

KING RICHARD III.

INTRODUCTION

BY F. A. MARSHALL.

NOTES BY

F. A. MARSHALL AND P. Z. ROUND.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00145-8 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 3
 William Shakespeare
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ.

KING EDWARD THE FOURTH.		LORD LOVEL.
EDWARD, Prince of Wales, afterwards	} sons to the King.	SIR THOMAS VAUGHAN.
King Edward V.,		SIR RICHARD RATCLIFF.
RICHARD, Duke of York,	} brothers to the King.	SIR WILLIAM CATESBY.
GEORGE, Duke of Clarence,		SIR JAMES TYRREL.
RICHARD, Duke of Gloster, afterwards		SIR JAMES BLUNT.
King Richard III.,		SIR WALTER HERBERT.
A Young Son of Clarence.		SIR ROBERT BRAKENBURY, lieutenant of the Tower.
HENRY, Earl of Richmond, afterwards King		CHRISTOPHER URSWICK, a Priest. Another Priest.
Henry VII.		Lord Mayor of London. Sheriff of Wiltshire.
CARDINAL BOURCHIER, Archbishop of Canter-		TRESSEL and BERKELEY, attending on Lady Anne.
bury.		Ghost of King Henry VI., Prince Edward, his son,
THOMAS ROTHERHAM, Archbishop of York.		and others.
JOHN MORTON, Bishop of Ely.		ELIZABETH, Queen to King Edward IV.
DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.		MARGARET, widow of King Henry VI.
DUKE OF NORFOLK.		DUCHESS OF YORK, mother to King Edward IV.,
EARL OF SURREY, his son.		Clarence, and Gloster.
EARL RIVERS, brother to King Edward's Queen.		LADY ANNE, widow of Edward, Prince of Wales,
MARQUESS OF DORSET and LORD GREY, her sons.		son to King Henry VI.; afterwards married to
EARL OF OXFORD.		Richard, Duke of Gloster.
LORD HASTINGS.		A Young Daughter of Clarence.
LORD STANLEY.		

Lords and other Attendants; a Pursuivant, Scrivener, Citizens, Murderers, Messengers, Soldiers, &c.

SCENE—In various parts of England.

TIME OF ACTION.

The time of this play, according to Daniel, occupies eleven days, with intervals.

Day 1: Act I. Scenes 1 and 2.—Interval.	Day 7: Act IV. Scene 1.
Day 2: Act I. Scenes 3 and 4; Act II. Scenes 1 and 2.	Day 8: Act IV. Scenes 2-5.—Interval.
Day 3: Act II. Scene 3.—Interval.	Day 9: Act V. Scene 1.—Interval.
Day 4: Act II. Scene 4.	Day 10: Act V. Scene 2 and first half of Scene 3.
Day 5: Act III. Scene 1.	Day 11: Act V. second half of Scene 3 and Scenes
Day 6: Act III. Scenes 2-7.	4 and 5.

HISTORIC DATES.—The dead body of Henry VI. exposed to public view in St. Paul's, 22nd May, 1471. Marriage of Richard with Anne, 1472. Death of Clarence, beginning of 1478. Death of Edward IV., 9th April, 1483. Rivers and Grey arrested, 30th April, 1483. Hastings executed, 13th June, 1483. Rivers, Grey, and Vaughan executed, 15th June, 1483. Buckingham harangues the citizens in Guild-hall, 24th June, 1483. Lord Mayor and citizens offer Richard the crown, 25th June; he is declared king at Westminster Hall, 26th June; and crowned, 6th July, 1483. Buckingham executed, October, 1483. Death of Queen Anne, 16th March, 1485. Henry VII. lands at Milford Haven, 7th August, 1485. Battle of Bosworth Field, 22nd August, 1485.

KING RICHARD III.

INTRODUCTION.

LITERARY HISTORY.

Of this play there are more editions printed before 1640 than of any other play of Shakespeare's. As in the case of I. Henry IV., six Quarto editions of this play appeared before the publication of the first Folio in 1623. The first Quarto was printed in 1597, and entitled:

The Tragedy of | King Richard the third. | Containing, | His treacherous Plots against his brother Clarence: | the pittiefull murder of his innocent nephewes: | his tyrannicall vsurpation: with the whole course | of his detested life, and most deserued death. | As it hath bene lately Acted by the | Right honourable the Lord Chamber- | laine his seruants. | AT LONDON | Printed by Valentine Sims, for Andrew Wise, | dwelling in Paules Church-yard, at the | Sign of the Angell. | 1597. | The next Quarto appeared in 1598; the title-page is substantially the same, except that the name of the author ("By William Shakespeare") was added, and that it was printed by Thomas Creede for the same publisher. The third Quarto was printed in 1602. On the title-page of this edition we find "Newly augmented;" but this statement is not founded on fact, as no additions were made. It was reprinted from the second Quarto by the same printer for the same publisher; and the only additions to be found in it are some additional errors of the press. The fourth Quarto was printed in 1605 from the third, with the same title-page, except that it was printed for "*Mathew | Lave*, dwelling in Paules Church-yard, at the Signe | of the Foxe, neare S. Austins gate, 1605. | " and not for Andrew Wise. The fifth Quarto, which has on the title-page: " | As it hath bene lately Acted by the Kings Maiesties | seruants. | " was

printed in 1612 not from Q. 4 but from Q. 3, by the same printer and for the same bookseller as the last edition. The next edition, the sixth Quarto, is the rarest of all, only one copy being known, which is in the Capell collection. It was published in 1622, and the title-page is the same as that of Q. 5, except that it was printed by Thomas Purfoot for the same publisher, Matthew Lawe. Another edition, Q. 7, was printed in 1629; the text was taken, not from F. 1, but from Q. 6. "It was printed by John Norton for Matthew Law. Except in the name of the printer, and the substitution of the word 'tiranous' for 'tyrranical,' the title-page does not differ from that of Q. 6" (see Cambridge ed. p. xv.). The eighth and last Quarto is a mere reprint of Q. 7, and was printed by John Norton in 1634. "There is no bookseller's name on the title-page, if we may trust that which Capell has supplied in MS. 'from a copy in the possession of Messrs. Tonsons and Draper'" (*ut supra*).

The differences and discrepancies between the two principal authentic texts, viz. Q. 1 and F. 1, are so numerous, and so bewildering in their variety and character, that the attempt to piece together from these discordant authorities a text, which shall approach as closely as possible to what Shakespeare intended his amended text to be, is enough to fill any editor with despair. Various theories have been started to account for the utter want of agreement between Q. 1 and F. 1; but none of them furnish any satisfactory solution of the mystery. The theory of the Cambridge editors is so ingeniously devised, and so carefully worked out, that in justice to them we must quote it at length:

"The following scheme will best explain the theory which we submit as a not impos-

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00145-8 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 3

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

KING RICHARD III.

sible way of accounting for the phenomena of the text:



A 1 is the author's original MS.

B 1 is a transcript by another hand with some accidental omissions and, of course, slips of the pen. From this transcript was printed the Quarto of 1597, Q 1.

A 2 is the author's original MS. revised by himself, with corrections and additions, inter-linear, marginal, and on inserted leaves.

B 2 is a copy of the revised MS., made by another hand, probably after the death of the author, and perhaps a very short time before 1623. As the stage directions of the Folio, which was printed from B 2, are more precise and ample as a rule than those of the Quarto, we may infer that the transcript, B 2, was made for the library of the theatre, perhaps to take the place of the original which had become worn by use, for *Richard III.* continued to be a popular acting play. Some curious, though not frequent, coincidences between the text of the Folio and that of the Quarto of 1602, Q 3, lead us to suppose that the writer of B 2, had occasionally recourse to that Quarto to supplement passages which, by its being frayed or stained, had become illegible in A 2.¹ They go on to say: "Assuming the truth of this hypothesis, the object of an Editor must be to give in the text as near an approximation as possible to A,¹ rejecting from F 1 all that is due to the unknown writer of B 2 and supplying its place from Q 1, which, errors of pen and press apart, certainly came from the hand of Shakespeare. In the construction of our text we have steadily borne this principle in mind, only deviating from it in a few instances where we have retained the expanded version of the Folio in preference to the briefer version of the Quarto, even when

we incline to think that the earlier form is more terse and therefore not likely to have been altered by its Author. Our reason is this: as the Folio version contains substantially that of the Quarto and as the question does not admit of a positive decision we prefer the risk of putting in something which Shakespeare did not to that of leaving out something which he did write. *Cæteris paribus* we have adopted the reading of the Quarto."

The conclusion thus arrived at seems rather inconsistent with the facts advanced in their theory; since what an editor should aim at is to make the text as nearly as possible identical with A 2, which, according to the theory of the Cambridge editors, was Shakespeare's *own revision of his original text*. We have therefore based our text upon that of F. 1, only adopting such readings from Q. 1 as the sense, or metre may seem to require. There is no reason to suppose, from what we know of Shakespeare's natural objection to have his plays printed, as long as the acting right was vested in his own company, that Q. 1 was, in this case, an *authorized* transcript from his original text; and we cannot agree with the Cambridge editors that any superiority possessed by either text is, on the whole, to be assigned to the Quarto rather than to the Folio.

It is much easier to find fault with the theories of others upon this difficult question than to propound any more satisfactory theory one's self. It is highly probable that it is owing to the very extraordinary popularity of this play that so many discrepancies are found between the text of Q. 1 and F. 1. The former must have been published within a comparatively short time after the first production of the play. It has already been observed that, from what we know of the history of the other Quartos, it is very improbable that the First Quarto of *Richard III.* was printed with the sanction or under the supervision of the author, and not from a copy obtained by more or less surreptitious means. It is evident that, whatever else it may be, Q. 1 could not have been the play as it was acted when Shakespeare was one of the leading members of the Lord Chamberlain's Company; that is to say, it was not the play as

¹ It is clearly so printed in my copy (Ed. 1864); but it may be a misprint for A₂.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00145-8 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 3

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION.

finally revised by him. It is a very suspicious circumstance that the words "greatly augmented" should appear on the title-page of Q. 3, as there is nothing in the text to justify such a description; and it certainly looks as if the printer had been promised a copy of the play, *as revised by the author*, with the additions that he had made in the course of its successful career. In the case of *Romeo and Juliet* Q. 2 has upon its title-page "Newly corrected, augmented, and amended;" and it, undoubtedly, contains Shakespeare's own revisions, and is the chief authority for the text as now recognized. Also in the case of *Hamlet*, the surreptitiously printed Quarto of 1603 was more than usually defective; and Q. 2 (1604), which is the best and fullest text of the play we have, has upon its title-page "Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true and perfect copie."

With regard to the Cambridge editors, who, in their text, adhere with almost fanatical reverence to Q. 1 in the cases where the difference between it and F. 1 are unimportant, and, in some cases, where the advantage certainly seems to be with the latter—even they acknowledge that the text of F. 1 is very often preferable, and that it contains corrections and additions which must have been made by Shakespeare himself. How, then, are we to account for the fact which must be frankly admitted that, in some cases, the reading of F. 1 is manifestly wrong, and that in many of these cases we are able to correct the mistake by the aid of Q. 1? Some of these mistakes, of course, are mere errors of the transcriber of the MS. or of the printer. But a large balance remains which cannot be so explained. Unfortunately space does not allow us here to go into a minute analysis of the differences between Q. 1 and F. 1. In the case of one scene taken haphazard we have done so; but we must refer our readers to the late Mr. Spedding's admirable paper in the *New Shakspeare Society's Transactions*, 1875 (p. 1-75), with nearly all of which, especially the concluding paragraph, we most cordially agree. Mr. P. A. Daniel, in his *Introduction to the Facsimile Reprint of Q. 1*, has most patiently analysed the

differences between Qq. 1-6 and F. 1; and he comes to the conclusion that F. 1 was printed from a copy of Q. 6, altered "in accordance with the theatrical MS. which the transcriber had before him." The arguments by which he reaches this conclusion are worthy of the closest attention, though we cannot agree with him on all points. But even he admits that an editor should take F. 1 "as the basis of his text."

We can only here suggest some facts which may partially explain the difficulty above mentioned. In order to form an idea of what a playhouse copy of a play was in the time of Shakespeare, one ought to see the MS. copy of some comedy acted by one of the travelling companies in Italy. The stage is, after all, a very conservative institution. Some fifteen or sixteen years ago, if not now, in Italy the theatre-copy of a play was, except for modern handwriting, quite as confused as the playhouse copy would be in the time of Shakespeare. The MS. is written on both sides of the paper, with only a narrow margin left, in which the stage-directions and the "calls" of the various actors are marked, exactly as we find them in the few old playhouse copies that remain to us of dramas acted in the seventeenth century. This one copy serves for the prompter and stage-manager, and from it all the parts have to be copied. It is easy to see how, in the course of the long career of a successful play which, if not acted many times in succession, would be frequently repeated at intervals, this MS. would get terribly damaged. Some of the leaves would have to be restored by the prompter, or by some copyist in the company; and it is possible that, in recopying these damaged sheets, certain lacunæ might have to be filled up from the actors' parts, or even from memory; and in this way, although the prompter may be supposed to have known nearly every line of the piece by heart, verbal errors might easily creep in; as they might also, in cases where some actor's part was used for reference, copied perhaps, in his own not too legible handwriting. It may be that some of the discrepancies in the text of Richard III. arose from the fact that the actors had made some

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00145-8 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 3

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

KING RICHARD III.

alterations without the sanction of the author, and, perhaps, during his temporary absence. Shakespeare assures us in *Hamlet* (iii. 2. 42-50) that he had a very great objection to what is technically known as "gagging." But everyone, who has had any practical experience of theatres, knows how difficult it is to prevent the actors either slightly changing the words of the text, or boldly inserting words of their own. Indeed the text of some plays of comparatively modern date, notably those of Sheridan, which have held the stage for some time, have suffered considerably from these unauthorized alterations. If we bear in mind these circumstances, and remember at the same time that *Richard III.* was, undoubtedly, one of Shakespeare's earliest plays, and had, perhaps, longer and more continued popularity than any other of his dramatic works; that it must have been revised and amended by him from time to time; and that these revisions and amendments were not to be obtained, *otherwise than surreptitiously*, by the printer of any of the Quartos, we shall cease to wonder at the very numerous discrepancies which occur between the texts of Q. 1 and F. 1. After examining the analysis of these discrepancies we must come to the conclusion, in the absence of any direct evidence to the contrary, that the text published by the editor of F. 1 bears a closer resemblance to the real text of Shakespeare than the copy which the enterprising Mr. Andrew Wise managed to get hold of in the year 1597.

To sum up the suggestions here put forward:

(1) It will be seen, from what is said further on as to the date of this play, that it is uncertain how long before 1597 it was acted, but that it was one of Shakespeare's earliest plays. We know it to have been Shakespeare's custom to revise his earliest plays when he considered it worth the trouble. He revised and made additions to *Love's Labour's Lost*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, and *Romeo and Juliet*. We may therefore be pretty certain that, in the case of so popular a play as *Richard III.*, he would revise and, perhaps, re-revise it. (2) Neither Q. 1 nor F. 1 represents the original play of *Richard III.*; but both represent amended versions; the alterations and additions, in both cases, having,

to a very great extent, been made by the author himself. (3) The publishers of the various Quartos before 1623 could not obtain the greater portion of the amendments and alterations made from time to time by the author. These were to be found only in the theatre-copy of the play—what we should call the stage-manager's copy—and F. 1 was, substantially, transcribed from this last copy with a few mistakes of the transcriber and of the printer. (4) The tattered condition into which the playhouse copy fell, owing to constant use, necessitating as it did portions of the MS. being recopied from time to time, accounts for some of the errors in F. 1.

As to the sources from which Shakespeare derived *Richard III.*, it may be said that he owed nothing to the old play of *Richardus Tertius*, and very little if anything to *The True Tragedy of Richard III.* (See note 204.) For his historical material Shakespeare was indebted to Holinshed, who, in his turn, copied almost word for word from Hall; and he, on his part, "conveyed" the history of the greater part of the reign of *Richard III.* from that written by Sir Thomas More. We have, as a rule, given the quotations from the original source, viz. the last-mentioned history. Shakespeare himself appears to have used the second edition of Holinshed, as he has copied a mistake which occurs only in that edition. (See note 647.) He also, very probably, referred to *The Mirror for Magistrates*; but he does not seem to have derived thence any particular incidents or expressions.

What is supposed to be the earliest allusion to *Richard III.* occurs in a collection of epigrams by John Weever, the title-page of which says that it was "Printed by V. S. for Thomas Bushell, and are to be | sold at his shop at the great north doore | of Paules 1599 |" (See *Shakespeare Allusion-Books*, Pt. I. 1874, pp. 181, 182). This is described by the editor (*ut supra*, p. 181) as a *second* edition; but there is nothing to indicate this fact on the original title-page, nor is the existence of any earlier edition known. As Drake points out (vol. ii. p. 371): "The book in question, in the collection of Mr. Comb, of Henley, and supposed to be a unique, was published in 1599,

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00145-8 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 3

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION.

at which period, according to the date of the print of him prefixed by Cecill, the author was twenty-three years old; but Weever tells us, in some introductory stanzas, that when he wrote the poems which compose this volume, he was *not* twenty years old; that he was one

That twenty twelve months yet did *never know*,

consequently, these Epigrams *must have been written in 1595, though not printed before 1599.*" The epigram contains fourteen lines, of which we give the following:—

THE FOURTH WEEKE.

Epig. 22. Ad Gulielmum Shakespeare.

Honie-tong'd *Shakespeare*, when I saw thine issue,
I swore *Apollo* got them and none other,

Rose-checkt *Adonis* with his amber tresses,
Faire fire-hot *Venus* charming him to loue her,
Chaste *Lucretia* virgine-like her dresses,
Prowd lust-stung *Tarquine* seeking still to proue her;
Romea Richard; more, whose names I know not,
Their sugred tongues, and power attractiue beuty
Say they are Saints, although that Sts they shew not,
For thousands vovos to them subiectiue dutie.

It will be observed that this is no direct evidence of the fact of Richard III. having been played at this time; for though the allusion most probably is to that play, still it might be to Richard II. The first Quarto of this play was entered at Stationers' Hall, 20th October, 1597; while Richard II. was registered on 29th August of the same year. Another early reference to Richard III. has been pointed out by Simpson in his Introduction to *A Warning for Fair Women*. In the Introduction to that play Comedy has a speech beginning:

How some damn'd tyrant to obtain a crown
Stabs, hangs, impoisons, smothers, cutteth throats.
—Simpson's *School of Shakspeare*, vol. ii. p. 242.

This is the more curious, as occurring in a play acted by the company to which Shakespeare himself belonged, *viz.* The Lord Chamberlain's Servants. The *Warning to Fair Women* was printed in 1599. We do not know how long it had been acted before. As to other references, there are five quotations

from this play in England's *Parnassus*, 1600.¹ There are other contemporary allusions, but none which need be mentioned here.

As far then as direct external evidence goes, we know that this play must have been produced before 1597, or at least early in that year; the title-page of Q. 1 not containing any statement which implies that it had been acted for any length of time previous to its publication.

On the question of the date of this play Mr. Collier, in his *Bibliographical Account of English Literature* (vol. ii. pp. 262, 263), has pointed out an allusion which seems indirectly to show that Shakespeare's play of Richard III. was not in existence in 1593. The article is on a rare book, the title-page of which is "LICIA | *or* | POEMES OF | LOVE, IN HO- | nour of the admirable | and singular vertues of his Lady, | to the imitation of the best | Latin poets, and others. | Whereunto is added the Rising to the | Croune of RICHARD | the third." There are only two copies of this work known. It has been reprinted in Grosart's *Miscellanies of the Fuller's Worthies' Library* (vol. iii. pp. 76-145), and is by him attributed to Giles Fletcher, whether rightly or wrongly it is not for us here to inquire. There is no date on the title-page of the work; but the letter "to *Ladie Mollineux*," which precedes the poem, is dated 8th September, 1593. The poem on Richard III. by the same author (*ut supra*, pp. 146-159) is absolutely devoid of any poetic merit, and does not contain a single passage or phrase which would seem to have been suggested by Shakespeare's play. Richard, who is supposed to speak in his own person, complains that whereas Shore's wife, Fair Rosamond and Elstred (see *Loocrine*) have all had their sorrows treated on the stage, he and his reverse of fortune have been neglected. The first four lines are:

The Stage is set, for Stately matter fitte,
Three partes are past, which Prince-like acted were,
To play the fourth, requires a kingly witte,
Els shall my muse, their muses not come nere.

¹ Except in one passage, in which there is a mistake of the printer, these passages seem to be quoted from Q. 1 or Q. 2, though in two of the quotations there are important variations in the text from those both of Qq. and Ff.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00145-8 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 3

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

KING RICHARD III.

After speaking of the three heroines above mentioned, he says in the sixth stanza:

Nor weepe I nowe, as children that have lost,

But smyle to see the Poets of this age:

Like silly boates in shallowe rivers tost,

Loosing their paynes, and lacking still their wage,

To write of women, and of womens falles,

Who are too light, for to be fortunes balles.

He then goes on to relate his own reverse of fortune. Certainly this would seem to infer that the writer was not aware of any play on the subject of Richard III. then being acted on the stage; yet we know that the so-called True Tragedy of Richard III., published in 1594, was acted by "the Queenes Maiesties Players;" and it is generally supposed that this was an old play which was published on account of the then popularity of Shakespeare's play; a conjecture which would certainly imply that Shakespeare's play was acted early in 1594, if not in 1593. But it may be that the enterprising publisher of The True Tragedy of Richard III. brought out that somewhat effete work, because he heard that Shakespeare was preparing a play on the subject; or, again, it may have been published independently, or in consequence of the recent productions of the two last parts of Henry VI. We do not find in Henslowe's Diary any mention of a representation of Shakespeare's Richard III. or of any play of that name. It would appear that on 12th June, 1602 (p. 223), Henslowe lent £10 to "bengemy Johnstone, at the apoyntment of E. Allyn and Wm. Birde, the 24 of June 1602, in earneste of a boooke called Richard crockbacke." If Ben Jonson ever wrote this play it must have perished, for nothing is known of it. There is an undated entry in Chettle's handwriting, being a receipt for forty shillings "in earnest of the Booke of Shoare, now newly to be written for the Earl of Worcester's players at the Rose" (p. 214). This must have been some time before the accession of James I. (see note 2, same page). On the 9th May, 1603, there is an entry of a loan "at the apoyntment of Thomas hewod" (Heywood) "and John Ducke unto harry Chettell in earneste of a playe wherein Shores wiffe is written." It is not known to what plays these two several entries

refer. Possibly Chettle assisted Heywood in revising his play of Edward IV. mentioned below. But we get no help from Henslowe's Diary in determining the date of Shakespeare's Richard III.

The internal evidences of the play itself, such as the long passages in *Στιχομυθια*, and the constant tendency to a bombastic style, certainly point to its having been written at an immature period of Shakespeare's career; but the metrical tests do not exactly tally with so early a date. However, it must be remembered that the play was undoubtedly revised, probably more than once, by the author. As has been said above, the present shape, in which we have it, is certainly not that in which it first left his hand.

Of plays on the same subject there were two Latin ones; one by Thomas Legge, acted at St. John's College, Cambridge, 1579, of which MS. copies existed in the University Library and in that of Emmanuel College; and another, on the same subject, which Halliwell describes as a poor imitation of this, by Henry Lacey, and which was acted at Trinity College, 1586. It is possible that Shakespeare knew little and troubled himself less about these two Latin plays. What attracted his attention to the subject was, probably, 'The True Tragedy of Richard III.' We may conclude that this had been played, more or less frequently, for two or three years before it was printed. The following is the title-page: "The True Tragedie of Richard the Third: Wherein is showne the death of Edward the fourth, with the smothering of the two yoong Princes in the Tower: With a lamentable ende of Shores wife, an example for all wicked women. And lastly the coniunction and ioyning of the two noble Houses, Lancaster and Yorke. As it was playd by the Queenes Maiesties Players. London Printed by Thomas Creede, and are to be sold by William Barley, at his shop in Newgate Market, neare Christ Church doore, 1594." About this play, already alluded to, nothing is known as to its authorship or stage-history. The most interesting play by one of Shakespeare's contemporaries, in which Richard III. figures as a character, is Hey-

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00145-8 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 3

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION.

wood's Second Part of Edward IV. In this play Richard is by no means the hero; the tragical end of Jane Shore forming the principal subject, in the pathetic description of whose death the author has foreshadowed the last scene of his best-known play, *A Woman Killed With Kindness*. Both parts of Heywood's Edward IV. should be read by all students of Shakespeare along with III. Henry VI. and Richard III. Heywood's play was printed in 1600, the title being "THE SECOND | PART OF KING EDWARD THE FOURTH. | Containing | his journey into *France*, for the obtaining of | his right there: | The trecherous falshood of the Duke of *Bur-* | gundie and the Constable of *France* | used against him, and his | returne home | againe. | Likewise the prosecution of the historie of M. | *Shoare* and his faire wife | Concluding with the lamentable death of them | both." Both parts were published together, and, as is stated on the title-page, they had "diuers times beene publicly played | by the Right Honourable the Earle of | *Derbie his seruants*;" so that they probably must have been produced some time before that date: they could scarcely have preceded Richard III. There is no sign of either author having copied from the other; though, of course, interesting resemblances may be found between some of Richard's speeches in both plays.

The pieces in *The Mirror for Magistrates*,¹ before the period of this play, are, in *The Third Part* of that work, number 73, *George Plantagenet*, attributed to Baldwin; 74, *King Edward the Fourth*, by Skelton; 75, *Lord Rivers*, attributed to Baldwin; 76, *Lord Hastings*, by Dolman; 77, *The Complaynt of Henry Duke of Buckingham*, by Sackville; 79, *Richarde Plantagenet Duke of Glocester*, by Segar; 84, *Shore's Wife*, by Churchyard; this last one was included in a collection of poems, 1593, called *Churchyard's Challenge*, and is the same poem that appeared in the original edition of *The Mirror for Magistrates*, augmented by twenty-one stanzas. By a curi-

¹ The numbers attached to the various pieces are taken from the reprint of this well-known work by Joseph Hazlewood, 1815, and will be found in vols. ii. and iii. respectively.

ous mistake Stokes, in his *Chronological Order of Shakespeare's Plays*, refers to this as a play, and calls it *Churchyard's* (p. 29). Finally, there are two pieces in Pt. IV. by Richard Niccols: 95, *The lamentable lives and deaths of the two young Princes, Edward the fifth and his brother Richard Duke of York*; and 96, *The tragical life and death of King Richard the third*. These were written after the appearance of Shakespeare's play. The most interesting parallel passages in these poems and Richard III. will be found quoted in the notes.

There is rather a striking resemblance between a passage in Richard III.'s first soliloquy (i. l. 12-15) and a poem included in the first issue of *Epigrammes and Elegies* by J. D. and C. M. and headed *Ignoto*:

I am not fashion'd for these amorous times,
To court thy beauty with lascivious rhymes;
I cannot dally, caper, dance, and sing,
Oiling my saint with supple sonnetting.

(See Dyce's *Marlowe*, 1876, p. 366.)

It may be remarked that this poem does not appear in the subsequent editions, which are both undated; but, on the authority of Ritson, the date of the first edition is generally assigned to 1596 (*ut supra*, Preface, p. xxxviii.). The resemblance is not very exact, but there is sufficient similarity of expression to suggest that the one author might have had the other's lines in his mind at the time. Perhaps this passage may be held by some to bear on the question whether this play is by the same authors as *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy*, and was only revised by Shakespeare. It would be interesting to analyse the language of Richard III., and to see how many peculiar or characteristic phrases and words are common to that play and to the Second and Third Parts of Henry VI. There are certainly passages in Richard III. which are suggestive of Marlowe's inflated style; but whether these passages were due simply to the fact of Shakespeare being, in the earlier part of his career, consciously or unconsciously, an imitator of the older dramatist, or whether they were due to Marlowe's open co-operation, we probably never shall know. If concordances could be made to the

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00145-8 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 3

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

KING RICHARD III.

works of the Elizabethan dramatists, they would be of infinite assistance in determining the question as to the supposed joint-authorship of some of Shakespeare's plays. For instance, if we find that in the Second and Third Parts of Henry VI. and in Richard III. there are many peculiar words used, and used only in these plays by Shakespeare, which words are also characteristic of, if not peculiar to Marlowe, it would be a considerable piece of presumptive evidence that he assisted Shakespeare in the composition of all three plays. Mr. P. A. Daniel has no doubt that this play is "the work of the author or authors of the Henry VI. series of plays" (*ut supra*, p. iv.). But until we have some very much stronger evidence than has yet been offered of the work of any other writer in this play, we shall not attempt to rob Shakespeare of the fame which belongs to the author of Richard III.

STAGE HISTORY.

Although so popular and so frequently acted, as this play must have been between 1595 and 1630, very little has come down to us with regard to the stage history of Richard III. during this period; but there are several contemporary allusions. How closely Burbage was associated with the part of Richard III. appears from the well-known passage in Bishop Corbet's *Iter Boreale* (written about 1618), in which he mentions that his host rode with him part of the way, on his journey from Nuneaton to Coventry, when they passed close to Bosworth Field:

See yee yon wood? There Richard lay,
With his whole army: Looke the other way.
And loe where Richmond in a bed of gorse
Encampt himsele ore night, and all his force:
Upon this hill they mett. Why, he could tell
The inch where Richmond stood, when Richard fell:
Besides what of his knowledge he could say,
He had authenticke notice from the Play;
Which I might guesse, by's mustring up the ghosts,
And policyes, not incident to hosts;
But cheifly by that one perspicuous thing,
Where he mistooke a player for a king.
For when he would have sayd, King Richard dyed,
And call'd—A horse! a horse!—he Burbidge cry'de.
Corbet's Poems [Gilchrist's Reprint, 1807],
pp. 193, 194.

10

In the journal of John Manningham, 1601, under date 2d February and 13th March, there is an anecdote—we cannot quote it here—in which Burbage is even more strongly identified with Richard III. In the Third Part of *The Return from Parnassus* (1601) Burbage (who is introduced as a character) says to Philomusus: "I like your face and the proportion of your body for *Richard* the 3. I pray M. *Phil.* let me see you act a little of it.

Phil. Now is the winter of our discontent,
Made glorious summer by the sonne of Yorke."
(Macray's Reprint, 1886, pp. 140, 141.)

The numerous quotations and imitations of the well-known line—

A horse, a horse, my kingdom for a horse

are given in note 655. The earliest absolute mention of the performance of the play is found in Sir Henry Herbert's Diary, in which it is stated that "Richarde the Thirde was acted by the K. players at St. James, wher the king and queene were present, it being the first play the queene sawe since her M.^{ty's} delivery of the Duke of York. 1633."

As we have already said, there is no mention of this play in Henslowe, and none in Pepys. Betterton does not seem ever to have played Shakespeare's Richard III., though he represented the character of Richard III. in *The English Princess*, by Caryll, in 1667. In fact, we can find no record of the performance of this play till Cibber's hybrid composition was produced, when "it seems to have been printed without the names of the performers to the D. P." (Genest, vol. ii. p. 195). This version, to the eternal discredit of the national intelligence and taste, held the stage for over one hundred and fifty years. As we purpose giving a reprint of Cibber's version, with an analysis of its several component parts, it is not necessary, at this point, to say anything more about it.

It would be impossible to go through the list of the many celebrated actors who have, more or less, made their mark in the part of Richard. Among the most celebrated names are those of Quin, Ryan, Barry, Sheridan, Henderson, Kemble, and Kean. Garrick, as is well known, made his first appearance at Good-