich man, they died, in Catesby's words, "When...unprepared and looked not for it" (III, ii, 65). The sudden awareness of the characters of their true state can be paralleled to the psalmist's statement: "How are they brought into desolation as in a moment! They are utterly consumed with terror" (Psalms 79:19). In relation to certainty of life, James writes: "...ye know not what shall be on the morrow. For what is your life? It is a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away" (James 4:14). Each of the characters, and especially Richard, fails to realize that, as James says, "If the Lord will, we shall live, and do this or that" (James 4:15). Margaret's predictions and curses indicate to the audience the actual insecure position of each character, but her prophecies go unheeded by the personages in the play until the moments of their disillusionment.

A pitfall which Clarence issues a warning against is that of placing civil authority above divine authority. When the murderers come to kill him, ostensibly upon orders of King Edward, Clarence warns them that the "King of Kings"

forbids murder, and that they are in danger of spurning the edict of God to fulfill that of a mortal (I, iv, 200-203). The Bible maintains that honor is due to kings and that one must submit himself "...to every ordinance of men for the Lord's sake: whether it be the king, a supreme; or unto governors" (I Peter 2:13-14). However, this commandment, as well as that of "...render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar's and unto God the things which be God's (Luke 20:25). is apparently based on the assumption that civil law and divine law do not conflict. These passages are clarified in Matthew's admonition: "Fear them not which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matthew 10:28), a passage which leaves no doubt but that the law of God, when it is contrary to that of man, is to take precedence. Peter in Acts is also express upon this point when speaking of a governmental edict prohibiting preaching in the name of Jesus in Jerusalem:

> ...the high priest asked them, Saying, Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? And behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us. Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, "We ought to obey God rather than men (Acts 5:28-29).

(This discussion between Clarence and the murderers also concerns the sin of usurping God's vengeance, a problem which is dealt with at length by Lily B. Campbell.)[5] Elizabeth too evidences an understanding of the Biblical principle

concerning a conflict between civil and divine law when she shows unwillingness to promote a match between Richard and his niece. Richard says, "Tell her, the king, that may command, entreats" (IV, iv, 345); and Elizabeth counters, "That ...which the king's King forbids" (IV, iv, 346), referring, no doubt, to the Levitican commandment that "None of you shall approach [marry] any that is near of kin to him..." (Leviticus 18:6).

Another sin recognized in Richard III is that of ingratitude. Dorset reminds his mother (II, ii, 89-95):

> ...God is much displeased
> That you take with unthankfulness his doing:
> In common unworldly things is called ungrateful,
> Which with a bounteous hand was kindly lent;
> Much more to be thus opposite with heaven,
> For it requires the royal debt it lent you.

Bishop Wordsworth notes that this speech recalls Job 1:21:[6]

> ...Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither: the Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed is the name of the Lord.

Ingratitude is a sin against which the Israelites were frequently warned (Deuteronomy 32:8) and one which Paul says is characteristic of the wicked (II Timothy 3:2).

A sin which finds mention once in the play is that of swearing. When Buckingham says, "...zounds, I'll entreat no more..." (III, vii, 219), Richard says with feigned horror, in order to appear pious before the citizens gathered with Buckingham, "O do not swear, my lord of Buckingham" (III, vii, 220). Although the value of this principle is

not strengthened in the play, since it is Richard who condemns swearing, this instance does give recognition to the third of the Ten Commandments (Exodus 20:7) and to Christ's admonition (Matthew 5:34-37):

> But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: Nor by earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

Christ's condemnation of swearing is also echoed by James in James 5:12.

Another sub-theme supports the Biblical teaching that an inordinate devotion to money leads to sin. There are two instances in the play which parallel the Biblical warning that "...the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows" (I Timothy 6:10). The first exemplification is related to the murder of Clarence. The second murderer struggles with his conscience and is reluctant to kill Clarence until the first murderer reminds him of the reward (I, iv, 126-127):

> First Murd: Remember our reward, when the deed is done.
> Sec. Murd: 'Zounds, he dies! I had forgot the reward.

And then the latter flippantly remarks that his conscience is "In the Duke of Gloucester's purse" (I, iv, 131). Later in the play, Richard, wishing to arrange the deaths of the

princes, says to a page, "Know'st thou not any whom corrupting gold, / Would tempt unto a close exploit of death?" (IV, i, 35-38). And the page replies (IV, i, 39-42):

> My Lord, I know a discontented gentleman,
> Whose humble means match not his haughty mind:
> Gold were as good as twenty orators,
> And will, no doubt, tempt him to anything.

In both of these cases, the sorrow which Timothy says often follows coveting after money is felt. The second murderer of Clarence shows his regret with a Scriptural allusion by saying, "How fain like Pilate, would I wash my hands / Of this most grievous guilty murder done!" (I, iv, 279-280). And the murderers whom Tyrrel hires to kill the princes are so stricken "...with conscience and remorse; / They could not speak" (IV, iii, 20-21).

Major Theme

Lily B. Campbell points out that basic to all of Shakespeare's histories and tragedies is the Biblical principle that "the wages of sin is death."[7] Equally applicable as a statement of theme for Richard III are the admonitions that "...Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord" (Romans 12:19), "...be sure your sins will find you out" (Numbers 32:23), and many other similar Biblical warnings. Divine retribution is indeed the major theme of Richard III. The most obvious evidence of the pervasiveness of this theme in the play is the fact that all the important characters who flaunt God's will eventually come to

destruction, and that even Richard, who is the scourge of God, is felled by Richmond, who brings redemption to England. Although the idea that evil will be paid with evil could conceivably have numerous non-Biblical sources, Shakespeare's use of this principle is undoubtedly derived from the English Bible, for Scriptural allusions and terms are employed in relation to each of the deaths occurring in the play.

Inherent in the Christian belief that evil is repaid with evil is that idea of punishment being extended after life, and it is in this Biblical doctrine that the most overwhelming proof of Shakespeare's imposing of Biblical concepts on the general theme is found. Although there are two Scriptural types of punishment for evil, earthly and eternal, with the exception of death as an earthly punishment,[8] it is only eternal punishment which is explicitly stated as certain. Specific groups, such as the Israelites, were at times promised earthly punishment for their sins;[9] but apart from death, the only type of assured earthly punishment for mankind in general which can even be inferred from the Bible is that of alienation from God (Galatians 4:18-19), a punishment with which the evil persons in Richard III are unconcerned because of their thoroughgoing wickedness. In fact, there are New Testament indications that certain physical occurrences which men consider catastrophic are not to be interpreted as divine judgments. When He is told of the Galileans whom Pilate has killed, Christ replies (Luke 13:1-4):

> ...Suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they suffered such things? I tell you Nay....Or those eighteen, upon which the tower of Siloam fell, and slew them, think that they were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay....

There are Biblical instances of several types of physical suffering, but this suffering is inflicted for purposes other than punishment of sins.[10] That certain physical suffering is a result of sin is unquestionable, but the Bible does not maintain that this suffering is inflicted by God. Rather, evil is often a natural consequence of evil: "...whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (Galatians 6:7). Richard is a notable exemplar of this principle: through his own ruthless usurping of the crown, he arouses enmity and places himself in a position to be destroyed at the hands of men. As Richard himself says, "...sin will pluck on sin" (IV, ii, 65). All of the major characters do, however, appear to receive both types of punishment; and although eternal punishment is the more distinctive of the New Testament, the characters acknowledge that their earthly punishment, in the form of unnatural death, is the vengeance of God at work. Margaret's curses prophesy both types of punishment. She refers to physical punishment when she says, "They that stand high have many blasts to shake them; / And if they fall, they dash themselves to pieces" (I, iii, 269-260), and (I, iii, 213-214)

> ...God I pray him,
> That none of you may live your natural age,
> But by some unlook'd accident cut off.

These warnings, however, are overshadowed by her predictions of eternal damnation for all; and when she says of Richard, "Sin, death, and hell have set their marks on him" (I, iii, 293), she shows the progression of the wicked from sin to physical death and, finally, to the "second death," which, as described in Revelation 21:8, is everlasting damnation. That the wicked receive this eternal punishment is borne out by the motif of damnation which pervades the play. In Clarence's dream it is in Hell that he meets Warwick, who is apparently also doomed (I, iv, 48-49). Queen Elizabeth acknowledges that her husband is in "his new kingdom of nere changing night" (II, ii, 46),[11] and Margaret speaks of him being in "eternal darkness" (I, iii, 269). Elizabeth also suggests that even the young princes will be "fix'd in doom perpetual" (IV, iv, 12), and Margaret again bears her out by saying that the "infant morn" of the princes has changed to "aged night" (IV, iv, 16). Hastings is in the "fatal bowels of the deep" (III, iv, 103), and Stanley is warned that should he betray Richard, Stanley's son George will fall into "the blind cave of eternal night" (V, iii, 62). Although this darkness imagery is perhaps a rhetorical way of alluding to death, this imagery seems also to refer to eternal damnation since Biblically darkness is often associated with Hell as light is with Heaven. John says that in Heaven there shall be no night (Revelation 21:25), and Christ contrasts Heaven with the "outer darkness" of Hell where "...there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matthew 8:11-12).

This general theme of vengeance can best be substantiated through a consideration of the sins and punishment of each of Richard's victims and, last, of Richard himself. Clarence, the first to die, has certainly reaped what he has sown. When telling Brakenbury of his dream, he explicitly acknowledges his guilt: he confesses, "...I have done those things, / Which now bear evidence against my soul" (I, iv, 66-67). His guilt is further borne out when the murderers remind him of his "false foreswearing" and his murder of Edward Prince of Wales (I, iv, 207). "False, fleeting, perjur'd Clarence" has broken God's law on two major counts. His statement to the murderers that God "Hath in the tables of his law commanded / That thou shalt do no murder..." (I, iv, 201-202) indicts Clarence as well as the murderers, and within this statement is doubtless an allusion to the fact that the Ten Commandments were written on tables of stone. Clarence's foreswearing, although it could fall under any of several Scriptural edicts against lying, is most explicitly warned against in Ecclesiastes 5:4, which reads "When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it; for he hath no pleasure in fools: pay that which thou hast vowed," and in Matthew 5:33, when Christ says, "...Thou shalt not foreswear thyself, but shall perform unto the Lord thine oaths." Clarence's vow was certainly one sworn before God, for he received the holy sacrament "To fight in quarrel of the house of Lancaster" (I, iv, 209). That Clarence is fully aware that his fall has come as a result of his sins is seen in his prayer (I, iv, 69-72):

> O God! if my deep prayers cannot appease thee,
> But thou wilt be avenged on my misdeeds,
> Yet execute thy wrath in me alone,
> O spare my guiltless wife and my poor children!

And in pleading with the murderers, he cries of God, "...he holds vengeance in his hands, / To hurl upon their heads that break his law" (I, iv, 204-205). Clarence's belief in and fear of the Biblical after-life are seen in his dream that he has drowned and found himself in Hell. To Brakenbury he says, "...my dream was lengthen'd after life; / O then began the tempest to my soul" (I, iii, 43-44). Clarence's concept of Hell appears to be that of mental torment and that of a place, both of which can be inferred from the Bible. His mention of the "tempest to my soul" suggests the former concept; the "legion of foul fiends" (I, iii, 58), which Matthew associates with Satan as his emissaries (Matthew 12:26-27; 25:41), and the "hideous cries" (I, iii, 60), which are reminiscent of "wailing and gnashing of teeth" (Matthew 13:42), present the latter concept, that of a literal interpretation of the Biblical Hell.

The next of Richard's victims are the Queen's relatives: Rivers, Vaughan, and Grey. Although Rivers maintains their innocence and says that they will meet in Heaven, their guilt is certain and is confessed by Grey, who says, "Now Margaret's curse is fall'n upon our heads, / For standing by when Richard stabb'd her son" (III, iii,15-16). In effect, this is recognition that they are receiving the vengeance of God since it is God's justice upon which Margaret's curses and predictions are founded. Also,

Hastings suggests eternal punishment for the trio in his answer to Catesby's statement that it is a vile thing to die unprepared; Hastings replies, "...and so falls it out / With Rivers, Vaughan, Grey..." (III, ii, 66-67).

The arrogant Hastings too has sown the seeds for his own destruction. He is guilty of knowing his "state secure" (III, ii, 83), which results in his seeking more for the "grace of mortal men" than for the "grace of God" (III, iv, 98-99). Proverbs 23:34, "Yea, thou shalt be as he that lieth down in the midst of the sea, or as he that lieth upon the top of a mast," is strongly echoed in Hastings' speech (III, iv, 100-104):

> Who builds his hopes in air of your good looks,
> Lives like a drunken sailor on a mast,
> Ready, with every nod, to tumble down
> Into the fatal bowels of the deep.

The deaths of the two young princes and of Anne present a special problem since their appearances are brief and since evil deeds on their parts are not elaborated in the play. If the theme of divine retribution holds true in their cases, their destruction is perhaps a result of heritage. Heredity, of course, can convey depravity down the stream of life, and just as "A good man leaveth an inheritance to his children's children" (Proverbs 13:24), an evil person creates an unfavorable environmental influence on his children. Thus Anne, and perhaps even the princes, are corrupted by the depravity of the age and are, as Rossiter calls them, "the helplessly guilt-tainted"[12] through environment. Anne's

guilt, of course, is more apparent than that of the princes. She is tainted with the sins of the House of York; and the fact that she is weak enough to marry her husband's murderer suggests that she could hardly be guiltless herself. At least, this weakness she shows serves thematically to prevent complete outrage on the part of the audience at her being murdered.

Although Anne's sins seem fairly certain despite their not being elaborated, there are two possible interpretations of the deaths of the two young princes. Since there is evidence throughout the play that the entire House of York has fallen from divine favor as rulers of the age, logic demands the princes' removal. And consistency suggests that their destruction is in punishment of their sins. From certain suggestions in the play, although they are slight, the princes' deaths could be construed to be, like those of the other characters, the result of the vengeance of God. In one scene the older prince's actions could be interpreted as arrogance and petulance, and the younger boy's baiting of Richard as cruelty or malice (III, i). Too, Elizabeth gives support to the view that the princes' deaths are deserving when she suggests that they will be "fix'd in doom perpetual" (IV, iv, 12).

On the other hand, however, the boys appear also to be merely innocents who suffer, as suggested by Richard's remark that the boys rest in "Abraham's bosom"[13] (IV, iii, 38) and by the other characters' frequent references to the innocence and purity of the boys. It is significant

also that Shakespeare generally deals with children sympathetically, as seen in his treatment of Macduff's children. And although consistency would suggest that the boys' deaths, like those of the other characters, are punishment by God through Richard, the princes' portrayal as innocents seems to overshadow suggestions of evil tendencies on their parts. And in this respect the boys appear to be murdered not as punishment for their sins, but by reason of their parents' sins. And in line with this interpretation, the boys serve primarily to provide character foils for Richard rather than to bear out directly the theme of divine retribution.

Buckingham recognizes both his sin and the justice involved in his punishment; for he says, "Wrong hath but wrong, and blame the due of blame" (V, i, 29), which suggests Psalms 7:14-16:

> Behold, he travaileth with iniquity, and hath conceived mischief, and brought forth falsehood. He made a pit, and digged it, and is fallen into the ditch which he made. His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violent dealing shall come down upon his own pate.

Buckingham acknowledges that his fall is a result of the vengeance of God when he observes, "That high All-Seer that I dallied with / Hath turn'd my feigned prayer on my head" (V, i, 20-21). And he indicates that his punishment will extend beyond physical death by saying, "...This All-Soul's day to my fearful soul / Is the determined respite of my wrongs" (V, i, 18-19).

The sins and punishment of Richard present an interesting problem in relation to theme since he is, as Rossiter points out, not simply the last and worst of the victims of God's vengeance. Rossiter observes:[14]

> Richard is in effect not only a demon incarnate; he is God's agent in a predetermined plan of divine retribution: the scourge of God....In a real sense, Richard is a King who can do no wrong; for in the pattern of the justice of divine retribution on the wicked, he functions as an avenging angel.

It seems then that since Richard is foreordained to mete out justice, but yet is punished for doing so, that the theme that "the wages of sin is death" is exemplified on two levels, levels which are paradoxical in themselves. On one plane, Richard is not different from the other personages in the play; his sins are of the same nature as theirs, and he is punished as are the other characters. On another plane, however, Richard as the scourge of God is destined to punish others for their sins and by doing so is but carrying out God's plan. That Richard is a scourge is unquestionable: Margaret recognizes that "Sin, death, and hell have set their marks on him" (I, iii, 293), and she, as far as the structure of the play is concerned, has superhuman powers, powers which are necessary in order for her to give an accurate picture of the situation to the audience.

Thus, on one thematic level Richard is punished for the same sins, although of greater degree, that the other characters commit; but in addition, as a scourge of God,

he is punished for usurping vengeance which Biblically belongs to God. And in the last act of the play when Richard shows fear, these two aspects of theme merge; for at this point it is apparent that Richard is, after all, but a mortal and, therefore, is not exempt from either sin or punishment. In this respect, then, the theological paradox of God's ultimate knowledge and man's freedom of will is reflected in the play through the character of Richard.

Directly related to the major theme is the Biblical doctrine of redemption. This concept is found in Richard III on two planes, both of which are Scriptural. The first is a political one and finds a parallel in the Old Testament. Redemption in the Old Testament sense is deliverance, as of God's people from Egypt (Exodus 3:7-8). And Richmond, who accounts himself the captain of God (V, iii, 108), brings redemption to strife-torn England in that he delivers the people from a "yoke of tyranny" (V, ii, 2) at the hands of Richard in order that "smooth-faced peace" (V, v, 33) may prevail. This type of redemption will not be dealt with further in this section, but will be more fully treated in Chapter Two in relation to the character of Richmond.

The other plane on which redemption is found in the play is a personal one and is based on the New Testament doctrine of Christ's giving of his life to free men from the bondage of sin (Titus 2:14) and death (Romans 8:23); this individual redemption is possible after repentance and leads one to eternal reward. Although this concept of redemption occupies a position equal to that of damnation

in the Bible, it plays a relatively minor position in the play because of the inbred evil of the characters. Although they show an awareness of this possibility of redemption through Christ, they are so steeped in evil that their recognition of such a possibility is primarily in the form of lip service; none of them seriously attempt to gain redemption, and their references to it are lightly spoken. Inherent in this concept is that of God's omniscience, which enables Him to mete out justice fairly. The characters believe that God is omniscient, that, as Paul says, "...all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do" (Hebrews 4:13), and that, as stated in Proverbs 15:3, "The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good." Margaret says, "O God, that seest it, do not suffer it" (I, iii, 271); Elizabeth directs a plea to "All-seeing heaven" (II, i, 82); and Buckingham acknowledges the "All-Seer" (V, i, 20). The justice of this all-seeing God is recognized throughout the play: this cognizance is implicit in the fact that none of those who die is bitter about his punishment. Margaret addresses the "upright, just, and true-disposing God" (IV, iv, 55), the Duchess speaks of "God's just ordinance" (IV, iv, 182), and Elizabeth says, "So just is God, to right the innocent" (I, iii, 182). Awareness of the possibility of redemption, made possible by God's omniscience and concomitant justice, is first brought to light in the play when Clarence, in his plea to the murderers, says (I, iv, 194-196):

> I charge you, as you hope to have redemption
> By Christ's dear blood shed for our grievous sins
> That you depart and lay no hands on me.

And he later refers to "The precious image of our dear Redeemer" (II, i, 123). Even Richard shows an awareness of forgiveness when he tells Elizabeth that he intends to "...prosper and repent" (IV, iv, 397). None of the preceding references, however, springs from deep religious fervor. Clarence is interested in the redemption of the murderers only as it bears on the sparing of his own life; Edward's concern with this Biblical concept is founded on his knowledge of his approaching death after a long self-indulgent life; and Richard's remark serves only to exemplify his hypocrisy. Therefore, this motif of redemption is easily overshadowed by Margaret's choral commentary which suggests that all are damned, not because they cannot repent and receive redemption, but because they will not.

This idea of redemption is further elaborated by mention of the day of judgment (on which, according to II Corinthians 5:10, men "...must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad") and of Heaven, which the Bible promises is the reward of those who die spiritually prepared (Matthew 5:34). The context in which references to the judgment day occur in the play shows that the characters view this day with fear since they are aware that they are unprepared for it. One of the murderers of Clarence says that Clarence will

not wake until the "judgment-day"[15] (I, iv, 103); and then he says, "The urging of that word 'judgment' hath bred a kind of remorse in me" (I, iv, 104), for he fears that his sins will damn him on that day. Richard too refers to this concept of judgment after his dream when he says, "All several sins, all used in each degree, / Throng to the bar, crying all, Guilty! Guilty!" (V, iii, 197-198). This speech is likely a borrowing from Isaiah 59:12: "...our sins testify against us." This Biblical passage could also well be a source for Clarence's cry that he has done things "Which now bear evidence against my soul" (I, iv, 67). The Scriptural principle that those whom God finds righteous on the day of judgment are rewarded with eternal life with Him in heaven is approximated by Richard when he says that if King Henry is, as Anne maintains, "gentle, mild, and virtuous" (I, ii, 104), Henry is then "The fitter for the kingdom of heaven, that hath him" (I, ii, 105). The first part of Richard's statement seems to be a direct reference to Luke 9:62: "And Jesus said unto him, No man having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." And Richard's idea that Heaven is for those who are "gentle, mild, and virtuous" finds numerous sources throughout the Bible, but especially in the Sermon on the Mount.

This concludes a study of Shakespeare's use of Biblical concepts in imposing a theme upon Richard III. It has been shown that all of the House of York appear to be damned, not by a God who punishes arbitrarily and indiscriminately,

but by an omniscient God whose vengeance is actually summary justice, a God who says, "For the wages of sin is death," but adds, "but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Romans 6:23). The wicked are, as the psalmist says, "...cut down like the grass, and wither as the green herb" (Psalms 37:2); but there is always the possibility of salvation for the righteous, as exemplified in Richmond's "redeeming" of England. This realization that those who die in the play are guilty and that the Biblical precept of punishment has a counterpart in the form of redemption serves thematically to mitigate the horror of the murders by creating within the audience the comfortable feeling that this is indeed an ordered universe and that "...all things work together for good to them that love God..." (Romans 8:28).

CHAPTER II

CHARACTERIZATION

None of the characters in Richard III are, of course, drawn directly from the Bible since the personages in the play are for the most part derived from English history. Shakespeare's depiction of certain characters is, however, noticeably influenced by his familiarity with the Bible.

The Two Young Princes

Although the characterization of King Edward's young sons is not elaborately developed in the play, there does appear in their portrayal evidence of Biblical influence. As suggested in Chapter One, two possible interpretations of the princes can be inferred from the play: one picture can be deduced from their brief appearances on stage, and the other is found in the attitude of the other characters toward the boys. The princes' actions on the stage suggest that both boys are quick-witted, precocious, and wary of Richard; they differ, however, in that while the older boy is serious-minded, thoughtful, and a bit haughty, the younger boy is candid, forward, and apparently somewhat malicious in his playfulness. This depiction of the princes seems to

conflict with the image presented by the attitude of the other characters toward the boys. The other characters speak of the princes as being perfectly innocent and pure, and it is in this attitude that a Biblical influence is detected.

Biblically, young children are considered wards of parents who are ordained by God to discipline them, rather than persons upon whom God will wreak his vengeance. The Bible suggests that children are "innocent" in two meanings of the word: they are innocent in that they are pure of heart (Matthew 18:4: I Corinthians 14:20) and also in that they are too young to possess a reliable moral sense (I Corinthians 14:20). The innocent nature of children is expanded upon in the New Testament by Christ. He says to the disciples, "...Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 18:4). In Matthew 10:15 Christ says concerning children, "...of such is the kingdom of God." And in the next verse he continues, "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." Paul also speaks to this point in his exhortation to the Corinthians: "Brethren, be not children in understanding: howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men" (I Corinthians 14:20).

The characters in Richard III allude to both types of innocence in relation to children. Richard refers to innocence in the sense of goodness or piety when he mentions

the "untainted virtue" of the older prince (III, i, 7); and the Duchess alludes to innocence as a lack of knowledge when she says of her children, "Incapable and shallow innocents" (II, ii, 18), a phrase which Craig interprets to mean "unable to understand."[1] The picture of purity by which the other characters represent the young princes finds support in almost every mention of the boys. They are called "tender princes" by the Duchess (IV, i, 4), Elizabeth (IV, i, 103), and Hastings (III, i, 28), and "gentle princes" by Anne (IV, i, 10). They are referred to as "Tender babes" by Elizabeth (IV, i, 99; IV, iv, 9) and Tyrrel (IV, iii, 9); and the older boy is named "sweet prince" by both Buckingham (III, i, 1) and Richard (III, i, 7). Elizabeth speaks of the boys' "tender temples" (IV, iv, 384) and their "gentle souls" (IV, iv, 11). The princes are considered by their murderers "The most replenished sweet work of nature, / That from the prime creation e'er she framed" (IV, iii, 18-19).[2] They are called "two sweet babes" (IV, iv, 134), "such little pretty ones" (IV, i, 100), "two sweet sons" (IV, iv, 134), and "unblown flowers, new appearing sweets" (IV, iv, 10). Their appellation of "lamb" (IV, iv, 22, 228) also connotes innocence and is perhaps derived from the Bible.[3] The most striking picture of purity in relation to the princes is found in Tyrrel's speech in which he quotes the princes' murderers (IV, iii, 9-14):

> 'Lo, thus,' quoth Dighton, 'lay those tender babes:'
> 'Thus, thus,' quoth Forrest, 'girdling one another
> Within their innocent alabaster arms:
> Their lips were four red roses on a stalk,
> Which in their summer beauty kiss'd each other,
> A book of prayers on their pillow lay....

The two different views of the princes presented in the play, as seen in the pictures presented by the other characters and a possible interpretation of the boys' stage appearances, are extended to the princes' ultimate destiny: Richard avows that the boys rest in "Abraham's bosom" (IV, iii, 38), and Elizabeth suggests that they are in "doom perpetual" (IV, iv, 12). As discussed in Chapter One, since the boys are Yorks, logic seems to require their removal, and consistency their damnation. Shakespeare, however, appears reluctant to condemn the boys, for he presents little evidence that they are deserving of punishment. But from the boys' stage appearances it could be argued that their astute questions and comments suggest that the princes are not "babes," despite their being considered such, and that the arrogance of the older boy and the apparent malice of the younger boy indicate that they are not so pure of heart as the murderers' description would lead one to believe. From their stage appearances, then, it could be concluded that in actuality the princes are mature enough to be held accountable for their actions and that the boys have been corrupted by the sins of the age and are, therefore, not "innocent" in either sense of the word, although they are far from being finished malefactors.

On the other hand, however, a more likely interpretation is that the boys' behavior is inserted for the purpose of comic interlude rather than to suggest manifestations of evil tendencies. And supporting this interpretation is the fact that since the boys are so frequently referred to as innocents, Shakespeare seems to use the princes primarily to increase the pathos and to accentuate the heinous nature of Richard's crimes.

Margaret

The speeches of Margaret, as mentioned in Chapter One, serve as a choral commentary; and Margaret herself is presented less as a character than as an avenging nemesis. As a representative of Fate, she is doubtlessly Senecan, but her function is also somewhat Biblical in that her prophecies are based on her conviction in the vengeance of the Christian God. This Scriptural foundation of her predictions is seen in her statement concerning Clarence's foreswearing, "Which God revenge!" (I, ii, 137); her curses, "I'll not believe but they ascend the sky, / And there awake God's gentle-sleeping peace" (I, iii, 287-288); and her curse against Richard's ruthlessness, "O God, that seest it, do not suffer it" (I, iii, 271). Moreover, her pronouncements suggest some comparisons with certain Old Testament prophets.

The role of the Hebrew prophets is made somewhat clearer by realizing that the ordinary Hebrew word for prophet is "nâbi," and is derived from the verb signifying "to bubble forth." The word by application refers to one who announces

or pours forth declarations of God.[4] The most essential characteristic of the Old Testament prophets is their revealing of God's will to man. The prophets, generally speaking, have a two-fold function: warning and promising. They warn of divine punishment, and they promise the favor of God in return for the people's obedience. It is in the warning of future divine retribution that Margaret rather closely resembles these Old Testament prophets. Margaret's utterances are called "curses," and she herself is referred to as a "prophetess." Biblically, the prophecies which concern divine vengeance in the case of disobedience are often considered curses, as seen in the ceremony staged by God through Moses on the mountains Gerizim and Ebal. The blessings are in return for obedience and the curses for disobedience (Deuteronomy 11:27). And since "prophecy" means any declaration of God, the word includes both blessings and curses. Margaret's prophecies, however, since they consist only of curses, resemble comminatory parts of the Old Testament more closely than they do the Biblical institution of prophesying in general.

The Old Testament prophets receive their power through various methods, such as dreams (Daniel 2:19), visions (Isaiah 6), and direct revelations (Jeremiah 1). The only indication in the play that Margaret possesses this God-given power is that all of her warnings are fulfilled. And Moses, in Deuteronomy 18:20-22, indicates that this is the way to distinguish false prophets from true ones. As far as the

other characters are concerned, however, Margaret seems to be merely clairvoyant; nevertheless, several characters at the time of their deaths confess that Margaret is a prophetess. For Queen Elizabeth Margaret predicts (I, iii, 204-206):

> Long mayst thou live to wail thy children's death
> And see another, as I see thee now,
> Decked in thy rights, as thou art stall'd in mine!

As retribution for standing by when her son "Was stabb'd with bloody daggers" (I, iii, 212), Margaret warns Rivers, Grey, and Hastings, "That none of you may live his natural age, / But by some unlook'd accident cut off!"[5] (I, iii, 213-214). For Richard she predicts (I, iii, 223-227):

> Thy friends suspect for traitors while thou livest,
> And take deep traitors for thy dearest friends!
> No sleep close up that deadly eye of thine,
> Unless it be while some tormenting dream
> Affrights thee with a hell of ugly devils!

And to Buckingham she says, "...he /Richard/ shall split thy very heart with sorrow," and she warns that one day Buckingham shall say, "...poor Margaret was a prophetess!" (I, iii, 300-301). Margaret's prediction for Elizabeth is fulfilled in the deaths of the two young princes and in Richard's usurping of the throne. Her prophecies concerning Rivers, Grey, Hastings, and Buckingham are accurate, for Richard arranges their deaths. In relation to her curses on Richard, he does indeed suspect his friends as traitors (V, iii, 220-222), and the desertion of Buckingham,

Ely, and Dorset fulfills the second part of the curse. And Anne bears witness that Richard's sleep is troubled when she says (IV, i, 83-85):

> For never yet one hour in his bed
> Have I enjoy'd the golden dew of sleep,
> But have been waked by his timorous dreams.

The prophecies of Margaret are recalled by Elizabeth's relatives, by Hastings, and by Buckingham shortly before their deaths. Grey says, "Now Margaret's curse is fall'n upon our head, / For standing by when Richard stabb'd her son" (III, iii, 15). And Rivers replies (III, iii, 16-18):

> Then cursed she Hastings, then cursed she Buckingham,
> Then cursed she Richard. O, remember, God,
> To hear her prayers for them, as now for us!

Hastings says, "O Margaret, Margaret, now thy heavy curse / Is lighted on poor Hastings' head!" (III, iv, 94-95). And Buckingham confesses (IV, v, 25-27):

> Now Margaret's curse is fallen upon my head;
> 'When he,' quoth she, 'shall split thy heart with sorrow,
> Remember Margaret was a prophetess!

After the deaths of the two young princes and after Richard's coronation, Elizabeth confesses to Margaret (IV, iv, 79-81):

> O, thou didst prophesy the time would come
> That I should wish for thee to help me curse
> That bottled spider, that foul bunched-back'd toad!

Margaret's office in the play is similar to that of the Old Testament prophets in that her warnings are based

on threats of divine vengeance. She diverges from the prophets, however, in that she takes pleasure in the downfall of those around her,[6] whereas the prophets, as servants of God, lament both the evil of the Hebrew people and their concomitant punishment. Too, Margaret is stained herself, for she has connived at murder.

Those prophecies explicitly labeled curses suggest the lengthy warning of Moses, who has prophetic powers (Deuteronomy 34:10), that the curse of God will fall upon the disobedient Israelites (Deuteronomy 28:16-68). And Margaret's mention of a plague suggests the ten plagues with which Moses threatens Pharoah that God will visit upon Egypt (Exodus 7-12). Those plagues upon Egypt originate, of course, from Heaven; and, similarly, Margaret states that her plague is to come from Heaven. She says to Richard (I, iii, 217-221):

> If heaven have any grievous plague in store
> Exceeding those that I can wish upon thee,
> O, let them keep it till thy sins be ripe,
> And then hurl down their indignation
> On thee, the troubler of the poor world's peace![7]

Margaret, then, seems to act in a way suggestive of certain parallels with Old Testament prophets. There are, however, enough dissimilarities and enough evidences of non-Biblical (primarily Greek derived through Seneca) influences in her characterization to prevent the assertion that Margaret is wholly derived from the Bible. Nevertheless, her strong dependence upon an omniscient, omnipotent, and righteous

God is most surely derived from Hebraic concepts rather than from traditional Greek concepts of blind fate.

Henry of Richmond

As is true of all the personages in the play save Richard, Henry of Richmond is not fully developed as a character. He appears in only three scenes, and he is little discussed by the other characters in other scenes. Richard, of course, completely dominates the play, and Richmond seems to be not much more than a stage device; he is merely the means by which Shakespeare causes good to prevail. Richmond functions as a redeemer in the play, and it is in this role that his characterization seems to have something of a Biblical basis. As discussed in Chapter One, the concept of redemption is found in the play on two planes: personal and political. Richmond brings the latter type of redemption to his people. And in this respect there are suggestive parallels between Richmond and Moses, although these parallels are certainly not clear cut ones.

Richmond's motive, as far as the play is concerned, is similar to that of Moses. Moses rises from the midst of the people whom he is ultimately to redeem and, after being approached by God, makes an unselfish choice to free his people from oppression. Although Moses shows many human weaknesses, his desire to save his people seems to be selfless as is his decision to kill the Egyptian who beat an

Israelite (Exodus 2:11-12). Similarly, Richmond's primary motive in attacking Richard, even above his desire for position for himself, appears to be to free his people from political tyranny.[8] (Just as Shakespeare departs from history in his exaggeration of Richard's evil, so he purifies the historical character of Henry of Richmond). Like Moses among the Egyptians, Richmond might have lived peacefully among the Bretons. And Richmond, as does Moses, frees not just his own generation, but he frees posterity. Richmond's purpose is to "Enrich the time to come with smooth-faced peace" (V, v, 33); and in his desire to glorify the house of Tudor, Shakespeare concludes the play with every indication that peace will reign for generations to come.

As Moses leads the Israelites against the tyranny of Pharoah, Richmond becomes the leader of his people against the tyranny of Richard. Moses serves as the leader of all his people, the Israelites in Egypt. And Richmond too assumes a position as leader of all his people. He addresses his soldiers as "Fellows in arms, and my most loving friends, / Bruised underneath the yoke of tyranny" (IV, ii, 1-2); and he does indeed seem to be the leader of all the people for, as his soldiers point out, Richard's apparent allies are actually his enemies (IV, ii, 19-21):

> Herb: I doubt not but his friends will fly to us.
> Blunt: He hath no friends but who are friends for fear,
> Which in his greatest need will shrink from him.

And in his oration to his army Richmond says, "Richard except, those whom we fight against / Had rather have us win than him they follow" (V, iii, 243). Moses is a servant of God and is commissioned by Him (Exodus 3). Richmond acts under the assumption that he is commissioned of God. He accounts himself the captain of God (V, iii, 109). He prays, "Make us thy ministers of chastisement" (V, iii, 113), and he says to his army, "God will in justice ward you as his soldiers" (V, iii, 254). Richmond serves as an instrument of God in two respects: he frees his people from political oppression, and in doing so he serves as a minister of chastisement by destroying Richard. Moses, of course, acts similarly in that in his seeking to free the Israelites he destroys, with God's help, the armies of wicked leaders, and most notably the army of Pharoah (Exodus 14). Thus, both leaders punish and free at the same time.

That God protects the Israelites is either explicit or implicit in every battle they win. The most assuredly Biblical aspect of Richmond is the fact that he recognizes the hand of God in battle, although Richmond does not, of course, depend heavily upon miracles as does Moses. Richmond says, "God and our good cause fight upon our side" (V, iii, 240). And it does appear that Shakespeare intends that God sway the victory in favor of Richmond in that the dreams presage victory for him. And the encouragement from the ghosts, "Good angels guard thee" (V, iii, 138, 156), suggests the "Angel of God" which goes before the camp of Israel (Exodus 14:19).

Moses, with one notable exception (Numbers 20:11), remains self-effacing and humble before God in his effort to free his people. Numbers 12:3 reads: "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth." Richmond too is humble and self-effacing. Just as Moses constantly asks for God's help and praises him for victories, Richmond prays for God's aid "That we may praise thee in victory!" (V, iii, 114). And he continues this prayer, "To thee I do commend my watchful soul" (V, iii, 115). Immediately after Richard's death, Richmond cries, "God and your arms be praised" (V, v, 1).

Moses and Christ are often compared both Biblically (Deuteronomy 18:15-18; Acts 3:22; 7:37; I Corinthians 10: 1-2; Hebrew 11:24-26) and theologically since both function as leaders of God's people, as redeemers, prophets, law-givers, and mediators between God and man. Thus, Moses is often considered the prefigurement of Christ. There appear to be Christ-like characteristics in Richmond also, especially in that none of his actions in the play suggest that he is not a wholly perfect individual. He appears to be extremely brave, virtuous, and selfless, perhaps even beyond that of a mortal. He is the very antithesis of Richard, who is wholly evil. And, in a sense, like Christ Richmond seems to purify his people through his own virtue since his victory brings them a ruler who is obedient to God. One of Richmond's lines suggests a statement made by Christ. Of his crucifiers Christ says, "Forgive them

for they know not what they do" (Luke 23:43). And similarly Richmond shows grace to the soldiers who have deserted him: "Proclaim a pardon to the soldiers fled" (V, v, 16). This action more closely approximates Christ's doctrine of love than the Old Testament attitude of "An eye for eye, tooth for tooth..." (Exodus 21:24).

Richmond does, however, seem to be much more closely patterned after Moses than Christ in that the redemption which Richmond brings is primarily political. As Moses delivers the Israelites from the oppression of the Egyptian king, Richmond frees England of the "wretched, bloody, and usurping boar" (IV, ii, 7) in order that the country can prosper, the women will be safe, and the children will be free (V, iii, 255-270). And Richmond reiterates his purpose in his statement which concludes the play: "Now civil wounds are stopp'd peace lives again: / That she may long live here, God say amen!" (V, v, 40-41).

Richard

In relation to the extensiveness of Shakespeare's use of the Bible in Richard III, it is significant that the characterization of Richard himself is heavily Biblical. The influence of Marlowe on Shakespeare's fashioning of Richard as an arch-villain can hardly be denied; but upon this arch-villain Shakespeare imposes many characteristics of Satan of the Bible. Although Richard is probably not intended to be an incarnation of Satan himself,

Richard is surely possessed of devils, of whom Biblically Satan is prince.[9] And Richard's characterization closely parallels that of Satan; for the devils, as emissaries of Satan, possess his traits.

The most obvious internal evidence of Shakespeare's employing of Satan in the fashioning of Richard is the characters' association of Richard with the Devil and with Hell throughout the play. Anne calls Richard "the devil" (I, ii, 45), "foul devil" (I, ii, 50), "devilish slave" (I, ii, 90), and she says, "O wonderful, when devils tell the truth!" (I, ii, 72). Margaret says to Richard, "Out, devil!" (I, iii, 118)[10] and says of Richard to Buckingham, "What, dost thou scorn me for my gentle counsel? / And soothe the devil that I warn thee from?" (I, iii, 297-298). Elizabeth says of Richard, "Shall I be tempted of the devil thus?" (IV, iv, 408). And Richard himself admits that he plays the devil (I, iii, 338) and says, "...I nothing to back my suit at all, / But the plain devil..." (I, ii, 237).

Richard's apparent association with Hell further bears out his alliance with Satan since Scripturally Satan is condemned to Hell. Christ says that on the day of judgment God will say to the wicked, "...depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matthew 25:41), and John says:

> And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophets are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever (Revelation 20:10).

Anne says to Richard, "...thou hast made the happy earth thy hell, / Fill'd it with cursing cries and deep exclaims" (I, ii, 51-52). And that she is speaking of the Biblical Hell is seen in her apparent allusion to Christ's statement that in Hell there shall be "weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Luke 13:28). Anne also speaks of Richard's "hell-governed arm" (I, ii, 67), calls him the "dreadful minister of hell" (I, ii, 46), and says that King Henry VI is in Heaven, "...where thou /Richard/ shalt never come" (I, ii, 108). She later says to Richard, "And thou unfit for any place but hell" (I, ii, 110). Queen Elizabeth equates Richard and Hell when she says to Dorset, "...go...and live with Richmond, from the reach of hell" (IV, i, 43) and when she says that her daughter will live "So long as hell and Richard likes of it" (IV, iv, 166). Margaret calls Richard the "son of hell" (I, iii, 230), "hell-hound" (IV, iv, 48), and directly aligns him with Hell when she says, "Hie thee to hell for shame, and leave the world, / Thou cacodemon! there thy kingdom is (I, ii, 143-144) and

> Richard yet lives, hell's black intelligencer,
> Only reserved their factor, to buy souls
> And send them thither: but at hand, at hand,
> Ensues his piteous and unpitied end:
> Earth gapes, hell burns, fiends roar, saints pray,
> To have him suddenly conveyed away" (IV, iv, 71-76).

Even Richard's mother recognizes his Satanic qualities, for she says to him, "Thou camest on earth to make the earth my hell" (IV, iv, 166). The idea that Satan, or the Devil, is Biblically delegated to Hell is also seen in the play in

passages less directly related to the character of Richard: Margaret prophesies that Richard will be tormented by dreams of a "hell of ugly devils" (I, iii, 227), and in Clarence's dream it is in Hell that he is confronted by a "legion of foul fiends" (I, iii, 58), fiends which Matthew associates with Satan in Matthew 12:26-27 and Matthew 25:41. (In this connection, it should be also noted that Anne once refers to Richard as a "fiend" /I, ii, 347.)

There is theological disagreement concerning Satan's appearances in the Bible. Generally, there are two understandings of Satan: figurative and literal. The former position holds that Satan is merely an abstraction of evil in the hearts of men, that he does not exist as a literal being, but that rather, his appearances in the Bible are either myths or parables. A literal understanding of Satan is that he is an actual being, a fallen angel who works constantly in opposition to God and man, and who is damned to Hell. Richard more closely approximates the literal Satan in that although Richard might be considered an abstraction of evil, he is not merely that. He is a vital being with enough facets of character to be thought of as an individual rather than the mere abstraction of a vice.

The total effect of all the Biblical references to Satan is to present a picture of Satan as the supreme evil-doer. Because of his thoroughgoing evil, he is known as the "wicked one" (I John 2:13, 3:12). His power accords him the title of "prince of this world" (John 12:31, 14:30,

16:11), and in this world he is the arch-enemy of the human race (Matthew 13:39).

In the play Richard appears as the supreme evil-doer. As is Satan, Richard is inhuman in the respect that he is totally evil; he has almost no inner conflicts, for he has no impulses toward good. His actions are, as Anne says, "inhuman and unnatural" (I, i, 60); and his reason for doing evil, in addition to his desire for power, is the mere delight involved. He admits, "To entertain these fair well-spoken days, I am determined to prove a villain" (I, i, 29-30). This calloused desire for evil is borne out when Anne says, "Villain, thou knows't no law of God nor man: / No beast so fierce but knows some touch of pity," and Richard replies, "I know none..." (I, ii, 70-72). And that he knows no touch of pity is exemplified in his statement to Clarence's murderers (I, iii, 348-350):

> ...do not hear him /Clarence/ plead;
> For Clarence is well-spoken, and perhaps
> May move your hearts to pity, if you mark him.

Richard's description of the murderers more accurately describes Richard than it does them: "Your eyes drop millstones, when fools' eyes drop tears" (I, iii, 355). Richard's unnatural delight in evil is also seen in his inordinate interest and great pleasure in the details of the princes' deaths when he instructs Tyrrel to come to him after supper in order to tell "the process of their death" (IV, iii, 31). Richard's power over men, like that of Satan, is

great; thus Margaret speaks of him as "That foul defacer of God's handiwork; / That excellent grand tyrant of the earth" (IV, iv, 51-52). And in the play Richard, like Satan, seems to be the arch-enemy of man, born, as Margaret says, "...to chase us to our graves" (IV, iv, 54).

Murder is one of the chief means through which Satan accomplishes his evil. Paul speaks of Satan as "him that had the power of death" (Hebrew 2:14), and John writes that "He was a murderer from the beginning" (John 8:44). Biblically, Satan is frequently associated with murder. He promotes the murder of Abel by working through Cain, as seen in John's statement that Cain killed Abel because Cain "was of that wicked one" (I John 3:11-12). It is Satan who is responsible for the murder of Job's sons and daughters, whose deaths Satan instigates in his attempt to cause Job to curse God (Job 1:19). And it is through murder that the "rulers of this age" become servants of Satan by crucifying Christ (I Corinthians 2:6-9). Richard III, of course, revolves around the murders incited by Richard. Richmond calls him "A bloody tyrant and a homicide" (V, iii, 246), Margaret says that he is a "murderous villain" (I, iii, 134), Anne speaks of his "butcheries" (I, ii, 54), and the Duchess says that his "...unavoided eye is murderous" (IV, i, 53). Within the scope of the play itself, Richard either murders or arranges for the deaths of Clarence, the two young princes, Anne, Buckingham, Hastings, Vaughan, Gray, and Ratliff. His court is indeed, as Elizabeth says,

a slaughter-house" (IV, i, 44).

Richard and Satan have in common another method of accomplishing evil; just as Satan is Biblically known as "the tempter" (Matthew 4:3; I Thessalonians 3:5), Richard is recognized by Elizabeth as a tempter when she says, "Shall I be tempted of the devil thus?" (IV, iv, 418). Satan tempts Christ by offering him earthly power; similarly Richard tempts Anne, Elizabeth, Buckingham, and others of the court who aspire to power. Paul says that Satan tempts also by promising earthly pleasure (I Corinthians 7:5); Richard tempts both sets of murderers through the delights of gold (I, iv, 124-128; IV, ii, 33-38).

Again, Satan and Richard are similar in that they are both deceivers. Paul says that "...Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light" (II Corinthians 11:14). Satan and Richard both often attempt to conceal their malignity by feigning kindness and good intentions. Just as Satan seems to befriend Eve, Richard answers Elizabeth's remarks, "Shall I be tempted of the devil thus," by assuring her, "Ay, if the devil tempt you to do good" (IV, iv, 418-419). Richard deceives, as his mother says, by being "kind in hatred" (IV, iv, 172). She accurately describes Richard's dissembling nature in her lament, "Oh, that deceit should steal such gentle shapes, / And with a virtuous vizard hide foul guile!" (II, ii, 27-28). That Richard, who is wholly evil, appears as "an angel of light" is suggested by several irony-filled passages which touch upon

the question of whether a man's appearance reveals his heart. The first instance occurs after Richard's lying protestations of love for Anne. She says, "I would I knew thy heart" (I, ii, 193), and Richard replies, "'Tis figured in my tongue" (I, ii, 194). Later, when the Bishop of Ely suggests that Buckingham is aware of Richard's feelings concerning the proposed coronation of the young prince, Buckingham replies (III, iv, 10-14):

> Who, I, my lord! we know each other's faces,
> But for our hearts, he knows no more of mine,
> Than I of yours
> Nor I no more of his, than you of mine.[11]

Although Buckingham is not being truthful with the Bishop, Buckingham's statement is much more accurate than he realizes at the time. Hastings also touches upon this problem when he evidences his gullibility by saying of Richard (III, iv, 53-54):

> ...there's never a man in Christendom
> That can less hide his love or hate than he;
> For by his face straight shall you know his heart.

Richard himself, in warning the older princes of his uncles, says (III, i, 9-11):

> Nor more can you distinguish of a man
> Than of his outward show; which, God he knows,
> Seldom or never jumpeth with the heart.

Both Satan and Richard base their deception on lying, hypocrisy, and subtle cunning. The Apostle John writes that Satan is the father of liars (John 8:44), and Paul

testifies that Satan works "lying wonders" (II Thessalonians 2:9). Satan lies when he promises that Eve will receive ultimate knowledge and that she will not die (Genesis 3: 4-5), when he persuades Job's wife that Job should curse God (Job 2:9), and when he assures Christ that should he cast himself from the pinnacle of the temple, angels will bear him up (Matthew 4:6).[12] Richard's lies throughout the play are almost innumerable. That Anne understands that lying is characteristic of Satan (and that Richard is to be associated with him) is seen in her statement, "O wonderful, when devils tell the truth" (I, ii, 73), a statement which seems to be based on John 8:44: "...there is no truth in him /Satan/." A favorite form of lying of both Satan and Richard is the practice of slander which they hope will arouse enmity and promote evil. Satan's slandering of God is well demonstrated in Genesis 3:4-5 in Satan's attributing of jealousy and selfishness to God. Satan slanders man when he assures God that Job's apparent virtue is a result of his prosperity (Job 1:9-11); then, in turn, Satan slanders God to Job's wife (Job 2:9). Richard falsely accuses Queen Elizabeth in his repeated avowals that she is responsible for the imprisonment of both Clarence and Hastings (I, iii, 63-70, 78, 90-91, 313-315; II, i, 134-137; II, ii, 21-22). Richard slanders Hastings by maintaining to the mayor after Hastings' death that he was a traitor (III, v). And he defames King Edward when he commissions Buckingham to "Infer the bastardy of Edward's

children" (III, v, 75). Richard boasts of this proclivity to slander in his first soliloquy when he says (I, i, 32-35):

> Plots have I laid...by...libels...
> To set my brother Clarence and the king
> In deadly hate the one against the other.

And later he says, "The secret mischief that I set abroach / I lay unto the grievous charge of others" (I, iii, 225-226).

Again Richard and Satan are similar in that they both attempt to deceive through hypocrisy. As Satan appears as an "angel of light" and his emissaries as "wolves in sheep's clothing (Matthew 7:15), Richard assumes the appearance of devoted piety throughout the play. He appears to lament Edward's dissipation (I, i, 138-141) and seems concerned that Clarence be forgiven by God for foreswearing himself (I, iii, 136). (These situations are both reminiscent of a point in the Sermon on the Mount).[13] He practices hypocrisy when he says, "I thank God for my humility" (II, i, 72) and in his speech (I, iii, 140-142):

> I pray to God my heart were flint, like Edward's
> Or Edward's soft and pitiful, like mine:
> I am too childish-foolish for this world.

Richard engages in hypocrisy when he cautions Buckingham not to swear (III, vii, 220) and when he says of those responsible for Clarence's imprisonment, "God pardon them that are the cause of it" (I, iii, 315). The most outstanding instance of Richard's dissembling nature, however,

is his feigned devotion as he stands "...meditating with two deep divines," prayer book in hand (III, vii, 75).[14] Just as Satan perverts Scripture in the temptation of Christ, Richard relies upon Biblical teachings as a means of deception. He boasts (I, iii, 334-338):

> But then I sigh; and with a piece of scripture,
> Tell them that God bids us do good for evil:
> And thus I clothe my naked villainy
> With old odd ends stolen out of holy writ;
> And seem a saint, when most I play the devil.

When Rivers says, "A virtuous and a Christian-like conclusion, / To pray for them that have done scathe to us" (I, iii, 316-317), Richard replies piously, "So do I ever" (I, iii, 318). Richard again alludes to Scripture in order to conceal his true purpose when he appeals to Anne's charity: "Lady, you know no rules of charity, / Which renders good for bad, blessings for curses" (I, ii, 68-69) and when he applies Proverbs 18:10 ("The name of the Lord is a strong tower...") to himself by saying, "...the king's name is a tower of strength" (IV, iii, 12).

Richard and Satan are both of brilliant intellect, as evidenced by their subtle cunning in the practice of deception. As a serpent, Satan deceives Eve through his cunning: Genesis 3:1 reads, "...the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." Paul testifies that Satan "...beguiled Eve through his subtilty" (II Corinthians 11:3), and Paul later refers to the "wiles of the devil" (Ephesians 6:11). The word "subtle"

is applied to Richard both by himself and by the Duchess. Richard boasts, "...I am subtle, false, and treacherous" (I, i, 37), and the Duchess says that he is "...subtle, bloody, treacherous" (IV, iv, 171). Richard's cunning is evident in his every action. His slyness is first seen in the first scene of the play in his clever twisting of his and Clarence's conversation for the benefit of Brakenbury (I, i, 90-96). Also, his approaching of both Anne and Elizabeth in relation to his intended marriages evidences great cunning. His course of action is entirely different for each woman. In wooing Anne, who is young and weak, he appeals chiefly to her emotions by feigning tears of repentance and love for her (I, ii). And when pleading with Elizabeth for her daughter's hand, he appeals principally to Elizabeth's desire for position and power: he reminds her that she could be "mother to a king" (IV, iv, 317) and mentions "the advancement of your children...to the dignity and height of honour; / The high imperial type of this earth's glory" (IV, iv 241; 243-244). Without his cunning intellect, Richard's long list of villainies could not have been accomplished. Likewise, Satan could not have maintained his position as "prince of the earth" were it not for his own subtlety.

The Hebrew word "sâtân" means "adversary" and is so used in I Samuel 29:4; II Samuel 19:22; I Kings 5:4, 11:14, 23, 25; Numbers 22:22, 32; Psalms 109:6;[15] and Satan himself is an adversary to both God and man. Zechariah 3:1

presents a picture of Satan standing on the right hand of God "...to resist him." And Peter tells the Christians of his day that Satan is a foe to man: "...your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour" (I Peter 5:8). Richard too is the adversary of God and man. Not only does he oppose God through the corruption of men as the "Foul defacer of God's handiwork" (IV, iv, 51), but he opposes God through his hypocritical reliance upon Scripture; it is as though the profaning of the Scriptures is a way of dishonoring God. Richard admits that his actions incur the opposition of God when he says, "Having God, her /Ānne's/ conscience, and these bars against me" (I, ii, 235). Margaret indicates that both Richard and his followers, by opposing God, serve Satan when she says, "Live each of you the subjects to his /Rīchard's/ hate, / And he to yours, and all of you to God's!" (I, iii, 302-303). Elizabeth recognizes Richard's opposition to God for she says, "God's wrong is most of all (IV, iv, 377), and Richmond says that Richard is "One that hath ever been God's enemy" (V, iii, 252).

Though both Richard and Satan are enemies of God, they are also instruments of God, a fact which again poses the paradox of foreordination. As instruments of God, they must work within limitations imposed by Him. This limiting of power is seen in God's forbidding Satan to take Job's life during his trials (Job 1:12, 2:6). A limitation imposed upon Satan by God is mentioned by Anne in relation

to Richard. She says, "Thou hadst power over his /Henry VI's/ mortal body, / His soul thou canst not have..." (I, ii, 47-48). (This passage seems to be evidence that Shakespeare intends to associate Richard and Satan in some way since, concerning Beelzebub, Matthew 10:25 reads: "... fear not them which kill the body: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.") Had Christ's crucifixion not occurred, Satan would have accomplished a major victory over God; therefore, Satan suffers a great defeat as a result of this event. Similarly, Richard's reign is brought to a sudden end with his death at the hands of Richmond who, not completely unlike Christ, frees England from the tyranny of Richard and brings political redemption to the people. The ultimate ends of both Satan and Richard provide another parallel in relation to their being subject to the will of God. Biblically, Satan is to be condemned at the judgment; he is to be "...cast into the lake of fire and brimstone..." (Revelation 20:10). Richard, as discussed in Chapter One, is to be damned eternally also. Despite the fact that he flaunts them, Richard, like Satan, is fully cognizant of the Bible's moral teaching and he ultimately indicates that he believes in and fears the power and vengeance of God; his sins are, therefore, more perverse and less ignorant than those of many other persons. His fearful belief is brought to light by his "timorous dreams" (IV, i, 85) and his frightened conscience which follow his dream in which the ghosts appear. He says,

"Cold fearful drops stand on my trembling flesh" (V, iii, 180), and that these dreams (V, iii, 216-218)

> Have struck more terror to the soul of Richard
> Than can the substance of ten thousand soldiers
> Armed in proof, and led by shallow Richmond.

And that he fears eternal punishment is rather explicit in his statement that "All several sins, all used in each degree, / Throng to the bar, crying all, Guilty! guilty!" (V, iii, 118-119). The Biblical passage, "The devils also believe and tremble" (James 3:19), is seemingly just as applicable to Richard as it is to Satan.

As instruments of God, Richard and Satan fulfill God's will by functioning as tempters. God wills testing since he wills man to be free (Deuteronomy 30:15-20); and, as Paul says, temptation is common to all men (I Corinthians 10:13). To God temptation seems to be a test or a trial (James 1:2-3); but to Satan temptation is nothing but seduction. Thus, God employs Satan in that He tries men through Satan's temptations. This method is seen in Satan's suggesting to David the idea of numbering the people (I Chronicles 21:1) since it was God Himself who drove Satan to this because God's anger was kindled against David (II Samuel 24:1). Likewise, Richard, as a scourge, is employed by God to test and punish the degenerate court of England. And that Richard is foreordained to purge the House of York is suggested in his opening soliloquy in his statement, "I am determined to prove a villain" (I, i, 30),

in which the word "determined"likely connotes foreordination as well as resolution.

Satan, as a wholly sinful being himself (I John 3:8), approaches men by appealing to the evil nature of those in whom lurks the same germ of the evil inherent in Satan. Satan, who obviously desires the power which God possesses, tempts Eve by offering her power which belongs only to God. Likewise, Richard, who desires power, corrupts the characters in the play by appealing to their own desires for this same worldly power. And with ease does Richard beguile those of the court to serve him for their greatest tendency is toward evil already. Thus Richard, as a scourge of God, metes out punishment which, in actuality, the characters bring upon themselves. That the court is steeped in worldly ambition and petty jealousies and is, therefore, vulnerable to further corruption is brought to light throughout the play. This fact is suggested by the citizen who says, "O, full of danger is the Duke of Gloucester! / And the queen's sons and brothers haught and proud" (II, iii, 27-28). Margaret warns the court of its tendency toward self-destruction when she says to Elizabeth (I, iii, 242-244):

> Why strew'st thou sugar on that bottled spider,
> Whose deadly web ensnareth thee about?
> Fool, fool, thou whet'st a knife to kill thyself.

And again Margaret suggests the enmity and disposition toward evil in the characters when she arrives at court for Edward's peacemaking and says, "What! were you snarling all before I came,/ Ready to catch each other by the throat" (I, iii,

188-189).

Since Satan plays upon the evil which is already manifested in those whom he approaches, and since Satan is so clever a deceiver, the New Testament frequently warns that man must maintain extreme vigilance (James 4:7; I Peter 5:8-9) in order to recognize wolves in sheep's clothing and thus to escape the "wiles of the devil." Although God promises that no temptation will be too great (I Corinthians 10:13), the wicked are easily ensnared by the devil (I Timothy 3:7; II Timothy 2:26). And the characters in the play are so weak that Richard is able to deceive them into serving him. Hastings and the queen's relatives die because they are deceived into believing that Richard befriends them. Clarence dies pleading that the murderers not slander Richard (I, iv, 247, 252-253)

> ...for he is kind...
> He hugg'd me in his arms, and swore, with sobs,
> That he would labour my delivery.

Anne loses her life because she does not recognize Richard's flattery or his feigned penitence. Buckingham dies because he is deceived into believing Richard's avowal that Buckingham is "my other self" (II, ii, 151). Richard is crowned king because the citizens are duped by his pretence at piety and humility. These characters, as do Tyrrel, the murderers of the princes, and the murderers of Clarence, sell themselves to the devil by becoming servers of Richard. The citizen who says that "By a divine instinct men's minds mistrust / Ensuing dangers" (II, iii, 42-43) is too

optimistic since the victims are, as Richard names them, "simple gulls" (I, iii, 228). And they are made simple by their evil: they do not see through Richard because of their own desires for power or material possessions, which they believe an alliance with Richard can afford them. The way in which Richard operates is suggested in Clarence's dream. Clarence says that Richard tempted him to walk upon the decks and that (I, iv, 16-20)

> As we paced along
> Upon the giddy footing of the hatches,
> Methought that Gloucester stumbled; and, in falling,
> Struck me, that thought to stay him, overboard,
> Into the tumbling billows of the main.

This picture succinctly demonstrates Richard's ability to deceive, his victims' lack of perception and vigilance, and the consequent loss of their lives and souls in Richard's or Satan's service.

CHAPTER III

PLOTTING

Although in Richard III Shakespeare relies very heavily upon his sources, which scholars generally concur are primarily the chronicles of Holinshed and Hall, he does depart from these accounts in several respects, such as telescoping, addition, omission, exaggeration, and minimization of various events. Certain changes would be absolutely necessary, of course, since a play and a chronicle are such disparate literary forms. But Shakespeare distorts several events which, it seems, could have conceivably been incorporated into a dramatic production. And it is these divergences from history that reveal something about Shakespeare's thematic intent. Although his reasons doubtless include, as well as artistic considerations, his desire to glorify the House of Tudor, his distorting of history seems also to serve dramatically to intensify his Biblical theme of divine retribution. Through his selectivity Shakespeare takes from English history those details bearing out his thesis and omits others that do not sustain his point. Similarly, he exaggerates and minimizes events in accordance with his thematic purpose.

The play appears to take the form that it does because

Shakespeare wishes not only to portray the political downfall of Richard III and to extol the House of Tudor, but to extend the punishment of the House of York to the wicked in general. Politically, the primary sin of the characters is their continuing in the pattern set by Bolingbroke, who dethroned Richard II, God's anointed. Their struggles to keep England under the rule of the Yorks, however, universalize their sins in that their pursuit for power involves the subordination of England's welfare to the ambitions of ruthless men. Thus, though Margaret mentions specifically the Yorks' sins of usurpation, she generalizes these sins by indicating that wickedness, presumably of any type, is to be avenged. As discussed previously, the Bible does not assure men of earthly punishment for sin, but in Richard III the characters apparently fear both earthly and eternal retribution, and the audience is left with the feeling that not only are the wicked damned eternally, but that they are felled in this world.

Through departures from history Shakespeare shows the precarious state of the wicked by causing their downfalls to appear to be swift and unexpected. Shakespeare does not show the capture of the queen's kinsmen in the play; rather, we merely see them marching toward Pomfret to be executed, as though they have just been arrested upon orders of Richard. (This significance of this telescoping might also include dramatic economy). Holinshed states that Richard and the council agreed that "the foreremembered lords &

knights that were taken from the king at Northampton and Stonie Stratford" were to be decapitated at Pomfret.[1] In a similar manner Shakespeare portrays Buckingham's fall as sudden and unexpected. Holinshed (p. 164-168) and Hall[2] both deal in detail with Buckingham's unsuccessful campaign. Shakespeare, however, dispenses with Buckingham's campaign and capture in just a few lines (IV, iv) and devotes an entire scene to Buckingham's sudden realization, as he is being led to death, that his sins are being vindicated. The theme of the play is especially sustained in his admission that "Wrong hath but wrong, and blame the due of blame" (V, i, 29).

Shakespeare treats Hastings' death somewhat differently than he does the downfalls of the queen's relative and Buckingham. Hastings' punishment comes suddenly and unexpectedly to him, but the audience has long been prepared for it. And because of the audience's awareness of Hastings' insecurity, the atmosphere of the uncertainty of the state of the wicked is intensified by his gross misjudgment in Act III, Scene iv. His assuring of Derby that "...with no man here he /Richard/ is offended" (III, iv, 58) is Shakespeare's invention. By exaggerating Hastings' false sense of security, which is present in the chronicles to a lesser degree (Hall, pp. 261-267; Holinshed, pp. 147-151), Shakespeare prepares for Hastings' speech which pictures the state of each of the wicked in the play (III, iv, 98-103):

> O momentary grace of mortal men,
> Which we more hunt for than the grace of God!
> Who builds his hopes in air of your good looks,
> Lives like a drunken sailor on a mast,
> Ready, with every nod, to tumble down
> Into the fatal bowels of the deep.

Too, Hastings' arrest (I. i, 125-128), which is fictitious, causes his assurance to appear even more foolish than it does in the chronicles. And through Hastings we see that the characters, like a drunken sailor upon a mast, are foolishly unaware of the dangers of their sins and place themselves in a precarious position from which they can fall at any moment.

Shakespeare also develops this theme through the exaggeration of both Richard's evil and Richmond's righteousness until the two leaders become antitheses and serve as dramatic foils for one another. Although Richard's character is painted very darkly by both Holinshed and Hall, Shakespeare, largely through plot changes, defames Richard even more.[3] And through this intensifying of Richard's evil, Shakespeare portrays Richard not only as an evil mortal, but as a being who is so thoroughly wicked that at times he appears inhuman. Richard's sins, like those of Satan, seem to involve more perverseness than ignorance; thus, that he merits punishment is seen more clearly in his career than in those of the other characters. Ernest Howse observes:

> Richard III is a "hero" drama, the drama of one man who in himself personifies the evil of the civil war....Richard is the

> juggernaut going his remorseless way; the others are but the victims whom we watch as they fall. Sometimes we scarcely pity them in their calamity, for the ones who die under the wheels are of the same base kind as he who drives the chariot.[4]

Although the theme of the play is apparent in the downfall of each of Richard's victims, Richard's own career, since it is portrayed as being of a much more evil nature than those of the other characters, more obviously exemplifies the theme than does the fact that Richard himself, as a scourge of God, metes out divine punishment. And it is through departures from history that Shakespeare achieves this effect. He exaggerates Richard's inhuman enjoyment of savagery and his seemingly supernatural powers over men and, thus, makes more forceful the theme.

Richard's characterization as an inhuman tyrant, totally lacking in sympathy, involves significant altering of Shakespeare's sources. Richard's opening soliloquy is of Shakespeare's own invention. Richard declares himself a villain and explicitly states that the reason for his evil is the pleasure which it affords him (I, i, 29-30).[5] Holinshed and Hall, however, show Richard's evil primarily as a means to an end, the end being worldly position and power. Holinshed says that Richard's cruelty was "...not for euill will alway, but ofter for ambition, and either for the suertie or increase of his estate." And Holinshed continues:

> Friend and fo was much what indifferent, where his aduantage grew; he spared no mans death whose life withstoode his purpose (pp. 175-176).

Hall too attributes Richard's evil primarily to his inordinate desire for power, and he concludes his account of Richard's career by saying:

> And yf he had continued still Protectoure and suffered his nephewes to have lyved and reigned, no doubt but the realme had prospered and he muche praysed and beloved as he is nowe abhorred and vilipended...(p. 300).

Shakespeare, however, by attributing to Richard seemingly inhuman savagery magnifies Richard's heinous nature.

Shakespeare deviates from the chronicles in his directly attributing of the death of Clarence to Richard. Holinshed says that the death of Clarence "...rose of a foolish prophesie, which was, that, after K. Edward, one should reigne, whose first letter of his name should be a 'G', and that as a result the king and queen "brought him to his end" (p. 138). And Hall says that King Edward "... caused him [Clarence] to be apprehended, and cast into the Towre, where he beying taken and adjuged for a Traytor, was prively drouned in a But of Malvesey" (p. 250). Shakespeare, however, has Richard plan the murder and even shows him commissioning the murderers and warning them not to be overcome with pity by Clarence's pleading (I, iii, 339-356).

Shakespeare also heightens Richard's cruelty by showing Richard's inordinate interest in the details of the deaths of the two young princes. Holinshed says that Richard gave Tyrrel "great thanks" and suggests that perhaps Tyrrel was

knighted (p. 161), but neither chronicler indicates that Richard reveled in the manner of the deaths. Rather, Richard seemed merely to be relieved that the two boys were out of the way. And both Holinshed and Hall temper the cruelty of the murders to a degree when they show that Richard insisted that the princes be given royal burial (Hall, p. 279; Holinshed, p. 161). Too, Hall causes Richard to appear more human when he says:

> I have harde by credible reporte of suche as were secret with his chamberers that after this abhominable deed done, he never was quiet in his mynde, he never thought him selfe sure where he wente abroade, his body prively feinted, his eyen wherled aboute, his hand ever on his dagger, his contenaunce and maner lyke alwaies to stricke againe, he toke evill reste on nightes, laye long wakyng and musyng, forweried with care and watche, rather slombred then slept, troubled with fearefull dreames, sodeinly somtyme stert up, leapte out of his bed and loked about the chambre, so was his restlesse harte continually tossed and tombled with the tedious impression and stormy remembraunce of his obhominable murther and execrable tyrannye (pp. 279-280).

Although Richard's mental deterioration and his troubled conscience are touched upon in the play, they are greatly minimized; and immediately following the report from Tyrrel, Richard appears to be in exceptionally high spirits when he enumerates his plans, both those accomplished and those to be fulfilled, and remarks, "To her [Elizabeth] I go, a jolly thriving wooer" (IV, iii, 43).

Richard's ruthlessness is also exaggerated in the play by Shakespeare's altering of the Duke of York's removal

from sanctuary. According to Holinshed, the Archbishop persuaded Elizabeth to release the prince (pp. 145-146). Shakespeare, however, apparently has the boy removed by force, according to Buckingham's orders to Hastings: "And from her jealous arms pluck his perforce" (III, i, 36).

Shakespeare also dehumanizes Richard by increasing his mental powers, particularly those of persuasion. The scene in which Richard proposes to Anne involves two departures from history. The wooing of Anne is fictional itself, and the event of the funeral procession is misplaced since it actually occurred in the year 1471. These departures from history serve dramatically to present Richard as being almost superhuman because of the power Shakespeare attributes to him. This power, of course, is instanced in Richard's fantastic wooing of Anne during the funeral procession of her father-in-law whom Richard himself has killed. Similarly, Shakespeare exaggerates Richard's persuasive abilities by altering the circumstances of Richard's suit to Elizabeth. According to the chronicles, Richard sent emissaries to Elizabeth and slowly seems to overcome some of her objections. Holinshed says:

> ...he /Richard/ sent to the queene (being in sanctuarie) diuerse and often messengers, which first should excuse and purge him of all things before against hir attempted or procured, and after should so largelie promise promotions innumerable, and benefits, not onelie to hir, but also to hir sonne lord Thomas, Marquesse Dorset, that they should bring hir (if it were possible) into some wanhope, or (as men saie) into a fooles paradise.

> The messengers, being men both of wit and grauitie, so persuaded the queene with great and pregnant reasons, & with fair and large promises, that she began somewhat to relent, and to guie to them no deafe eare; insomuch that she faithfullie promised to submit and yeeld hir selfe fullie and frankelie to the kings will and pleasure...(p. 162).

Shakespeare, however, has Richard with unmitigated temerity ask Elizabeth for her daughter's hand immediately upon Elizabeth's vociferous and bitter cursing of Richard for the grief he has brought upon her (IV, iv, 198-431). And then Shakespeare allows Richard to appear even more despicable by his gloating over Elizabeth's being a "Relenting fool, and shallow changing woman" (IV, iv, 431).

Richard's intellectual power is seen also in his clever twisting of his and Clarence's conversation in the first scene of the play (I, i, 88-96). This event too is unhistorical.

Also, the scene which most epitomizes Richard's hypocrisy and demonstrates his intellectual cunning, that in which he meditates between two divines, reluctant to grant an audience to the citizens, has no historical basis (III, vii). Of Richard's feigned reluctance to appear, Hall (p. 275) and Holinshed say only that "...the protector made great difficultie to come out vnto them..." (p. 156).

Thus, Shakespeare dehumanizes Richard through departures from history in which he attributes to Richard inordinate pleasure in savagery and uncanny powers of persuasion and intellect, all of which cause Richard to appear a more heinous

character than he is historically and one who is fully deserving of the most dreadful punishment imaginable.

Just as Richard is made more evil than he is historically, so is Richmond purified, and through him the theme that the evil are punished has a counterpart, that the righteous prevail. Shakespeare purifies Richmond primarily by subordinating his desire for power to his desire that good reign. Holinshed, however, indicates otherwise, for he has Richmond say in his oration to his army:

> Therefore labour for your gaine, & sweat for your right. While we were in Britaine, we had small liuings and little plentie of wealth or welfare, now is the time come to get aboudance of riches, and copie of profit; which is the rewarde of your service and merite of your payne (p. 295).

Shakespeare also minimizes Richmond's first defeat (IV, iv, 523-529) and dwells instead upon his final victory, emphasizing the idea that Richmond, who is wholly righteous, is guided by God. This early defeat is dealt with in the play in approximately eight lines, whereas Hall deals with it in a rather detailed manner (p. 285).

Also through deviations from history Shakespeare is able to contrast effectively the two leaders. It is interesting to note that the order of the orations of the leaders to their soldiers is reversed. Bullough suggests that this reversal is designed to disgust the hearer with the baseness of Richard's appeal. And Bullough observes also that the dreams in which the ghosts appear serve similarly.[6]

According to Hall, Richard has a dream of "diverse ymages, lyke terrible develles whiche pulled and haled him" (p. 291), but Shakespeare uses the dreams to display the moral contrast between the two men and to indicate that God, because of Richard's sins, is displeased with him and that Richard's defeat is in punishment for his crimes, whereas Richmond's victory is accorded him through his righteousness. Thus, it appears that Richard is not brought to an end by man, but by God Himself.

Through departures from history Shakespeare creates an atmosphere of guilt and impending punishment, both earthly and eternal, for the wicked. Neither Holinshed nor Hall mentions the murderers of Clarence as having qualms about their deed. Shakespeare, however, has Clarence's murderers engage in a lengthy conversation concerning their troubled consciences and their fear of the judgment. And Clarence in this scene explicitly states the theme of the play when he warns them (I, iv, 204-205):

> Take heed; for he holds vengeance in his hands,
> To hurl upon their heads that break his law.

Clarence's warning is reinforced when after the drowning the second murderer cries (I, iv, 278-280, 285):

> A bloody deed, and desparately dispatch'd
> How fain, like Pilate, would I wash my hands
> Of this most grievous guilty murder done!
> ....I repent me that the duke is slain.

King Edward's remorse over the death of Clarence also contributes to the atmosphere of guilt. He cries, "O God,

I fear thy justice will take hold / On me, and you, and mine, and yours for this!" (II, i, 131-132). Historically, however, Clarence died in 1478 and Edward in 1483, and Shakespeare extends Clarence's life some five years so that Edward's death may appear to be hastened by feelings of remorse and fear of divine vengeance. (Too, however, Shakespeare may have been prompted to telescope these events for dramaturgical reasons.)

The feelings of compunction which the murderers of the princes have are also of Shakespeare's invention: Holinshed and Hall say merely that Tyrrel reported the murder to Richard (Holinshed, p. 161; Hall, p. 279), without commenting upon the reaction of the actual murderers. Shakespeare, however, intensifies the atmosphere of guilt by having the murderers "gone with conscience and remorse" to the point that "They could not speak" (IV, iii, 20-21). And the feelings of guilt which these murderers evidence serve also to magnify Richard's evil nature since these murderers are supposedly seasoned assassins.

One of Shakespeare's most flagrant departures from history is the one which most substantiates the theme of the play. This departure is the ominous presence of Margaret throughout the action. Historically, Margaret never returned to England after she was ransomed. Yet she plays a major part in Richard III. As an avenging nemesis, Margaret functions somewhat as a Greek chorus, and it is in her speeches that the moral lesson of the play, and also of the

tetralogy, is most explicitly found. As discussed previously, Margaret's function seems to be of Senecan derivation; yet her message is similar to that of the Old Testament prophets since her curses are based upon proclamations of God rather than upon blind fate. Thus, Shakespeare employs a pagan element in order to heighten the Biblical concept of divine vengeance. Margaret is an essential part of the play, for she reinforces the moral lesson that the evil are punished, a lesson which would be weakly presented were it necessary to infer it from the play without Margaret. During her first appearance, after enumerating the sins of those of the court, she says, "God, I pray him, that none of you may live your natural age, / But by some unlook'd accident cut off" (I, iii, 212-214). And that their falls are to be a result of the vengeance of God is seen in her warning that should the court serve Richard, all will live the subject of God's hate (I, iii, 313). Margaret's warnings pervade the play, even when she is not on stage. We are reminded of her prophecies when several of those who meet their doom recall her curses (III, iii, 15-18; III, iv, 94-95; IV, v, 25-27). Her curses and the fulfilling of them serve to tie the threads of the play together and to demonstrate that summary justice has been meted out and that those punished have not been struck down arbitrarily, but deservedly. Thus, Margaret's presence reinforces the idea that this is a well-ordered universe in which the wicked do not escape punishment; and through Margaret's unhistorical

presence, Shakespeare provides an ever-present and increasing awareness that those who die do so because of their sins and that this punishment is meted out, albeit indirectly, by God Himself.

Since Shakespeare's Elizabethan audience was familiar with the history presented in Richard III, Shakespeare, of necessity, worked within arbitrary limits. But in his dramatization of history he pictures the inscrutable and relentless working of a universe of moral law. He shows the issues of human life in political terms by picturing England caught between forces of both good and evil. He shows wickedness gradually bringing about its own destruction; and this theme becomes Biblical through the characters' awareness of the vengeance of God, through Richmond's portrayal as a minister of God, and through Margaret's choral commentary. Thus, through Shakespeare's interpretation, he imposes upon history the Christian concept that one's sins will find him out.

CONCLUSION

A study of Richard III reveals that the Bible noticeably influences its theme, characterization, and plotting. The theme is seen in the characters' statements that "Bloody thou art, bloody will be thy end" (IV, iv, 194); "Wrong hath but wrong, and blame the due of blame" (IV, v, 29); and "...sin will pluck on sin" (IV, ii, 65). This is not the entire theme, however, for Shakespeare imposes the concept of divine retribution upon the play's motif of revenge. He shows that the return of evil for evil is not merely evil's wreaking its own destruction: in Richard III the hand of God is behind the various punishments, as is suggested by Clarence's reminder that "...he [God] holds vengeance in his hands, / To hurl upon their heads that break his law" (I, iv, 294-205). It has been demonstrated that this major theme of divine retribution is upheld by minor Biblical themes consisting of virtues which one must cultivate and pitfalls which one must avoid in order to escape the vengeance of God. Although these sub-themes are freely paraphrased rather than directly quoted from the Bible, they are unmistakenly Biblical, and several of them are directly attributed either to the Scriptures or to God. In relation to the Duchess' sin of ingratitude, Dorset says that "God is much displeased..." (II, ii, 89).

Rivers says that charity is "Christian-like" (I, iii, 316), and Richard recognizes that this virtue is derived from "holy writ" (I, iii, 337).

The characterization further supports the theme, primarily in the portrayal of Richard as a scourge of God and in Richmond as a redeemer or minister of God. Also in these two men we see the theme exemplified in that Richard, who is evil, is defeated, and that Richmond, who is righteous, is victorious. The parallels drawn in this study between Biblical characters and those in the play should be considered, except in the case of Richard, as tentative. With this one exception, characterization seems to be the least influenced Biblically of the three aspects of the play studied.

A study of Shakespeare's sources reveals that through his selectivity he alters history in order that the plotting sustain his theme. He causes the downfall of the wicked to appear swift and unexpected, he presents Richard as both an instrument of God and as a being whose sins extend beyond those of a mortal, and he pictures Richmond as wholly righteous. And he unifies these elements by introducing Margaret to remind us constantly that divine justice is being served.

In a discussion of the Biblical influence upon Richard III, the Senecan influence should not be underestimated. The choral commentary, ghosts, atmosphere of horror, and concern with revenge are Senecan, and importantly so. These

pagan elements, however, are fused with Christian tradition and serve to intensify the Biblical theme. The choral commentary is based upon God's promise of vengeance. The ghosts foretell summary justice and are based, in part, on Margaret's prophecies. The atmosphere of horror, although created largely by the fear of earthly suffering, also entails fear of an eternal damnation which is distinctively Christian, as seen in the characters' references to the Christian concepts of Hell, the day of judgment, and the bar of justice. Thus, the motif of revenge is more Christian than Greek.

Although the theme of the play is Biblical, Richard III itself is not didactic. The Biblical influence as a whole serves to instill in the audience the feeling that the outcome of the drama is providential more than to warn the audience of the dangers of sin, although such a warning is certainly inferential. We cannot determine from this study whether or not Shakespeare endorsed Christianity; we can conclude only that he was familiar with the Bible and freely relied upon it as source material. The chief value of this study lies in the fact that, as a popular playwright, Shakespeare doubtless employed the Bible in order to appeal to his audience which was conversant with the Bible and in whose culture the Bible was so important an element. And this fact and the extensive use of the Bible in Richard III suggest that an awareness of the Scriptural allusions is essential to a full understanding of the play.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

[1]Richmond Noble, Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge (New York, 1935), p. 20.

[2]William Burgess, The Bible in Shakespeare (Winona Lake, 1903), p. 61.

[3]Kenneth Muir, Shakespeare's Sources, I (London, 1957), p. 7.

[4]Bishop Charles Wordsworth, Shakspeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible (London, 1864), p. vii.

[5]Hamilton Coleman, Shakespeare and the Bible (New York, 1955).

[6]Wordsworth, p. i.

[7]Thomas Carter, Shakespeare and Holy Scripture (London, 1905).

CHAPTER I

[1]The Complete Works of Shakespeare, ed. Hardin Craig (Chicago, 1951), Act I, Scene iii, Lines 316-317. Subsequent references to Richard III will be to this edition and will be noted parenthetically in the text as to act, scene, and lines.

[2]The Holy Bible, King James Version, Westminister Study Edition (Philadelphia, 1948), Romans 12:17. Subsequent Biblical references will be to this edition and will be noted parenthetically in the text as to book, chapter, and verse.

[3]This certainty also instances dramatic hybris since the characters' confidence leads them to overlook Margaret's warnings.

[4]John Masefield, William Shakespeare (London, 1952), pp. 99-100.

[5]Lily B. Campbell, Shakespeare's Histories (San Marino, 1951), pp. 310-314.

[6]Wordsworth, p. 215.

[7]Campbell, p. 310.

[8]Physical death is a Biblical punishment for the general sinful nature of mankind which results from Adam's transgression (Genesis 3:19), Hebrews 9:27). However, since this penalty is an unavoidable one common to all men, it is considered neither in the play nor in the Bible as individual punishment meted out according to the degree to which one sins.

[9]The sins and punishments of the Israelites are summarized in Psalms 78 and 106.

[10]Types of Biblical suffering:
a) suffering as a result of one's own sins (Job 4:8)
b) suffering associated with martyrdom (Acts 7)
c) suffering as a test of the righteous (Book of Job)
d) suffering to exemplify a spiritual lesson (John 9)
e) suffering which is Biblically unexplained (Job 1:18-19)

[11]In Craig's edition Elizabeth says that her husband is in "perpetual rest." The Variorum, however, reads "nere-changing night."

[12]A.P. Rossiter, Angel with Horns, ed. Graham Storey (New York, 1961), p. 14.

[13]"Abraham's bosom" is a Biblical phrase used in Luke 16:22 and which is equated with Heaven as seen in Matthew 8:11: "...many shall come from the east and west and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven."

[14]Rossiter, p. 7.

[15]"Judgment day" is a phrase found in Jude 6, Matthew 12:36, II Peter 2:9, and II Corinthians 5:10.

CHAPTER II

[1]The Complete Works of Shakespeare, ed. Hardin Craig (Chicago, 1951), p. 314.

[2]This doubtless is an allusion to the account of the Creation as described in the first chapter of Genesis.

[3]In relation to the Bible, "lamb" connotes purity in that Christ, who is "without spot and without blemish," is considered the Lamb of God because of His sacrificial death (John 1:29, 36; Acts 8:32; I Peter 1:19). "Lamb" also connotes goodness to a lesser degree in the sense that members of the "flock of God" are referred to as "lambs" in the New Testament (Luke 10:3; John 12:15; I Peter 5:2).

[4]William Smith, Bible Dictionary, ed. F.N. and M.A. Peloubet (2nd ed., Philadelphia, 1948), p. 534.

[5]Margaret's wording and thought both suggest Psalms 37:22: "...they that be cursed of him shall be cut off."

[6]Margaret's own loss of position as Queen to Henry VI, of course, is responsible for her malice, which is seen in her answer to Elizabeth's avowal that she finds little joy in being queen. Margaret says, "And lessen'd be that small, God, I beseech thee! / Thy honour, state and seat is due to me" (I, iii, 111-112).

[7]Margaret's wish that a plague even more grievous than any she can think of fall upon Richard suggests Moses' concluding statements concerning the curses with which the Israelites are threatened. "Moreover he /God/ will bring upon thee every sickness, and every plague which is not written in the book of this law..." (Deuteronomy 28:60-61).

[8]Moses and Richmond differ, of course, in that the Israelites flee from the Egyptians rather than attack them.

[9]Satan is identified with the devils in Matthew 12:24-26. When Christ rids a possessed man of devils, the Pharisees contend that Christ receives his power from Beelzebub, the "prince of the devils"; and Christ says, "...if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself...."

[10]This exclamation of anger suggests perhaps that Richard is demon-possessed, for it approximates the Biblical expression of "casting out devils" which is found in Mark 9:38 and Luke 9:49.

[11]This and the two following passages seem to allude to I Samuel 16:7: "But the Lord said unto Samuel, Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have refused him: for the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart."

[12]Satan's words are a lie in this instance because this promise is available only to one in the path of obedience.

[13]Matthew 7:3-5: "And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to the brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold a beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

[14]Buckingham's speech that Richard is "...meditating with two deep divines; / Not sleeping, to engross his idle body,/ But praying to enrich his watchful soul" (III, vii, 75-77) is a reference to the incident in the Garden of Gethsemane: "And he cometh unto the disciples, and findeth them asleep, and saith unto Peter, "What could ye not watch with me one hour? Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Matthew 26:40-41). /Italics mine/. This scene also suggests the hypocrites of Matthew 6:5 who "...love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men."

[15]Smith, p. 591.

CHAPTER III

[1]Raphael Holinshed, Holinshed's Chronicle as Used in Shakespeare's Plays, ed. Ernest Rhys (London, 1943), p. 150. Subsequent references to Holinshed's Chronicle will be to this edition and will be noted parenthetically in the text as to page number.

[2]Edward Hall, "The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke," Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, ed. Geoffrey Bullough (London, 1960), p. 280-286. Subsequent references to Hall's chronicle will be to this edition and will be noted parenthetically in the text as to page number.

[3]For a detailed study of Richard III's various historical and dramatic treatments, see G.B. Churchill, Richard III Up to Shakespeare, Berlin, 1900.

[4]Ernest Marshall Howse, Spiritual Values in Shakespeare, (New York, 1955), p. 79.

[5]Richard's inhuman attitude toward his murders is well demonstrated in his cry as he stabs Henry VI: "Down, down to hell; and say I sent thee thither: / I that have neither pity, love nor fear" (3 Henry VI, V, vi, 68-69).

[6]Bullough, ed., Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, III, p. 247.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burgess, William. The Bible in Shakespeare. Winona Lake: Winona Publishing Company, 1903.

Campbell, Lily B. Shakespeare's Histories. San Marino: The Huntingdon Library, 1947.

Carter, Thomas. Shakespeare and Holy Scripture. London: Hodder and Stroughton, 1905.

Churchill, G.B. Richard III Up To Shakespeare. Berlin, 1900.

Coleman, Hamilton. Shakespeare and the Bible. New York: Vantage Press, 1955.

Furness, Howard Horace. Ed., Richard III by William Shakespeare, A New Variorum Edition. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1908.

Hall, Edward. "The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke." Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Ed. Geoffrey Bullough. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960.

Holinshed, Raphael. Holinshed's Chronicle as Used in Shakespeare's Plays. Ed. Ernest Rhys. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1934.

Howse, Ernest Marshall. Spiritual Values in Shakespeare. New York: Abingdon Press, 1955.

Masefield, John. William Shakespeare. London: W. Heinemann, 1952.

Muir, Kenneth. Shakespeare's Sources, I. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1957.

Noble, Richmond. Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935.

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

Rossiter, A.P. Angel with Horns. Ed. Graham Storey. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1961.

Shakespeare, William. The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Ed. Hardin Craig. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1951.

Smith, William. Bible Dictionary. Eds. F.N. and M.A. Peloubet. Philadelphia: Universal Book and Bible House, 1948.

The Holy Bible, King James Version, Westminister Study Edition. Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1948.

Wordsworth, Bishop Charles. Shakspeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible. London: Smith, Elder, and Company, 1864.

VITA

Fleur Fuller

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: REFLECTIONS OF THE BIBLE IN SHAKESPEARE'S RICHARD III

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Amarillo, Texas, August 12, 1938, the daughter of William Gordon and Faye Christopher Fuller.

Education: Graduated from Monterey High School, Lubbock, Texas in 1956; received the Bachelor of Arts Degree from Texas Technological College, 1960; completed requirements for the Master of Arts Degree in August, 1962.

Professional Experience: Since September, 1960, has taught as a graduate assistant in the Department of English and Foreign Languages, Oklahoma State University.